

From: John Cox
To:
Subject: BRENT Reg19: 7 Delivery and Monitoring
Date: 05 December 2019 11:18:45

Reg19: 7 Delivery and Monitoring

(1) Change the section name to *“Delivery Risks and Monitoring”*. That is a better and more accurate description.

(2) I agree with nearly all the concepts in section 7, but you must review all the wording of this important section to try and make it easier to read fluently.

Try and use the concepts of the ‘Plain English Campaign’.

There are specific improvements to make, such as:

7.1.6 Change *“subsidisation”* to **subsidy”*

7.1.6 Explain *“I4B”*

7.1.8 You don’t mean *“on-gong funding”*, do you?

7.1.18 Change *“are the Brent River Park”* to *“is the Brent River Park”*

7.1.18 Get rid of either *“trying”* or *“seeking”*.

There are others.

(3) The Performance Measure:

“Number of public houses lost and not replaced by development”

should change its target of:

“No loss of viable public houses”

To:

“No loss of public houses”.

That is the whole point of a target, and also emphasises the default position of the council. (You would never talk about ‘no loss of viable low-cost housing’, would you?)

(4) There needs to be a Performance Measure on:

“Poverty and Deprivation”

through long-term monitoring of specific sections of the community – existing communities – suffering poverty and deprivation.

For example, there is not enough data on the subject in the years since your last Local Plan and therefore how the subject might affect this Plan.

(4) 7.1.9 Not reopening the Dudding Hill Freight Line for both short-distance London Overground trains and long-distance inter-regional trains would indeed harm (that is, *“fundamentally undermine”*) all Growth Areas across north-west London, so why not say so?

You would need to design new Growth Areas (would the ‘Neasden Stations’ one be renamed the ‘Neasden Station’?) so that there was protected public land for future Dudding Hill Line stations and investigate what other land might be required for protection.

Contrary to your comments, the Staples Corner Growth Area might actually be the least affected, because its promised station is still likely to happen, and in the short-term as well.

LB Barnet has £480-million (mostly grants, some loans) from the government which will seemingly guarantee a Thameslink station on the Midland Main Line at ‘Brent Cross West’ (even though the Brent Cross Shopping Centre development has collapsed).

That new station has always been the intended station within walking distance of the Staples Corner Growth Area and would at least provide gleaming new

Thameslink platforms, for radial as opposed to orbital trains.

Barnet is unwilling to say if platforms for Brent's Dudding Hill Line trains will be passively provided unconditionally at Brent Cross West station, since it is that sort of borough.

Barnet has been saying for two or three years that: "Provision is not precluded", but the Midland Main Line runs along the very edge of Barnet, so it has never really been interested in anything further west, even back as far as the 2001 Barnet-Railtrack development proposals.

It is unfortunate that Barnet has taken on the task of designing the Brent Cross West station, and given the job to Capita.

Overall though, the Thameslink station is essentially fully funded and close to the submission of a planning application. Only hesitation over Brent's Dudding Hill Line trains is holding it up.

John Cox