

Chapter 5: Open Environment

Policy GGreen Belt (Green belt)

Deposit Draft Objections

Support for Policy

GGreen Belt / 284 / 1566	The Barnet Society	5.1.7
GGreen Belt / 200 / 1278	Adrian Salt and Pang Ltd	5.3.1

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

GGreen Belt / 319 / 5817R	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)
15 / 5491R	North Finchley Agenda 21 Partnership

Support for Policy Changes

GGreen Belt / 319 / 5818R	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	5.1.4
---------------------------	--------------------------------------------------	-------

Pre-Inquiry Change Objections

GGreen Belt / 377 / 6946P	Lynne Ogden	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 378 / 7073P	Mr Roger Browning	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 379 / 7074P	B.L. Watson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 380 / 7075P	Ms Helen Harte	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 381 / 7076P	D McClore	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 382 / 7077P	M.G Pyrre	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 383 / 7078P	Mr John Clayton	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 384 / 7079P	Mr Freddie Taylor	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 385 / 7080P	Mr Craig Leuin	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 386 / 7081P	Mr Colin Saunders	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 387 / 7082P	Mr Daniel Ingle	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 388 / 7083P	Mr Adam Warden	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 389 / 7084P	Mr Andy Brony	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 390 / 7085P	M Neidus	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 391 / 7088P	H Griffin	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 392 / 7089P	M Newell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 393 / 7090P	L Lynch	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 394 / 7091P	Mr Jonny Lines	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 395 / 7093P	Ms Kim Hunt	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 396 / 7094P	Mr John Morris	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 397 / 7095P	M Yates	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 398 / 7096P	A Wilson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 399 / 7098P	A Douglas	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 400 / 7100P	S Nugent	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 401 / 7101P	Mr Grant Graves	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 402 / 7102P	Mr William Evans	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 403 / 7103P	Mr Patrick Houilton	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 404 / 7104P	D.G. Pyrke	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 405 / 7105P	RFP Copland	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 406 / 7106P	Lee Mills	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 407 / 7107P	I Wheeler	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 408 / 7108P	S Watson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 409 / 7109P	Mr Craig Clayton	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 410 / 7110P	P Jackson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 411 / 7111P	N Jackson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 412 / 7112P	Mr Bruce Holborough	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 413 / 7113P	Mr Richard Macaulay	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 414 / 7114P	M Davies	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 415 / 7115P	Crystal Mitchell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 416 / 7116P	R Mitchell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 417 / 7117P	Mr David Lewis	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 418 / 7118P	Mr David Sale	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 419 / 7127P	Alex Smith	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 420 / 7128P	P Smith	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 421 / 7129P	R Page	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 422 / 7130P	J Mould	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 423 / 7131P	M Tyler	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 424 / 7132P	Terry Collins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 425 / 7134P	M Wilson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 426 / 7135P	D Sanford	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 427 / 7136P	L Davidson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 428 / 7137P	D.R. Morris	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b

GGreen Belt / 429 / 7138P	James Lester	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 430 / 7139P	Guy Baomsl	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 431 / 7140P	D Mitchinson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 432 / 7141P	Ms Heather Harris	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 433 / 7142P	Mr Paul Winston	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 434 / 7143P	G Reynolds	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 435 / 7144P	J.A. Westmoreland	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 436 / 7145P	L.V. Theobald	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 437 / 7146P	B Hughes	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 438 / 7147P	Mr Graeme Cooper	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 439 / 7148P	Mr Pierre Ason-Tsang	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 440 / 7150P	A.F. Swineler	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 441 / 7151P	Richard Soer	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 442 / 7152P	R.P. Milner	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 443 / 7153P	R Glazer	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 444 / 7154P	Mr David Cracknell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 445 / 7155P	Hayley Richards	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 446 / 7156P	Mr John Hunt	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 447 / 7157P	Alexis Kyriakides	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 448 / 7158P	James Harvey	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 449 / 7159P	Mr Tom Stuttard	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 450 / 7160P	N.B. Pritchard	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 451 / 7161P	T Rose	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 452 / 7163P	E Piu	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 453 / 7164P	M.J. Powell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 454 / 7165P	Mr Simon Hunt	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 455 / 7166P	G Bowman	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 456 / 7167P	Ms Helen Cooper	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 457 / 7168P	Mr Gary Jupp	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 458 / 7169P	G.R. Cooper	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 459 / 7170P	N Hatch	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 460 / 7171P	Mr Andrew Wray	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 461 / 7173P	Mr Paul Cooper	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 462 / 7174P	Mr Brian Tippines	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 463 / 7175P	Mr Steve Roberts	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 464 / 7176P	Mr Paul Teeung	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 465 / 7177P	Mr John Salter	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 466 / 7178P	Cliff Roberts	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 467 / 7179P	Gregg Cristofoli	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 468 / 7180P	Mr Holmes	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 469 / 7181P	J.C. Sullivan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 470 / 7182P	Mr Brian Hickey	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 471 / 7183P	G Cooper	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 472 / 7184P	Mr Eric Childs	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 473 / 7185P	R Waterlow	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 474 / 7186P	Ms Paula Watson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 475 / 7187P	T Norman	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 476 / 7188P	R Stevens	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 477 / 7189P	Ms Helen Harvey	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 478 / 7245P	A Draper	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 479 / 7246P	Ms Abigail Cooper	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 480 / 7247P	J.P. Cooper	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 481 / 7248P	Mr Stuart Mitchell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 482 / 7249P	Michael Campbell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 483 / 7251P	Ms Joanne Campbell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 484 / 7252P	Mr Colin Campbell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 485 / 7254P	Jimmy Miller	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 486 / 7255P	Mr N Sallas	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 487 / 7256P	Mr Arthur Chapman	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 488 / 7257P	Tommy Rose	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 489 / 7258P	Ms Franger	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 490 / 7259P	M B Eade	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 491 / 7260P	H Eade	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 492 / 7261P	L Eade	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 493 / 7262P	J Lovelock	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 494 / 7263P	S Richardson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 495 / 7264P	S O'Connell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 496 / 7265P	Gillian Kurland	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 497 / 7266P	John Rose	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 498 / 7267P	Angela Mabey	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 499 / 7269P	S Tierny	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b

GGreen Belt / 500 / 7270P	A Buckland	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 501 / 7272P	June Walsh	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 502 / 7273P	A Tollervey	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 503 / 7274P	Mr C O'Gorman	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 504 / 7275P	Steve Buckland	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 505 / 7276P	T Nicholls	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 506 / 7278P	D Wiggins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 507 / 7279P	Dave Morris	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 508 / 7280P	Stephen Fretow	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 509 / 7281P	Gerry Currell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 510 / 7283P	Mr R C Currell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 511 / 7284P	Craig Abrahams	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 512 / 7285P	R Sugarman	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 513 / 7286P	S A Herbert	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 514 / 7287P	I Bragoli	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 515 / 7289P	G Cannon	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 516 / 7290P	Phillip Myers	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 517 / 7001P	K.V. Myers	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 518 / 7291P	A Journes	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 519 / 7292P	Brenda Allan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 520 / 7293P	S Allan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 521 / 7294P	R Allan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 522 / 7295P	T G Duke	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 523 / 7296P	D G Nickolls	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 524 / 7297P	Lenor Pierozzi	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 525 / 7298P	Pierozzi Luciano	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 526 / 7299P	P Cannon	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 527 / 7300P	Paul Meehan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 528 / 7302P	B Meechan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 529 / 7303P	Brian Grogan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 530 / 7304P	D J Woodbridge	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 531 / 7305P	L Bean	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 532 / 7307P	Kevin Horne	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 533 / 7309P	D A Miwer	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 534 / 7310P	G C Fisher	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 535 / 7311P	Alan Smith	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 536 / 7312P	P Collins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 537 / 7313P	John Snow	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 538 / 7314P	T Wilkins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 539 / 7315P	David Damson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 540 / 7317P	Anthony Martin	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 541 / 7319P	Steve Horne	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 542 / 7320P	A Gordon	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 543 / 7321P	Robert L Smith	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 544 / 7322P	Richard White	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 545 / 7323P	Mark Delco	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 546 / 7324P	M Morrall	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 547 / 7325P	Martin Price	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 548 / 7326P	T Keenan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 549 / 7327P	M Sanders	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 550 / 7328P	R Knox	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 551 / 7329P	G Handzopoulos	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 552 / 7330P	Gunther Walker	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 553 / 7331P	M Edwards	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 554 / 7332P	Paul Stock	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 555 / 7333P	J Sandford	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 556 / 7334P	R E Thompson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 557 / 7335P	D L Bowman	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 558 / 7336P	Mr J S Harris	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 559 / 7337P	Janice Rose	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 560 / 7338P	Dane Kierstenson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 561 / 7339P	M Tweedie	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 562 / 7340P	Thomas O'Toole	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 563 / 7341P	H Fergy	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 564 / 7342P	Jon Desmond	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 565 / 7344P	Andy McCall	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 566 / 7345P	Ian Grottick	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 578 / 7002P	Mr Wayne Thorose	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 579 / 7003P	Mr Carl Thorose	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 580 / 7004P	Mr Henry John Toye	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 581 / 7005P	James Matthewson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b

GGreen Belt / 582 / 7006P	P.J. Morgan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 583 / 7007P	K Marsh	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 584 / 7008P	Catherine Lemming	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 585 / 7009P	Mr William Bowley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 586 / 7010P	Ann Bull	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 587 / 7011P	F.A Beazley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 588 / 7012P	K.L. Beazley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 589 / 7013P	Mr Malcolm Donald	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 590 / 7014P	J.A. Matthewson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 591 / 7015P	Shahid Haq	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 592 / 7016P	J Castignetti	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 593 / 7017P	Ms Linda Lipman	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 594 / 7018P	Mark Lipman	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 595 / 7019P	M Jones	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 596 / 7020P	Michael Smith	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 597 / 7021P	Simon Davis	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 598 / 7022P	Nick Hopwood	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 599 / 7023P	R Pullenayegum	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 600 / 7028P	Jane Marsh	(KBA)	
GGreen Belt / 601 / 7027P	Steven Marsh	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 602 / 7026P	DB Marsh	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 603 / 7029P	Peter Marsh	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 604 / 7030P	Tim Searle	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 605 / 7031P	Graham Searle	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 606 / 7032P	Mr Steve Vincent	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 607 / 7033P	Rob Borg	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 608 / 7034P	P.D. Edwards	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 609 / 7035P	G.J. Clark	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 611 / 7036P	Janet Matthewson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 612 / 7037P	John Lewis	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 617 / 7038P	Geoff Masters	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 618 / 7039P	P.M. Farrell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 619 / 7040P	T.J. Farrell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 620 / 7041P	Gary Kennedy	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 621 / 7042P	Mr J Ford	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 622 / 7043P	Dominic Woolard	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 623 / 7044P	T.B. Cheshire	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 624 / 7045P	A Morgan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 625 / 7046P	D Toye	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 626 / 7047P	Lisa Toye	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 627 / 7048P	J Searle	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 628 / 7049P	A Alcock	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 629 / 7050P	D Hillman	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 630 / 7051P	Sheena Cooper	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 631 / 7052P	Richard Dunmayne	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 632 / 7053P	P Bentley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 633 / 7054P	Hulling Sucult	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 634 / 7055P	A Jenkins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 635 / 7056P	M Gower	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 636 / 7057P	Mr Alan. S. Wakefield	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 823 / 7058P	Will Rudlins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 824 / 7059P	D George	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 825 / 7060P	A Murphy	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 826 / 7061P	M.G. Smit	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 827 / 7062P	S.A. Smit	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 828 / 7063P	Matt Smit	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 829 / 7064P	M Moate	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 830 / 7065P	R.A. Scott	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 831 / 7066P	D O'Mamowey	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 832 / 7067P	A Moore	(KBA)	5.3.32 - 5.3.32b
GGreen Belt / 833 / 7068P	Jack Harness	(KBA)	5.3.32 - 5.3.32b
GGreen Belt / 834 / 7069P	A Cousins	(KBA)	5.3.32 - 5.3.32b
GGreen Belt / 835 / 7070P	Duncan Quigley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 836 / 7071P	Nick Street	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 837 / 7072P	Owlad Emmanuel	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 872 / 6947P	M.T.W Bentley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 873 / 6948P	Mr Nigel Roth	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 874 / 6949P	Mr Nicholas Roth	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 875 / 6950P	M.H. Bae	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 876 / 6951P	C.L.R Boden	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 877 / 6952P	Rob Harron	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b

GGreen Belt / 878 / 6953P	Lesley Harron	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 879 / 6954P	Claire Poole	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 880 / 6955P	Ben Poole	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 881 / 6956P	B Rose	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 882 / 6957P	Greg Simms	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 883 / 6958P	Robin Goldman	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 885 / 6960P	S Hollins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 886 / 6962P	Karl Lipscombe	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 887 / 6963P	Jon Tiller	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 888 / 6964P	Mr George Blevings	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 889 / 6965P	Mr Rob Nutting	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 890 / 6966P	Mr Ben Keogh	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 891 / 6967P	Mr Derek Broomfield	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 892 / 6968P	Mr Tom Blake	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 893 / 6969P	Russell Hawkins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 894 / 6970P	P Berry	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 895 / 6971P	Mr Paul O'Duffy	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 567 / 7380P	David Whitehouse	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 568 / 7382P	J.P Adkins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 569 / 7384P	M Matthewson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 570 / 7385P	S.A. Matthewson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 571 / 7386P	Mr Steve Watson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 572 / 7387P	Mr Steven Mann	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 573 / 7391P	Mr John Berridge	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 574 / 7392P	P Snow	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 575 / 7393P	R Greenfield	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 576 / 7394P	Eleri Scott	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 577 / 7395P	Mr Brian Ingle	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 637 / 7396P	S.A. Cowin	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 638 / 7397P	N.R. Freeborn	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 639 / 7398P	Robert Collins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 640 / 7399P	Adrian Sayward	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 641 / 7400P	Andrew Cole	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 642 / 7401P	Mr Colin Watts	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 643 / 7402P	A.M Reynolds	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 644 / 7403P	Michael Sharon	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 645 / 7404P	Leslie Skuse	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 646 / 7405P	Kevin Green	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 647 / 7406P	Karen Purser	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 648 / 7407P	Mr Adam Wilkinson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 649 / 7408P	John Purser	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 650 / 7409P	B Keane	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 651 / 7410P	Mr Wadsley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 652 / 7411P	K.R. Jones	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 653 / 7412P	M Dedenham	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 654 / 7413P	L Debenham	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 655 / 7414P	C.A Gibbens	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 656 / 7415P	Graham Rix	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 657 / 7416P	Mr Peter Flower	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 658 / 7417P	Ian Brown	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 659 / 7418P	Mr Robert Wormault	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 660 / 7419P	S.J. Colley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 661 / 7420P	R.A. Harris	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 662 / 7421P	S. Spreadbury	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 663 / 7422P	K Moore	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 664 / 7423P	D Northcott	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 665 / 7424P	Paul Foulser	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 666 / 7425P	B Hopkins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 667 / 7426P	W Wildman	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 668 / 7427P	Ian Copping	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 669 / 7428P	D Copping	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 670 / 7429P	S.M. Dewch	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 671 / 7430P	R Jackson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 672 / 7431P	Richard Aspden	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 673 / 7432P	Mr Thomas	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 674 / 7433P	J Stratton	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 675 / 7434P	Lee Metselaar	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 676 / 7435P	J Venneear	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 809 / 7436P	M L Alcock	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 677 / 7437P	Paul Spriggs	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 678 / 7438P	Geoff Masters	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b

GGreen Belt / 679 / 7439P	B Mutch	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 680 / 7440P	Charlotte Green	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 681 / 7441P	Ryan Jell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 682 / 7442P	R W Crowley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 683 / 7443P	Rob Radford	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 684 / 7444P	Dan Crowley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 685 / 7445P	J Robinson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 686 / 7446P	D J Robinson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 687 / 7447P	Wayne Humber	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 688 / 7448P	M Burr	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 689 / 7449P	Brian Hird	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 690 / 7450P	T Hayes	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 691 / 7451P	P Cowkin	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 692 / 7452P	Paul Pelter	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 694 / 7453P	D Warner	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 695 / 7454P	S Wilmott	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 808 / 7455P	Wendy Hoyte	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.2.23b
GGreen Belt / 696 / 7456P	N Biscoe	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 697 / 7457P	J Pennington	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 810 / 7458P	T Smith	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 698 / 7459P	G Southorn	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 699 / 7460P	C Feraday	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 811 / 7461P	Gordon Marshall	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 812 / 7462P	D Vick	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 813 / 7463P	Julie Pielsticker	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 814 / 7464P	John Allen	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 700 / 7465P	A A Burns	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 815 / 7466P	C Baldwin	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 702 / 7467P	Jamie Burns	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 701 / 7468P	T Wiley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 816 / 7469P	B S Tuckey	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 703 / 7470P	Berni O'Brien	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 704 / 7471P	L E Howard	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 705 / 7472P	Arthur Willows	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 706 / 7473P	John Howard	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 707 / 7474P	N Davis	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 708 / 7475P	J M Madden	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 709 / 7476P	H M Hartwell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 817 / 7477P	David Amies	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 710 / 7478P	H Bunn	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 712 / 7479P	R J Bigg	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 819 / 7480P	Tom Cloke	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 713 / 7481P	J Hearn	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 820 / 7482P	G Whitehead	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 821 / 7483P	Richard Carter	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 714 / 7484P	B L Finch	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 822 / 7485P	T Knell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 838 / 7486P	Fred Smith	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 715 / 7487P	Alison Finch	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 716 / 7488P	Simon Mann	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 717 / 7489P	P Watson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 718 / 7490P	Oliver Minton	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 839 / 7491P	F Bruzzi	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 719 / 7492P	Andrew Moore	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 720 / 7493P	B Cockelton	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 840 / 7494P	S Molman	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 841 / 7495P	C Stocker	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 842 / 7496P	Tiet	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 843 / 7497P	Grant Cass	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 721 / 7498P	M J Pamplin	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 722 / 7499P	Will Watson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 723 / 7500P	W Cresswell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 844 / 7501P	D Hawkins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 724 / 7502P	M A Hall	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 725 / 7503P	Stephen Hallinn	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 845 / 7504P	Mr Matthew Searle	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 846 / 7505P	Ms Susan Searle	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 847 / 7506P	Mr Andy Gaymer	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 848 / 7507P	Mr Alan Gaymer	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 849 / 7508P	Mr Richard Lake	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 726 / 7509P	N R J Baker	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b

GGreen Belt / 850 / 7510P	C.E. Redmond	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 727 / 7511P	A R Hall	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 728 / 7512P	P Hundleby	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 851 / 7513P	C Lumley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 729 / 7514P	J Darcy-Haldane	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 730 / 7515P	P Mitchinson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 852 / 7516P	Ms Lucy Perkins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 853 / 7517P	R Haynes	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 731 / 7518P	B Hopkins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 854 / 7519P	Mr John Willcocks	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 732 / 7520P	B Crabb	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 855 / 7521P	A.R. Wakefield	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 733 / 7522P	Glen Parker	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 734 / 7523P	Michael Bevan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 856 / 7524P	Mr Paul Canton	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 735 / 7525P	William	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 736 / 7526P	Reg Hay	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 737 / 7527P	T Keewan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 857 / 7528P	R Murray	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 738 / 7529P	Mark Steele	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 739 / 7530P	Alan Hoskins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 740 / 7531P	George Hammond	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 741 / 7532P	Lee Foster	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 742 / 7533P	Betty Hoskins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 743 / 7534P	P Price	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 744 / 7535P	Lisa Elliot	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 745 / 7536P	S Shivji	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 746 / 7537P	Michael Cobley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 747 / 7538P	Sandra Dale	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 748 / 7539P	David Smith	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 749 / 7540P	Tom Hammond	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 750 / 7541P	A J Pada	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 751 / 7542P	Michael Howell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 752 / 7543P	D A Hills	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 753 / 7544P	Michael Elliot	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 754 / 7545P	Trevor Cotterell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 755 / 7546P	Hitul Patani	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 756 / 7547P	Michael Thomas	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 757 / 7548P	Kelly Thomas	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 758 / 7549P	Chris Sayers	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 858 / 7550P	Keith Doe	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 759 / 7551P	Paul Wood	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 760 / 7552P	J Harding	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 859 / 7553P	Chris Smith	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 860 / 7554P	Mr Andrew Smith	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 761 / 7555P	Jon Williams	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 762 / 7556P	Mike Loneman	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 763 / 7557P	D Burness	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 861 / 7558P	T Stefaniv	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 764 / 7559P	Carl Jenkins	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 862 / 7560P	Mr David Goss	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 765 / 7561P	A J Holton	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 766 / 7562P	T Jennison	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 863 / 7563P	T Brezze	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 767 / 7564P	G Smith	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 768 / 7565P	Peter Green	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 769 / 7566P	M C Warlick	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 864 / 7567P	Mr James Naptain	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 770 / 7568P	Alison Joseph	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 865 / 7569P	M Canter	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 866 / 7570P	Mr John Noonan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 867 / 7571P	A Manktelon	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 771 / 7572P	Kevin Burness	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 772 / 7573P	J Taylor	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 773 / 7574P	Chris Bates	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 774 / 7575P	M Hooper	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 868 / 7576P	Mr Don McCallum	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 775 / 7577P	Damian Griffiths	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 776 / 7578P	G C Stokes	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 869 / 7579P	Mr David Mills	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 777 / 7580P	Phil Garnett	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b

GGreen Belt / 778 / 7581P	Richard Mansep	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 870 / 7582P	D Soer	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 779 / 7583P	Iain Botterill	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 871 / 7584P	Mr Thomas Scanlon	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 780 / 7585P	Andy Ward	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 896 / 7586P	Joss Sheldon	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 897 / 7587P	S.R. Harris	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 898 / 7588P	Mr Robert Aylett	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 899 / 7589P	Mr John Crowley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 900 / 7590P	Mr Phil Harding	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 901 / 7591P	Ms Natasha Bennett	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 902 / 7592P	Mr Nigel Bennett	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 903 / 7593P	R Dhawan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 781 / 7594P	Patricia Botterhill	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 782 / 7595P	R W Briggs	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 783 / 7596P	L Petch	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 784 / 7597P	S Rusted	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 785 / 7598P	Harry Clarke	(KBA)	7.3.23 - 7.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 904 / 7599P	M Dhawan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 786 / 7600P	G B Hunt	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 905 / 7601P	TFT Hufford	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 787 / 7602P	C Degan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 906 / 7603P	Mr Peter Bright	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 788 / 7604P	Dick Bailey	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 907 / 7605P	Mr John. F. Gardner	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 908 / 7606P	Siza Acata	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 789 / 7607P	John Williams	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 790 / 7608P	Bevis Thomas	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 909 / 7609P	Mr Graham Sleed	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 910 / 7610P	Mr Michael Kilbey	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 791 / 7611P	Rob Vale	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 792 / 7612P	Chris Woollar	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 911 / 7613P	A Morgan	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 793 / 7614P	J P Mohammed	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 794 / 7615P	John Williams	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 912 / 7616P	A Thomson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 795 / 7617P	John McArthur	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 796 / 7618P	Mr Tapp	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 797 / 7619P	R James	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 913 / 7620P	Jamie Frankel	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 798 / 7621P	B Daykin	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 799 / 7622P	R Thomas	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 800 / 7623P	Nick Williams	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 914 / 7624P	Chris Emerz	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 801 / 7625P	P M Hooper	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23
GGreen Belt / 802 / 7626P	Victoria Hooper	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 915 / 7627P	Mr James Castle	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 803 / 7628P	Vanessa Hooper	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 916 / 7629P	J.M. Miner	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 804 / 7630P	L Stokes	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 805 / 7631P	Chris Stokes	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 917 / 7632P	R Saunders	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 806 / 7633P	M Woolgar	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 918 / 7634P	Mr Ian Fletcher	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 807 / 7635P	Martin Sadler	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 919 / 7636P	A Allen	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 920 / 7637P	W Wormaid	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 921 / 7638P	Harmer	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 922 / 7639P	Ms Louise Salter	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 923 / 7640P	Ian Anderson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 924 / 7641P	Ms Catherine Massey	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 925 / 7642P	M Euesden	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 926 / 7643P	Terry O'Dwyer	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 927 / 7644P	Mr Nigel Blackwell	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 928 / 7645P	Mr Peter Flower	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 929 / 7646P	Mr Stephen Murray	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 930 / 7647P	J.F Madden	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 931 / 7648P	Kirsty Madden	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 932 / 7649P	Mr Christopher Nash	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 933 / 7650P	J.A Matthewson	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 947 / 7651P	B Shilling	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b

GGreen Belt / 884 / 7652P	D.F. Lowry	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 818 / 7653P	C Merryweather	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 616 / 7654P	Michael Hanley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 615 / 7655P	Mark Ashfield	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 614 / 7656P	Tom Bentley	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b
GGreen Belt / 613 / 7657P	Kirsty Maddon	(KBA)	5.3.23
GGreen Belt / 610 / 7658P	M.L. Chern	(KBA)	5.3.23 - 5.3.23b

Issues

- The status of land at Underhill;
- The GLA's biodiversity strategy.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.1 I deal with the 500 plus 'Keep Barnet Alive' objections later in this chapter. These address the status of land occupied by Barnet Football Club, Underhill.
- 5.2 In respect of the RSPB objection, the adopted London Plan refers to a series of strategies that have been prepared in parallel with the Plan; these include one on biodiversity that was published in July 2002. Therefore the Revised Deposit Draft is correct in using the term strategy. As elsewhere, the text will need to be brought up to date to recognise the new status of the London Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

- 5.3 I recommend that paragraph 5.1.6 be modified to refer to the Mayor's biodiversity strategy, published in July 2002.

Policy GBEEnv1 (Character)

Deposit Draft Objections

GBEnv1 / 284 / 1568 The Barnet Society

Issues

- Whether 'natural' should appear before 'built' in the policy.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.4 As the Council points out, this policy also applies to the Built Environment chapter. With that in mind, I see no particular merit in changing the word order.

RECOMMENDATION

- 5.5 I recommend that no change be made to Policy GBEEnv1.

Policy GBEEnv4 (Special areas)

Deposit Draft Objections

GBEnv4 / 282 / 1481 Friends of Windsor Open Space
 GBEnv4 / 281 / 1646 Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership
 15 / 1529 North Finchley Agenda 21 Partnership

Support for Policy

GBEnv4 / 281 / 1646 Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

GBEnv4 / 319 / 5302R Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)

Issues

- The strength of protection to be offered to special areas;
- The areas to be covered.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.6 In my recommendations in Chapter 4, I recommend that this policy be modified to remove the detail that is inappropriate for a Part I policy. In response to the objections from CELA and FWOS, Green Chains are covered by Policy O12.

RECOMMENDATION

5.7 See my recommendation in Chapter 4.

Policy O1 (Green Belt/MOL)

Deposit Draft Objections

O1 / 187 / 1308	Government Office for London	
O1 / 263 / 1189	The Finchley Society	
O1 / 284 / 1669	The Barnet Society	5.3.2
O1 / 281 / 1647	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	
O1 / 72 / 760	Medical Research Council	
O1 / 15 / 814	North Finchley Agenda 21 Partnership	

Support for Policy

O1 / 211 / 603	John Laing Property Ltd	
O1 / 210 / 595	All Souls College, Oxford	
O1 / 284 / 1569	The Barnet Society	5.3.2
O1 / 268 / 1355	Greensquare Residents Association	
O1 / 205 / 1022	West Finchley Bowling Club	

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

O1 / 187 / 5880R Government Office for London
 O1 / 187 / 5881R Government Office for London

Issues

- Green Belt policy in respect of specific proposals;
- The very special circumstances test;
- The purposes of the Green Belt.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.8 The GOL objections refer to certain proposals in the Proposals Schedule

which fall within the Green Belt. I address the Underhill site (Site 2) later in this chapter. I agree with the Council that GOL's objection in respect of Scratchwood Local Nature Reserve (14) can best be resolved through the addition of appropriate comments in the Notes column to the Schedule. I address this in my Chapter 14. Damascus House (h30) is under construction and I recommend there that it be deleted from the Schedule.

- 5.9 The reference to 'very special circumstances' that appears in Policy O1 derives from the national guidance of PPG2 *Green Belts*. For that reason, I do not support those objections that propose its removal. Development control decisions will be guided by the policy, and by the PPG which sets out how the very special circumstances test is to be applied. There is no need for the policy to spell this out. Regarding cases where local authorities are a development partner or landowner, there are procedures to guide planning decisions and there is no need to make specific reference to this in the text.
- 5.10 CELA would like to see an acknowledgement that inappropriate development on land adjacent to valued open spaces has an adverse effect on their visual amenity. However, this is a matter that is covered by Policy O7 and I see no need to refer to it here. Neither do I see any need in paragraph 5.3.2 to add to the first purpose of including land within Green Belts, to define further what is meant by 'built up areas'. I consider that the reference to London is quite sufficient.
- 5.11 I address the MRC's objection under Policy O4.

RECOMMENDATION

- 5.12 I recommend that:
- (i) The Schedule of Proposals entry in respect of Scratchwood Local Nature Reserve (Site no.14) be amended as recommended in the Council's Schedule of Responses dated September 2001; and
 - (ii) No change be made to Policy O1 or paragraph 5.3.2.

Policy O2 (New buildings and uses on Green Belt/MOL)

Deposit Draft Objections

O2 / 263 / 1191	The Finchley Society	
O2 / 284 / 1570	The Barnet Society	5.3.9
O2 / 281 / 1833	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.9
O2 / 281 / 1649	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	
O2 / 15 / 815	North Finchley Agenda 21 Partnership	

Support for Policy

O2 / 268 / 1356	Greensquare Residents Association	
O2 / 281 / 1648	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.9
O2 / 205 / 1024	West Finchley Bowling Club	
O2 / 90 / 1381	Barnet Football Club	

Support for Policy Changes

O2 / 257 / 5723R	Circle 33, Metropolitan & Notting Hill Housing, Paddington Churches and Service
------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issues

- The operation of Green Belt policy;

- Appropriate development within the Green Belt;
- Public access to Green Belt land.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.13 The wording of this policy closely mirrors national planning guidance as set out in PPG2. This places a strong presumption against inappropriate development but it also recognises that there are very special circumstances that could allow such a development to proceed. This would be determined on a case by case basis. This is a well established aspect of Green Belt policy and I see no reason to depart from it here. In the previous section, I commented upon those situations where the Council itself is a development partner or land owner.
- 5.14 In terms of the types of development to be regarded as appropriate, I believe that these are adequately spelled out in Revised Deposit policy; they correspond broadly with those listed in PPG2. It would not be possible to foresee every specific use that would be appropriate. According to paragraph 3.4 of PPG2, such uses should 'preserve the openness of the Green Belt' and 'not conflict with the purposes of including land in it'. Further to CELA's objection, I believe that the policy goes as far as it can in terms of access as some types of appropriate use such as agriculture may not always be accessible to the general public.
- 5.15 I deal with the objections from Marchfield Developments Ltd and the Mill Hill School Foundation elsewhere in this chapter.

RECOMMENDATION

- 5.16 I recommend that no further changes be made to Policy O2 or to its reasoned justification.

Policy O4 (Major Developed Sites)

Deposit Draft Objections

O4 / 187 / 1305	Government Office for London	5.3.11
O4 / 259 / 1031	The Mill Hill School Foundation	5.3.11
O4 / 210 / 596	All Souls College, Oxford	
O4 / 281 / 1650	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.12
165 / 903	Mr P.A. Brigstock	5.3.22
259 / 1026	The Mill Hill School Foundation	

Support for Policy

O4 / 268 / 1358	Greensquare Residents Association
O4 / 205 / 1028	West Finchley Bowling Club

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

O4 / 187 / 5396R	Government Office for London	5.3.11
O4 / 324 / 5297R	Andrew Reid	5.3.11

Pre-Inquiry Change Objections

O4 / 72 / 6888P	Medical Research Council	5.3.11
O4 / 165 / 7202	Arkley Estates Ltd	

Support for Pre-Inquiry Changes

O5 / 187 / 6854P	Government Office for London	5.3.11 – 5.3.12
------------------	------------------------------	-----------------

Issues

- Do the four identified sites qualify as MDS?
- Acceptable future uses within an MDS;
- The categorisation of other sites as MDS.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.17 Policy O4 has been substantially redrafted following the comments of GOL at both First and Second Deposit stages. As a result, it has been brought more fully in line with the guidance of PPG2 *Green Belts*. This recognises that there are long-standing major developed sites (MDS) in the Green Belt where infilling or redevelopment meeting the criteria of paragraphs C3 or C4 of Annex C to the PPG would not be inappropriate. Those criteria are now spelled out in the wording of the policy.

Sites proposed as MDS

- 5.18 The Revised Deposit UDP identified four MDS, all of which are in Mill Hill: Mill Hill School, The Ridgeway; National Institute for Medical Research, The Ridgeway; MRC Technology, Burtonhole Lane and; Watch Tower House, The Ridgeway.
- 5.19 The PIC responds to GOL's comment that greater justification should be provided to warrant the identification of the four sites by adding selection criteria to paragraph 5.3.11. However, they do not dispell my own reservations as to whether all of the selected sites amount to 'substantial' sites as described in PPG2, paragraph C1. In particular, I estimate that the MRC Technology site is some 1ha only in area. This corresponds to the Council's first criterion for the selection of MDS.
- 5.20 PPG2 provides no guidance as to the scale of an MDS. However, to take as a parallel housing development, a 1ha plot would not normally be regarded as a major site. On the other hand, a 5ha plot, say, would accommodate some 150 dwellings at the minimum PPG3 density and would count as major, certainly in a London context. On that basis, I have no difficulty in recognising the other three sites proposed as MDS because they are at least of that size. It seems to me that, compared with smaller properties, the redevelopment of sites of this scale would be more likely to offer opportunities 'for environmental improvement without adding to their impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it'. This is an underlying aim for MDS as set out in PPG2, paragraph C4.
- 5.21 Where does this leave the MRC Technology site? Taken in isolation, this site of just one ha would fail to qualify. On the other hand, it adjoins the National Institute for Medical Research and it shares some of the same characteristics, having a relatively small building footprint within an extensive site. Given, also, that the Medical Research Council (MRC) is the freehold owner of both of the sites, it would be appropriate, in my view, to consider both parts of this ownership as part of a single MDS. This should not close any possible options for the future. PPG2, paragraph 3.4 refers to complete or partial redevelopment of a site and I see no reason why this should not enable, for example, redevelopment to proceed on one of the holdings and not the other.
- 5.22 I reach two conclusions. First, that based on the Council's proposals, there should be three MDS, not four. These are Mill Hill School, The Ridgeway; Watch Tower House, The Ridgeway and; MRC properties at the Ridgeway and Burtonhole Lane (National Institute for Medical Research

and MRC Technology). The second arises from my comparison between the MRC Technology site and the three other MDS on the Council's original list. This is that the first of the Council's selection criteria, that 'sites should have a minimum site area of 10,000sq.m' is untenable and that it should be deleted.

Acceptable future uses within an MDS

- 5.23 MRC objected at the PIC stage, not to the selection criteria but to the stated purpose for identifying the sites, 'to support the provision of educational and religious facilities, and to protect employment sites'. Arkley Estates also objected to the stated purpose. However, it seems to me that this sums up the reason why the Council selected these sites in the first place. The categories of use reasonably relate to those set out in paragraph C1 to the PPG and the protection of employment sites is in line both with the PPG and the broader aims of this UDP.
- 5.24 Regarding those uses, paragraph C1 includes 'research and education establishments'. Given the nature of the MRC uses, the Council might reasonably have cited research facilities in its purpose and I recommend such an addition. Watch Tower House, has an educational function as well as a religious one.
- 5.25 As set out in paragraphs C3 and C4 to the PPG (and in Policy O4 as revised), the MDS designations have two main functions. First, they enable limited infilling of sites in continuing use. That helps to protect their employment use. The second purpose is to allow redevelopment. This can be either complete or partial and it can apply whether the site is redundant or in continuing use.
- 5.26 There is nothing in the PPG or in Policy O4 that would preclude the principle of complete or part redevelopment of the chosen MDS for uses other than the existing ones. In other areas, this has, for example, seen redundant hospitals in the Green Belt redeveloped for housing. In any one case such proposals would need to be tested against other policies as part of the normal development control process. As far as the MRC objection is concerned, I do not see the Council's purpose for identifying MDS as necessarily preventing redevelopment for other uses. Rather its concern is to support the present uses and the services and employment that they provide.
- 5.27 I turn now to the Council's selection criteria which follow the stated purpose. Arkley Estates objects to all three of these. I have already concluded that the first criterion that relates to minimum site area should go; sites of the area cited are not MDS, in my view. While I have concluded that three specific sites do qualify on size and other grounds, I shall not attempt to cite an alternative minimum site area to that put forward by the Council. PPG2 is silent as to what a suitable minimum area might be and I have no real basis for selecting one.
- 5.28 The second criterion cites the types of use that would qualify as MDS. They reflect the uses that are present in Barnet's Green Belt. Regarding the intention of the owners (criterion iii), the likelihood of development within the plan period is a relevant factor.
- 5.29 I reach two conclusions. First, that the stated purpose should stay, subject to the addition of the word 'research' in front of educational and religious facilities and secondly that while the first criterion should be deleted the second and third should be supported.

Should other sites qualify?

- 5.30 Arkley Estates object to the omission of their mobile home site at Arkley Park from the list of MDS. Following an appeal decision in 1971, permission was granted for 92 mobile homes. For some years, the company has been seeking approval to replace these units with permanent homes and designation as an MDS would, in principle, pave the way for a phased redevelopment.
- 5.31 However, Arkley Park does not have the characteristics of a major developed site. Its existing housing use falls outside any of the examples cited in PPG2 Annex C. I consider that had housing sites, including those used for mobile homes, been intended to be considered as MDS, they would have been included in the list. Instead, the examples cited are largely infrastructural and institutional uses, not housing.
- 5.32 The objector places considerable store on the decision to designate the Government Offices site at Brockley Hill, Stanmore as an MDS. In appearance terms there is some superficial similarity because the buildings are all single storey and flat roofed and, as at Arkley Park, there is relatively little space around them. But that site at some 7.2ha is far larger, three times the size of the caravan site. Also, it seems to me that, compared to an existing housing use, these single user offices are more akin to the type of institutional use that MDS policy primarily caters for. Moreover, by virtue of its scale, the Brockley Hill site offers far more scope for worthwhile environmental improvements as mentioned in PPG2, paragraph C4. I do not consider that Arkley Park qualifies as MDS.
- 5.33 Mr A Reid would like to see other land including Belmont Riding School included as MDS. However, this does not fall within the general ambit of MDS. In particular, the land is not in an infrastructural or institutional use. As an alternative, the objector seeks to extend the development opportunities possible in MDS to other sites 'having substantial built form'. However, this would erode the distinction between MDS and other sites and be directly contrary to Green Belt policy.

RECOMMENDATION

- 5.34 I recommend that:
- (i) Policy O4 be modified as set out in the Revised Deposit UDP;
 - (ii) The supporting text be modified as set out in the Revised Deposit UDP, subject to a revision of the list of MDS in paragraph 5.3.12 to combine the two MRC sites as one MDS, i.e. National Institute for Medical Research, The Ridgeway and MRC Technology, Burtonhole Lane;
 - (iii) Suitable modifications be made to the Proposals Map to show the MRC sites as one;
 - (iv) The Council's PIC to paragraph 5.3.11 be amended:
 - (a) Through the addition of 'research,' before 'educational and religious facilities' ; and
 - (b) Through the deletion of the first criterion 'The sites should have a minimum site area of 10,000 sq.m.';
 - (v) In respect of Arkley Park this site be not identified as MDS; and
 - (vi) No change be made in respect of Mr A Reid's objection.

Policy O5 (Replacement of existing buildings in green belt/MOL)

Deposit Draft Objections

05 / 121 / 821 St. Joseph's College 5.3.13

Support for Policy

05 / 284 / 1571 The Barnet Society

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

05 / 121 / 6834R St. Joseph's College 5.3.13

Issues

- Whether the policy is about 'dwellings' or 'buildings'.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.35 This policy is entirely about replacement dwellings and I agree with the objector that the text, including the title, should be consistent.

RECOMMENDATION

5.36 I recommend that the title for paragraph 5.3.13 read Replacement of Dwellings.

Policy O6 (Re-use of buildings in Green Belt/MOL)

Deposit Draft Objections

06 / 210 / 597 All Souls College, Oxford

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

06 / 317 / 5624R Beechwood Homes Ltd

Issues

- The detailed wording of Policy O6;
- Whether the policy should encompass redevelopment.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.37 I agree with All Soul's College that the term 'openness' should replace 'open character' in Policy O6. The Council agreed to this change but it does not appear in the Revised Deposit UDP. It would bring the wording in line with that of PPG2 and should be applied as necessary to other policies in this chapter.

5.38 I do not support the Revised Deposit objection from Beechwood Homes Ltd. This calls for an amendment allowing for the redevelopment of buildings provided that there would be no greater impact upon the Green Belt. However, while PPG2 allows for the re-use of buildings and extensions/alterations to dwellings, it does not provide for redevelopment.

RECOMMENDATION

- 5.39 I recommend that the term 'openness' replace 'open character' in Policy O6 and in other policies in Chapter O5 of this UDP.

Policy O7 (Land adjoining Green Belt/MOL)**Deposit Draft Objections**

O7 / 218 / 1096

Middlesex University

Issues

- The flexibility of the policy.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.40 The objector seeks to add flexibility to this policy recognising that certain site specific proposals may contradict its aims. In my view, Policy O7 could be more positively worded with a view to securing a net enhancement of adjacent Green Belt /MOL. This would accord with the general aims of this UDP, for example, Policy GBEnv1. I propose revised wording below.

RECOMMENDATION

- 5.41 I recommend that Policy O7 be reworded on the following lines:

Proposals for new development adjacent to the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land should seek to secure a significant enhancement in the visual amenity of these areas through a combination of good design, appropriate siting and perimeter landscaping which respects the character of its surroundings. The Council will resist proposals which would have a detrimental effect on visual amenity, or the openness, purposes and objectives of these designated areas.

Policy O8 (Agricultural land in the Green Belt)**Deposit Draft Objections**

O8 / 162 / 1762	MAFF	5.3.16
O8 / 162 / 1763	MAFF	5.3.17
O8 / 162 / 716	MAFF	5.3.20
O8 / 162 / 724	MAFF	
O8 / 162 / 723	MAFF	
O8 / 281 / 1652	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.17
O8 / 281 / 1651	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.16
O8 / 182 / 1165	Lafarge Redland Aggregates Limited	
O8 / 15 / 816	North Finchley Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.17

Support for Policy

O8 / 200 / 1277	Adrian Salt and Pang Ltd	5.3.16
-----------------	--------------------------	--------

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

286/5601,5602	Barnet Friends of the Earth
15/363R	North Finchley Agenda 21 Partnership

Support for Policy Changes

O8 / 319 / 5304R	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	5.3.16
------------------	--------------------------------------------------	--------

Issues

- National policy regarding agricultural land.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.42 The Revised Deposit UDP has been the subject of significant changes that respond to many of the objections made at First Deposit stage. I support the changes which seek, in particular, to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. I note that the policy as redrafted takes into account a proposal by NFLA. In respect of the LRAL objection, I agree with the reasoning of the Council that it would not be right to qualify the loss of agricultural land by inserting the word 'permanent'.
- 5.43 Regarding the CELA and NFLA objections, I believe that the text makes clear that, regardless of whether the loss of any agricultural land might otherwise be acceptable, development proposals would still need to be assessed on the basis of Green Belt and MOL policy.
- 5.44 BFoE would like to see 'agricultural uses' replace 'agriculture' in the policy and a recognition that the policy should protect the best and most versatile land generally and not just that used for agriculture. While Section 336(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act defines agriculture as including horticulture and the use of land for grazing, it would be helpful in my view to make this clear in the supporting text to Policy O8. Allotments are covered by Policy L16.

RECOMMENDATION

- 5.45 I recommend that:
- (i) Policy O8 and its supporting text be modified as set out in the Revised Deposit UDP; and
 - (ii) In response to the objection from BFoE, additional explanation be provided in the text that the policy will apply to horticultural type uses as well as to agriculture.

Policy O9 (Article 4 directions and the Green Belt)

Deposit Draft Objections

O9 / 162 / 723

MAFF

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

O9 / 286 / 5602R

Barnet Friends of the Earth

O9 / 267 / 5312R

Mill Hill Residents Association

5.3.23

O9 / 15 / 5493R

North Finchley Agenda 21 Partnership

Issues

- The need for this policy.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.46 I note that the Revised Deposit UDP omits Policy O9 because the Article 4 Direction with which it deals is already in place. A reference is made to it in paragraph 5.3.21 of the supporting text and the areas involved are shown on the Proposals Map.

RECOMMENDATION

5.47 I recommend that the UDP be modified through the deletion of Policy 09.

Green Belt boundary changes**Map 5.1****Deposit Draft Objections**

/ 38 / 431	International Bible Students Association (IBSA)	
/ 286 / 1782	Barnet Friends of the Earth	5.3.22
/ 93 / 579	GLA constituency member for Barnet (Cllr. Coleman)	5.3.23
/ 210 / 601	All Souls College, Oxford	5.3.22
/ 68 / 775	Hertsmere Borough Council	
/ 121 / 817	St. Joseph's College	
/ 284 / 1572	The Barnet Society	5.3.23
/ 260 / 6756	Yvonne Naylor	5.3.22
/ 260 / 1114	Yvonne Naylor	5.3.1
/ 200 / 1279	Adrian Salt and Pang Ltd	5.3.1
/ 71 / 855	Conservative Group - Barnet Council	5.3.23
/ 267 / 1350	Mill Hill Residents Association	5.2.23
/ 90 / 1380	Barnet Football Club	
/ 15 / 824	North Finchley Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.23
/ 15 / 1530	North Finchley Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.22
/ 103 / 726	Gene Wilson	5.3.22
/ 281 / 1653	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.23
/ 181 / 1142	Marchfield Developments Ltd	5.3.22
/ 50 / 521	Thames Water Property Services Ltd	
NewPol/258/965	Three Valleys Water plc	

Support for Policy

map 5.1 / 90 / 1379	Barnet Football Club	5.3.23
---------------------	----------------------	--------

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

286 / 5603R	Barnet Friends of the Earth	5.3.23
map 5.1 / 281 / 5777R	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	

Issues

- The case for de-designating Green Belt land at Underhill in connection with the expansion plans of Barnet Football Club;
- The case for other proposed Green Belt boundary changes:
 - o St Joseph's College;
 - o Land at Barnet Gate Lane;
 - o Land at Milesplit Hill;
 - o Land at Milesplit Hill Reservoir;
 - o Land at Arkley View;
 - o Land to the north of Rowley Green Lane;
 - o Land at Scratchwood, north of the service station;
 - o Land at Spur Road;
 - o Watch Tower House;
 - o Land adjacent to Elstree Tunnel.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Barnet Football Club, Underhill

- 5.48 Barnet Football Club has been based at its present Underhill ground for almost a century. The football ground is tightly constrained, being bordered on three sides by housing. That, coupled with the introduction of the Taylor Report and Football Ground Criteria, has meant that the capacity of the ground is limited to 4,800 or some 5,500 with temporary seating on the North Stand. A further limitation is the pronounced slope across the site which exceeds the 1 in 60 gradient set out in the Football League guidelines. The land also forms part of the Green Belt, the critical issue here that I shall return to below.
- 5.49 The Club's fortunes have fluctuated greatly over recent years. A ten-year spell in the Nationwide League came to an end in 2001 when the Club was relegated to the Nationwide Conference. Its aspiration is to return to the League but this will require improved facilities in line with the standards that are now required. Indeed the Club has been seeking better facilities for some time. In the mid 1990s it formulated a plan to relocate to Copthall where a 10,000 seater stadium was proposed. The plans were called in for decision by the Secretary of State and following an Inquiry in 1998 planning permission was refused. A second proposal followed, this time for a 9,212 seat stadium to be located on land to the south of the present ground. Once again, the plans have been subject to call-in procedure and an Inquiry is due to be held in the autumn of September 2004.
- 5.50 Those proposals for South Underhill are essentially a separate matter, although my findings will feed into that Inquiry. From the two UDP hearing sessions, one involving Barnet Football Club, the second Keep Barnet Alive, I necessarily heard material that will be of relevance to the forthcoming Inquiry. However, my role is a restricted one. It is to address the objections and counter objections that have been made in respect of the UDP proposals; these concern specifically the Green Belt status of the present site and some adjoining land. The Deposit Draft UDP showed a 'rounding off' of the Green Belt, de-designating the present ground and a triangular area to the east. At Revised Deposit stage, the area to be taken out of the Green Belt was expanded through the addition of a strip of land to the south of the present ground; this additional area measures about 1 ha. It was argued on behalf of the Club that this would permit an enhanced stadium to be built. Map 5.1 of the Revised Deposit Draft shows the proposed omissions from the Green Belt boundary.
- 5.51 However, the administration of Barnet Council changed in May 2002. Members resolved that they no longer wished to support the South Underhill proposal and the Council changed its stance too in respect of the Green Belt status of the present ground. Thus, the Pre-Inquiry Changes to the UDP omit the amendments to the Green Belt boundary that the Council had earlier proposed to make. Allied to this, the Schedule of Proposals now changes the description of 'Site 2' from 'Redevelopment for new football stadium' to 'Extension of seating at football stadium' and limits the site area to the existing stadium area.
- 5.52 The Statement of Common Ground, prepared for the first of the two hearings, says that 'Barnet Council share the aspirations of the Club to succeed and possibly gain promotion to the Nationwide League'. Those aspirations could be met through making improvements to the existing stadium. The Statement goes on to say that the view of the Club is that

such a strategy would suffice only for the short term. From the evidence, it is clear that the Club is pursuing a two phase strategy, one based on improvements that could be carried out within the broad confines of the present site and the second based on relocation to land to the south.

- 5.53 A detailed plan for the shorter term was tabled (Drawing No. 1106-PL-002 Rev.L). This would entail some limited expansion to the east (involving the relocation within this area of two existing uses) and some expansion to the south (encroaching to some extent onto land owned by the existing cricket club). While the problem of the slope would remain - short of costly ground works to reduce the gradient - this plan does demonstrate what would be feasible if a little more land could be made available.
- 5.54 Returning to the Green Belt issue, PPG2 indicates that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless exceptional circumstances exist that necessitate such a revision. The London Plan reaffirms the importance of continuing to protect the Green Belt. The exceptional circumstances test is the key test in this case.
- 5.55 At the hearing into the counter objection by the Club, the Council expressed the view that maintenance of the Green Belt should be no bar to a suitable redevelopment of the existing site. I agree. There are two ways that the case for such a redevelopment (or extension) could be considered. First, following PPG2, paragraph 3.4, it might be argued that such a development would amount to 'essential facilities for outdoor sport...which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land in it'. On that basis, it would not be inappropriate development. My own view is that were a redevelopment to proceed on the lines set out in the tabled plan, the harm to the Green Belt, over and above that caused by the existing stadium, would be limited.
- 5.56 Secondly, even were it considered to be inappropriate development, a case might still be mounted that the need of the Club for better facilities constituted very special circumstances outweighing the Green Belt harm and other harm. Either way, and given the Council's support for the Club as set out in the Statement of Common Ground and the Schedule of Proposals, there need be no obstacle, in principle, to a suitable redevelopment.
- 5.57 Moreover, de-designation would involve possible dangers. Were the Club to relocate or to close even, the land would potentially become available for some other type of use that might have a greater impact upon the Green Belt than does the present stadium. This argument reinforces my conclusion that exceptional circumstances do not exist, that no change should be made to the Green Belt boundary and that Map 5.1 should be deleted. It seems to me, however, that at the Modifications stage, the entry in the Schedule of Proposals should be amended to reflect more accurately the needs and intentions of the Club. I propose revised wording below; such a description would reasonably encompass a limited extension to the Club's 'footprint', along the lines of the proposal tabled at the Inquiry.

Other Sites

- 5.58 A number of other objectors have put forward a case for amending the Green Belt. Any modifications to it would have to show exceptional circumstances. This test is a long-standing feature of national Green Belt policy and it is firmly embedded in the London Plan. Indeed, Object 1 of

the Plan is 'to accommodate London's growth within its boundaries without encroaching on open spaces'. As far as this UDP is concerned, can exceptional circumstances be shown for any of the sites being put forward?

- 5.59 The common argument being put forward by the objectors is that Barnet will need to expand its built up area to accommodate its share of the extra housing envisaged for London. Up to 2006, this will amount to a minimum target of 23,000 additional homes per annum but the aim is to boost this to achieve 30,000 per annum. The housing capacity study to be carried out in 2004 is to inform a new London-wide target. As far as Barnet is concerned, its present target is 17,780 in the period 1997-2016, an annual figure of 890 homes per year.
- 5.60 At the Inquiry session into a possible change in the Green Belt boundary at St Joseph's College, these figures were the subject of some debate. I was left in some doubt as to whether the annual target is being achieved. Based on the GLA's monitoring figures, and taking into account progress in bringing 'non-self contained' homes into use, the average number of new homes is 805 per annum, and below the target. But using the Borough's own figures the completion rate is 970 per annum and above the target.
- 5.61 The crucial question is whether there is any shortage of land for housing within the present built up area. The facts are that a substantial number of homes are being built in Barnet without any encroachment into the Green Belt. Sites are coming forward seemingly in sufficient numbers. Even if the 'correct' figure were to be the lower one, the average deficit is not large. In some individual years the target was comfortably exceeded.
- 5.62 This is before any account is taken of the large housing sites that have come forward since the last housing capacity study was undertaken. These include the major opportunity site of Brent Cross/Cricklewood (at least 5,000 homes), and sites at Colindale, West Hendon and Mill Hill East. These sites are not yet formally identified but they are indicative of the potential that exists for brownfield development within Barnet. Based on the completion trends of the past few years and this clear potential, I cannot see that there is any substantial case on housing grounds for taking up Green Belt land.
- 5.63 I turn now to the individual sites. The complex of buildings that make up **St Joseph's College** are located in the centre of an otherwise open site that rises steeply towards The Ridgeway. The land is surrounded on three sides by housing and lies entirely within the Green Belt. Under the objector's proposals, the Green Belt boundary would be redrawn to the immediate south of the College buildings.
- 5.64 Currently, this area of Green Belt forms a tongue of open land stretching southwards from the more open countryside on the northeastern side of The Ridgeway. In my view this tongue forms an important part of the Green Belt that contributes to at least two of the purposes listed in paragraph 1.5 of PPG2. Were the designation to be removed and housing built on this land 'the unrestricted sprawl' of 'a large built up area' would not have been checked (Purpose i) and the countryside would not have been safeguarded from encroachment (Purpose ii).
- 5.65 Other arguments were made at the Inquiry. However, there is no need to go further. The proposal would cause significant harm in Green Belt terms. Coupled with the lack of any obvious need for this land in housing terms, no exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated.
- 5.66 In respect of land at **Barnet Gate Lane**, this is also an important part of

the Green Belt. It helps to keep open the wide gap between Arkley to the north and the linear development along Totteridge Lane to the south. Again it contributes to several purposes of the Green Belt and again there are no exceptional circumstances. The objector talks about 'compatible, community, educational and leisure uses' for the short term but I cannot see that this would justify releasing land from the Green Belt.

- 5.67 I reach the same conclusions in respect of land at **Milesplit Hill** and **Spur Road**. The former is a narrow strip of land facing housing to the west. Nevertheless, it forms part of the Green Belt, contributing to the openness of this area. The latter is a larger plot to the northwest of Stonegrove. It forms an integral part of the large swathe of Green Belt land on the northwest edge of the Borough. Again, its development would infringe several of the purposes of the Green Belt. The same applies to land at **Milesplit Hill Reservoir**.
- 5.68 Similar arguments can be applied in respect of land at **Arkley View**. Any development would be partly contained along its northern side by an existing ribbon of housing. The southern half of the land is also surrounded by housing. However, despite this partial containment, this land is clearly part of the countryside and the purposes of the Green Belt would be harmed. The objector considers that development here would be preferable to that proposed at Arkley Reservoir. However, that site is not part of the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances.
- 5.69 The land to the **north of Rowley Green Lane** lies quite close to Arkley Reservoir. However, it is on the north side of Rowley Green Road and within the Green Belt. Again, several purposes of the Green Belt would be infringed and there are no exceptional circumstances.
- 5.70 Another objector makes the case for removing Green Belt status from a site at **Scratchwood** to the north of the service station complex. This is in industrial use, including the recycling of construction waste. The operators may wish to expand these activities in the future and the present status of the land is incompatible with this. In my view, however, this land serves a Green Belt purpose and its status should remain. I agree with the Council that this should not necessarily prevent the expansion of the waste recycling activity; it would be a question of demonstrating very special circumstances. To be weighed in the balance would be the contribution that an increased recycling activity would make to the wider aims of the UDP and recycling targets.
- 5.71 In the case of **Watch Tower House**, this site is clearly fulfilling the purposes of the Green Belt and no boundary change should be made. Under Policy O4, the site is allocated as MDS. Regarding land adjacent to **Elstree Tunnel**, a mistake on the Proposals Map has been rectified and this land is now shown within the Green Belt.
- 5.72 In terms of changes to the UDP, 'Green Belt' needs to be deleted from the title to this section which should now read MOL Boundary Changes. Paragraph 5.3.22 should then be modified to explain that no Green Belt boundary changes are to be made. Also, given the controversy about this, it would be reasonable to add a brief update on the planning situation regarding Barnet Football Club.

RECOMMENDATION

- 5.73 I recommend that:
- (i) No changes be made to the Green Belt boundary;

- (ii) In connection with Barnet Football Club, Map 5.1 be deleted;
- (iii) In the Schedule of Proposals, the description of Site No.2 be amended to 'Partial redevelopment of existing stadium area';
- (iv) The title to this section be amended to read '**Proposed MOL Boundary Changes**'; and
- (v) Paragraph 5.3.22 be amended accordingly.

Metropolitan Open Land boundary changes

Deposit Draft Objections

69 / 997	Finchley Manor Garden Centre	5.37
205 / 1854	West Finchley Bowling Club	
152 / 626	Temple Fortune Sports Club (Gareth Morgan)	5.3.22

Support for Policy

93 / 581	GLA constituency member for Barnet (Cllr. Coleman)	5.3.25
93 / 580	GLA constituency member for Barnet (Cllr. Coleman)	5.3.24

Revised Deposit draft Objections

69 / 5313R	Finchley Manor Garden Centre	5.3.7
281 / 5780R	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	map 5.2

Issues

- The case for removing the MOL designation from Manor Garden Centre;
- The case for designating other land as MOL.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.74 Finchley Manor Garden Centre lies on the southern side of East End Road where it is surrounded on three sides by the grounds of St Marylebone Cemetery. Like the cemetery it is MOL. The objector would like to see it excluded from the MOL. It differs from the cemetery in that it is excluded from the conservation area and nature conservation designations and it does not qualify to be MOL.
- 5.75 As the UDP says, MOL 'covers areas of major open spaces which, in terms of their contribution to recreation, leisure and visual amenity have more than a borough wide significance'. One of its purposes is to contribute to 'the physical structure of London by being clearly distinguishable from the built up area'.
- 5.76 The big cemetery clearly is such a space. By its nature, the garden centre has its own character but there are integrating features. One is the fact that its road frontage is bounded by tall trees that are similar in scale to those within the cemetery. The second is the fact that the cemetery, in particular its trees, can be clearly seen across the width of the garden centre and above its buildings which are single storey. Essentially, this land is more open than built up in character. In openness terms it has more in common with the cemetery than with the built up area across the road. Visually, it is part of the same open space and the MOL designation should stay.
- 5.77 West Finchley Bowling Club would like to see their site classified as MOL. However, this is amenity land that is of local rather than wider

significance. I agree with the Council that it does not qualify.

- 5.78 The UDP includes a number of proposed changes to MOL. One, made at the Revised Deposit stage, responds to an objection made by the Temple Fortune Sports Club. It deletes part of the existing MOL designation, land which does not contribute to the physical structure of London. Other than one from CELA which criticises the Council's Green Belt and MOL policies generally, there appear to be no objections either to this change or those made in respect of the former Friern Barnet Hospital and Compton School.

RECOMMENDATION

5.79 I recommend that:

- (i) In respect of the proposed MOL boundary changes at the Temple Fortune Sports Club, Bridge Lane, the former Friern Barnet Hospital and Compton School, the text be modified as set out in the Revised Deposit UDP; and
- (ii) No further changes be made to MOL boundaries.

Policy O10 (Heritage land)

Deposit Draft Objections

O10 / 181 / 1146	Marchfield Developments Ltd	
O10 / 188 / 1190	Greater London Authority	
O10 / 210 / 598	All Souls College, Oxford	5.3.28
O10 / 125 / 823	Nick Gardner	5.3.30
O10 / 200 / 1281	Adrian Salt and Pang Ltd	5.3.28
map 5.4 / 92 / 578	Miss M. Dewing	
map 5.4 / 210 / 599	All Souls College, Oxford	

Support for Policy

O10 / 284 / 1573	The Barnet Society	5.3.28
------------------	--------------------	--------

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

O10 / 188 / 5372R	Greater London Authority	
-------------------	--------------------------	--

Pre-Inquiry Change Objections

188	Greater London Authority	
-----	--------------------------	--

Support for Pre-Inquiry Changes

O10 / 286 / 7204P	Barnet Friends of the Earth	6.3.23 – 6.3.23b
O10 / 281 / 7086P	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.23 – 5.3.23b

Issues

- The need for this policy;
- The strength of the policy;
- The boundaries of Heritage Land.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.80 I am concerned about Policies O10 and O11 which cover Heritage Land and Countryside Conservation Areas respectively. This is not because the land is without any special value, far from it. It is because of the seeming proliferation of designations within Barnet's open areas that are already strongly protected by their Green Belt or MOL status. Unless these

additional designations are seen to have a real purpose, there is a danger that they could be discredited. Are they just development control tools and, if that is the case, are they all still needed? Or is it intended to use them as a basis for landscape enhancement programmes or new countryside management regimes (as with the Watling Chase Community Forest)?

- 5.81 Moreover, to avoid confusing the public it would be desirable to co-ordinate the designations applied with those pursued by neighbouring boroughs. I do not propose any fundamental changes as part of this UDP, largely because of the timescale, but propose instead that there should be a full review as part of the LDF process.
- 5.82 As far as the objections to the present Policy O10 are concerned, these address both the strength of the policy and the boundaries of the designated area. The latter are a matter for the review. Regarding strength, pending the review, I see no particular reason to change the wording, for example through the addition of 'seek to', because it is in line with that of the Green Belt policies alongside which it will work.

Recommendations

- 5.83 I recommend that:
- (i) No changes be made to Policy O10 or to its supporting text or to Map 5.4; and
 - (ii) The question of countryside designations generally be subject to a full review as part of the LDF process.

Policy O11 (Countryside Conservation Areas)

Deposit Draft Objections

O11 / 181 / 1147	Marchfield Developments Ltd
O11 / 188 / 1192	Greater London Authority
O11 / 200 / 1678	Adrian Salt and Pang Ltd

Support for Policy

O11 / 200 / 1273	Adrian Salt and Pang Ltd
------------------	--------------------------

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

O11 / 188 / 5373R	Greater London Authority
-------------------	--------------------------

Issues

- The need for the policy;
- The boundaries of Countryside Conservation Areas.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.84 My comments on this policy are the same as for Policy O10 on Heritage Areas.

RECOMMENDATION

- 5.85 I recommend that:
- (i) No modification be made to Policy O11, its supporting text or to Map 5.5; and

- (ii) The question of countryside designations generally be subject to a full review as part of the LDF process.

Policy O12 (Green Chains)

Deposit Draft Objections

O12 / 219 / 894 Environment Agency 5.3.31

Support for Policy

O12 / 219 / 896 Environment Agency

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

O12 / 319 / 5305R Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) 5.3.31

Support for Policy Changes

O12 / 319 / 5303R Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) 5.3.31

Issues

- The balance between public access and nature conservation interests.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.86 Green chains are essentially linear features that have a London-wide significance as part of its network of open space. The London Plan refers to their importance for both recreation and biodiversity. They are intended to be publicly accessible, but this does not necessarily mean that the public should have access to each and every corner, particularly where nature conservation interests might be affected. That will be a question of appropriate management at the local level.
- 5.87 The Environment Agency's objection has been taken into account in the Revised Deposit UDP and, notwithstanding the unspecific objection made by the RSPB, I believe that the correct balance has been struck.
- 5.88 My second recommendation brings my conclusion into line with what I am recommending for the green corridors (Policy O13).

RECOMMENDATION

- 5.89 I recommend that:
- (i) Paragraph 5.3.31 be modified as set out in the Revised Deposit UDP; and
 - (ii) The Proposals Map be supplemented by detailed plans showing the precise boundaries of the Green Chains.

Policy O13 , Map 5.6 (Green Corridors)

Deposit Draft Objections

O13/ 147 / 1682	Transport for London	5.3.34
O13 / 263 / 1202	The Finchley Society	
O13 / 15 / 1531	North Finchley Agenda 21 Partnership	
map 5.6 / 168 / 947	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	

map 5.6 / 188 / 1188 Greater London Authority 5.3.35

Support for Policy

O13 / 219 / 897 Environment Agency
O13 / 200 / 1274 Adrian Salt and Pang Ltd 5.3.34

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

O13 / 168 / 5390R Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd
O13 / 188 / 5375R Greater London Authority 5.3.35
O13 / 319 / 5306R Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)

Support for Policy Changes

O13 / 286 / 5656R Barnet Friends of the Earth
O13 / 281 / 5767R Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership

Pre-Inquiry Change Objections

O13 / 286 / 7196P Barnet Friends of the Earth
O13 / 935 / 7277P London Wildlife Trust
O13 / 263 / 6938P The Finchley Society
O13 / 281 / 6987P Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership
O13 / 282 / 7122P Friends of Windsor Open Space

Issues

- The corridors that should be protected;
- The balance of the policy;
- The detailed boundaries of the green corridors.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.90 Green corridors are a well established, London-wide concept. The London Plan describes them as 'relatively continuous areas of open space that run through built-up areas and provide an extension to the habitats of the sites they join'. They may involve the verges of road or rail routes, waterways or linked open spaces and may or may not be accessible to the public. Barnet's proposals, identified on Map 5.6, are in accord with these principles.

5.91 The objections from TfL and Sainsbury's address the railway routes. Not surprisingly, TfL's priorities are towards the operational needs of the railways. However, as the Council points out, much essential railway development will not require planning permission. Where planning permission is required the nature conservation value of the corridor would need to be taken into account. But, as is recognised in a change to paragraph 5.3.36, there can be no blanket embargo upon development; this will need to be determined on a case by case basis. Sainsbury's queries the choice of the East Coast Mainline as a corridor. From the Council's response, however, this corridor was identified by the former London Ecology Unit.

5.92 I find the policy as amended in paragraph 5.3.36 and through the PIC to the policy to be reasonably well balanced. Notwithstanding the objection of the Finchley Society, I find the earlier wording 'will not permit' to be too categorical. In practice much would depend on the nature conservation interest of a site and on the extent to which a proposal might obstruct a corridor thereby affecting the movement of animals or plants. Where the effects would be significant and not readily subject to mitigation, this would weigh against the proposal. Often, however, a great deal can be achieved through negotiation and through the application of conditions and agreements.

5.93 The GLA is concerned about lack of detail in respect of the Green Corridor

boundaries. This is a land use policy and it is incumbent upon the Council to show those boundaries in detail. In my view, the same applies to the Green Chains. One way to do this would be to supplement Map 5.6, and the Proposals Map in the case of the Green Chains, with a series of detailed A4 plans that might appear in an appendix to the UDP.

RECOMMENDATION

5.94 I recommend that:

- (i) Policy O13 and its supporting text be modified as set out in the Revised Deposit UDP and the PIC; and
- (ii) Map 5.6 be supplemented by detailed plans showing the precise boundaries of the Green Corridors.

Policy O14 (Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI))

Deposit Draft Objections

O14 / 181 / 1148	Marchfield Developments Ltd	
O14 / 200 / 1282	Adrian Salt and Pang Ltd	5.3.39
O14 / 281 / 1654	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.40
286 / 1783	Barnet Friends of the Earth	
113 / 734	Bidwells	

Support for Policy

O14 / 285 / 1672	Woolmead Avenue Residents Association	5.3.41
O14 / 269 / 1679	English Nature	
O14 / 200 / 1275	Adrian Salt and Pang Ltd	5.3.39

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

O14 / 319 / 5308R	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	5.3.40
O14 / 281 / 5775R	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.40
O14 / 281 / 5766R	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.36
O14 / 186 / 5837R	Tarling Road Residents' Association	5.3.40
O14 / 186 / 5287R	Tarling Road Residents' Association	5.3.40

Pre-Inquiry Change Objections

O14 / 281 / 7087	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.40
------------------	----------------------------------------	--------

Issues

- The balance of the policy;
- The protection of specific sites.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.95 Policy O14 appears to be at variance with Policy 3D.12 of the London Plan. It suggests that no development will be permitted which would in any way be detrimental to the nature conservation value of a site of nature conservation importance. As worded in the policy, that would apply to all sites in the hierarchy. By contrast, the London-wide policy seeks, first, avoidance of adverse impact and, if that is not possible, minimisation of adverse impact coupled with mitigation of residual impacts. It also allows for compensation where, exceptionally, development is to be permitted. The UDP policy should be revised on those lines and I make some proposals below, both for the policy itself and for the supporting text .

5.96 Three of the objections are to the nature conservation status of land (Arkley Lane, Barnet Gate Lane, The Barnet Countryside Centre and College Farm). According to the Council, their nature conservation

importance was identified by the former London Ecology Unit in their Ecology Handbook 28, published in 1997. I have no reason to question either the selection of these three sites as being of importance or their position in the hierarchy in Table 5.1. Another objector queries the boundary of the Hadley Green Site of Metropolitan Importance. Again, I understand from the Council that this area was identified by the London Ecology Unit and I have no reason to question the original definition of the site.

RECOMMENDATION

5.97 I recommend that:

- (i) Policy O14 be replaced by the following text:
Where development is proposed which would affect a site of importance for nature conservation, the Council will, in the first instance, expect the proposals to avoid adverse impact or, where that is not possible, to minimise such impact while incorporating mitigation of any residual impacts. Where, exceptionally, a development is to be permitted because the reasons for it are judged to outweigh significant harm to nature conservation, the Council will expect appropriate compensation measures;
- (ii) At the end of paragraph 5.3.41, the following be added 'They will be accorded a level of protection commensurate with their borough or local significance';
- (iii) Paragraph 5.3.40 be redrafted to reflect the new wording to Policy O14 and the content of the London Plan; and
- (iv) No change be made to the content of table 5.1.

Policy O16 (Protected Species)

Deposit Draft Objections

O16 / 281 / 1655	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	
O15 / 279 / 1451	Laing Field & Moat Mount Residents Association	5.3.42

Support for Policy

O16 / 281 / 1658	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership
------------------	----------------------------------------

Support for Policy Changes

O16 / 286 / 5657R	Barnet Friends of the Earth
-------------------	-----------------------------

Issues

- The detailed wording of the policy.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.98 Policy 16 should be redrafted to place it more directly in line with Policy 3D.12 of the London Plan. Moreover, in addition to referring to PPG9 *Nature Conservation*, the supporting text should also refer to London's Biodiversity Strategy, published in July 2002.

5.99 In response to the LFMM objection, the term 'animal' as used in paragraph 5.3.42 includes birds.

RECOMMENDATION

5.100 I recommend that:

- (i) Policy O16 be redrafted as follows:
The Council will resist development that would have a significant adverse impact on the population or conservation status of protected species or priority species identified in the London Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) and this Borough's BAPs; and
- (ii) The supporting text be updated to take the London Biodiversity Strategy into account.

Policy O18 (Watling Chase Community Forest)**Deposit Draft Objections**

O18 / 200 / 1283	Adrian Salt and Pang Ltd	5.3.47
O18 / 281 / 1656	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.47

Support for Policy

O18 / 181 / 1149	Marchfield Developments Ltd	
O18 / 281 / 1657	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.47
284 / 1574	The Barnet Society	Map 5.7

Support for Policy Changes

O18 / 319 / 5355R	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	5.3.48a
O18 / 319 / 5309R	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	5.3.48

Issues

- The need for this policy;
- The detailed boundaries;
- The type of trees to be planted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.101 Watling Chase Community Forest is a part of a national initiative to increase woodland coverage throughout England. According to the Council, the boundary was established in 1995 following public consultation. Thus the boundary is set and it is not for this UDP to change it. In response to the representation of the Barnet Society regarding Map 5.7, the text refers to the extension of the Community Forest into South Hertfordshire. This is a sufficient reference to the cross boundary nature of this project.

5.102 The supporting text could be shortened. Any planting will need to be compliant with the Forest Plan and I see no need for the last two sentences of paragraph 5.3.48. Doubtless, the planting will consist primarily of native broadleaved species.

RECOMMENDATION

5.103 I recommend that sentences 3 and 4 to paragraph 5.3.48 be deleted and replaced by the text to Revised Deposit paragraph 5.3.48a.

Policy O19 (Management plans on open land)

Deposit Draft Objections

O19 / 218 / 1097	Middlesex University	
O19 / 284 / 1575	The Barnet Society	5.3.49

Revised Deposit Draft Objections

O19 / 263 / 6796R	The Finchley Society	5.3.49
O19 / 319 / 5310R	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	5.3.49
O19 / 281 / 5765R	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.49

Support for Pre-Inquiry Changes

O19 / 282 / 7121P	Friends of Windsor Open Space	5.3.49
O19 / 281 / 6986P	Church End Local Agenda 21 Partnership	5.3.49

Issues

- The need for this policy.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.104 Policy O19 deals with the production and implementation of management plans and programmes related to Barnet's designated countryside areas and other open spaces. The policy and its supporting text was deleted at Revised Deposit but it has been re-instated as a PIC.

5.105 While this does not belong in the UDP as a specific policy, the Council's wider aims for these areas will depend on effective management and implementation. These matters should certainly be covered in this Plan. Given that they relate to all the Council's designations, I suggest that there are two possible places for a section headed Management, either just after paragraph 5.1.12 or as part of a new introduction to the detailed policies for the chapter.

RECOMMENDATION

5.106 I recommend that:

- Policy O19 and paragraph 5.3.49 be deleted as proposed in the Revised Deposit UDP; and
- A new section entitled 'Management' be inserted into the UDP following the suggestions outlined in my report.

Proposed new policies

Deposit Draft Objections

NewPol / 102 / 677	London Borough of Brent	
NewPol / 162 / 720	MAFF	
NewPol / 162 / 721	MAFF	
NewPol / 263 / 1187	The Finchley Society	5.1.12
NewPol / 285 / 1675	Woolmead Avenue Residents Association	
NewPol / 286 / 1811	Barnet Friends of the Earth	
NewPol / 286 / 1802	Barnet Friends of the Earth	

Issues

- The need for a new policy on habitats;
- The future of land to the south of the Silk Stream within the SSSI;

- Balancing nature conservation with recreation in the Welsh Harp area;
- Compensating for losses of the Green Belt;
- The need for policies on rural diversification and rural dwellings.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.107 BFoE proposes a new policy on the protection of habitats. In my view, the various sites of nature conservation importance achieve this. They cover a wide variety of habitats. Also, much can be done through the use of conditions and legal agreements to enhance biodiversity. I consider that there are sufficient policies and mechanisms in place to protect ecological interests. The challenge is to ensure that they are imaginatively and firmly applied.
- 5.108 W.A.R suggest that the area south of the Silk Stream (within the SSSI boundary) should be converted into a woodland park, incorporating leisure and educational activities. For their part, LB Brent would like to see a new policy balancing nature conservation and recreation in the Welsh Harp area, comparable to one in their own UDP. I have limited information about either of these possibilities. However, it seems to me that they ought, at least, to be considered as complementary proposals to the present plans for the Marsh Drive housing estate. If they are seen to have potential, they could, perhaps, be taken forward under the forthcoming LDF.
- 5.109 The Finchley Society would like to see a new policy that would compensate for losses of Green Belt or MOL. However, if my recommendations are accepted, there will be no loss of Green Belt land or further reductions of MOL. While there have been some small adjustments to the total amount of MOL, these areas are very well protected and I see no need for a new policy.
- 5.110 MAFF would like to see new policies on rural diversification and agricultural dwellings. Given the very limited area of countryside in Barnet I consider that there is little need for new specific policies. If relevant cases do arise they can, if necessary, be assessed against national policy.

RECOMMENDATION

5.111 I recommend that:

- (i) The policies/proposals suggested by W.A.R and LB Brent be considered by the Council in the context of the overall regeneration of West Hendon and the forthcoming LDF; and
 - (ii) The other new policies put forward be not adopted.
-