Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Focus for Discussion:

   **Matter 12 Additional Hearing in relation to Fundamental Changes**

   *Are the pre submission fundamental changes justified adequately by the evidence base and in conformity with the London Plan and national policy? Will the approach be effective with due regard to flexibility?*

   i. Has the consultation been undertaken in accord with the Statement of Community Involvement?

2a Sustainability Appraisal (SA):

   i. Does the SA make a robust and justified assessment of the changes to SP8 (particularly as regards the Friern Barnet Site, the scoring matrix and its conclusions)?

   ii. Does the SA make a robust and justified assessment of the changes relating to SP2 housing matters?

2b Employment Land

   i. What is the rationale for the proposed changes? What evidence justifies the approach of SP8?

   ii. Is there evidence to indicate that the approach of the CS is not in general conformity with the London Plan?

   iii. Is the 2009 'Employment Study' sufficiently robust? What evidence supports the need for more traditional uses in designated areas?

   iv. What criteria inform LSIS designation? What evidence demonstrates their applicability to the identified sites?

   v. Is there evidence relevant to the consideration of alternative approaches?

   vi. Is the approach of the CS sufficiently flexible to ensure effectiveness? Should other land uses be permitted, e.g. residential?

   vii. Should DEA9/17 be 'regeneration areas'?

   **With particular regard to DEA6 Pinkham Way:**

   viii. What is the current situation with regard to the site and the North London Waste Plan?

   ix. Is the proposed designation intended to facilitate the provision of a waste plant upon the site rather than as part of a general and evidenced strategy of land allocations?

   x. What is the rationale for the change? What practical effect does the reclassification have? What prompted the alteration following the pre-submission draft CS?

   xi. If retail uses are to be mitigated, could alternative wording be employed? What level of risk is there in relation to an over expansion of retail uses?

---

1 Regard will be had by the Inspector to the discussions and submissions made previously in relation to the earlier hearings

Further changes to the agenda are feasible prior to the hearing
xii. Is the proposed change justified on the basis of the LSIS criteria?

xiii. What evidence informs the nature conservation value of the site? Is this evidence adequate?

xiv. Is the site adequately assessed in terms of its open space value?

xv. Is the site part of a designated green corridor?

xvi. Does the change in designation reflect adequately national planning policy, for example PPS1, 4, 9?

xvii. Should the CS include specific recognition of the site’s nature conservation value, for example ‘subject to no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site”? Is the designation consistent with the Council’s Community Strategy and Biodiversity Action Plan?

xviii. Is the site allocation consistent with the London Plan; for example Section 7, Policies 4.4, 3D.14?

xix. Is the site deliverable in light of its nature conservation value?

xx. Does the SA support the principle of the allocation?

xxi. Is the reclassification suitable in lieu of the nature conservation value of the site, its location in relation to residential property and with regard to issues of air quality and traffic congestion?

xxii. To what extent has site been considered against alternatives? (other uses including Local Nature Reserve).

2c Housing

i. Is the evidence in support of SP2 sufficiently robust and does it justify the affordable housing threshold?

ii. Is the policy sufficiently flexible (with due regard to development viability and the advice of PPS3)?

3. Other Matters

4. Close

Further changes to the agenda are feasible prior to the hearing