

Appendix A



Sustainable Development and Environment Supplementary Planning Document

Consultation Statement

June 2023

This Consultation Statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulations 12 and 13 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

What was consulted upon?

The Sustainable Development and Environment Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was subject to a six-week period of consultation between 16th February and 30th March 2023.

Why is the SPD needed?

To help improve development's environmental sustainability. High quality sustainable development requires adopting a holistic approach. The design and construction of new buildings and the spaces around them is important. It has a key role in delivering sustainable development.

The true benefits of sustainable environment and development go well beyond simply cutting carbon emissions. There are also associated economic and social benefits. These include reduced energy bills and improved quality of life, now and in the long-term.

This SPD provides details of how the council will address the environmental impacts of development through application of national and development policies and guidance. This will be achieved by accelerating the necessary reduction of carbon emissions. It will be further enabled by associated improvements in air quality, through quality green and blue infrastructure, efficient and clean energy, sustainable travel, reduced environmental nuisances and waste management in the borough.

As adopted, the document will be given significant weight as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Council will work with applicants early on in the application process seeking compliance with the SPD to ensure acceptable developments.

Area of coverage

The London Borough of Brent, with the exception of areas in which the Old Oak and Park Royal Mayoral Development Corporation is the local planning authority.

Steps the Council took to publicise the draft SPD.

The Council publicised the draft SPD by:

- a) emailing consultees on the planning policy consultation database (over 1000 addresses);
- b) publicising via the Council's online consultation portal;
- c) making hard copies available in the Brent Civic Centre and Brent Council public libraries;
- d) making it available on the Council's website
- e) Using the Council's corporate notifications and social media outlets.

Responses

A total of 12 residents responded, in addition to 15 organisations, including National Highways and Greater London Authority (GLA), amenity/ campaign groups, including Brent Cycle Campaign and developers/ agents.

In terms of a high-level overview of comments received, generally the document was well received by both residents and other types of respondents. The majority were supportive. Residents' comments tended to highlight the length and complexity of the document. Some thought more of the provisions applied to major developments should be targeted on minor applications too. Others considered that the Council could do more overall than it was doing in relation to its own actions outside planning as well as in relation to development on renewables, transportation, air quality, water management, open space and biodiversity.

The GLA identified potential inconsistencies with London Plan Guidance on air quality. Thames Water identified some clarifications in terms of timing of receipt of information in the development process. Brent and Westminster Swifts' Group made detailed points on biodiversity matters. Brent Cycling Campaign raised a number of issues, including the Council's commitment to zero carbon transport, cycling in general and interpretation of application of standards. Brent Parks' Forum wanted wider application of standards on air quality and tree canopy cover for example than set out and raised concerns about development close to watercourses and water management. NW London Rivers' Alliance raised similar concerns around water issues as well as how the Council monitored/ enforced mitigations/ attenuation. The developers at a large site on Atlip Road raised points on district heat networks and application of standards to residential development.

Changes to the SPD

In terms of response, the positive nature of the how the document was received clearly is something to welcome. The wide range of subject matter it addresses mean it is inevitably a long and at times technical document. It is considered for the most part it provides an effective balance between catering for and being accessible to the general public and applicants, with their associated professional experts.

In terms of applying policies to a wider range of developments, the SPD can only apply existing policies, not create new ones. Many policies do treat major and minor development differently. In addition, the Government seeks to 'ease the burden' on small housebuilders to increase outputs. The SPD does not address in detail what the Council does outside the development sphere, although comment has been made on the representations where appropriate about the Council's approach to numerous sustainability matters. A number of minor amendments have been proposed in response to comments on renewables, transportation, air quality, water management, open space and biodiversity.

In response to the GLA, the SPD has been amended to take account of changes to London Plan Guidance. In response to Thames Water, it is accepted that the draft SPD was inconsistent with site allocation policy and therefore changes to the SPD were needed. In response to the Swifts' Group some changes were made, in particular in relation to application of biodiversity considerations, e.g. incorporating bat and bird boxes. In response to Brent Cycle Campaign, minor clarifications have been incorporated into the SPD, similarly so for Brent's Parks' Forum and the NW London River Alliance. In response to Atlip Road minor clarifications were made on housing standards, such as Passivhaus being desirable rather than mandatory. In addition, a Checklist for applicants that was inadvertently not included in the draft SPD was included. This did not introduce new matters for applicants to address into the SPD. It essentially distils the advice provided in each section into a simple checklist format to run through prior to submission of an application or in some cases taking forward a development that does not require planning permission.

A more detailed 'Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them' is set out starting on the next page.

Adoption date

The Council adopted the SPD on the 12th June 2023 and issued the relevant notification.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

Rep No	Name	Summary of Comment	Officer Response	SPD Recommendation
1	Resident 1	The document covers most likely issues for future planning. An area that needs additional work is prevention of the need for mechanical ventilation with its additional energy demands. Such ventilation is required either due to solar gain through poor orientation/ lack of quality shading of windows, or lack of cross ventilation. Air conditioning should not be needed. Extractor fans should also have winter heat recovery.	These issues are for the most part addressed particularly in major developments through the necessary scheme energy review and need for a carbon neutral development, plus other standards such as BREEAM excellent for non-residential schemes. These should take account of heat/ comfort of rooms in relation to solar gain and the impacts this might have on the need for cooling or heating. Such reviews should occur early within a scheme's design, being part of an iterative process in the scheme's design stages to inform window size and orientation. Cross ventilation through passive measures is encouraged by the London Plan policy of seeking to limit single aspect dwellings. For smaller developments whilst it is agreed ideally these will be doing as much to ensure carbon neutral development, Government policy towards lifting the burdens to increase the small builders' sector's outputs means the Council has to take a proportionate approach and encourage them to take such measures, rather than making it compulsory. It is agreed that air conditioning should not be required. However, it is a lifestyle choice for many households and added post development occupation, the majority of which the Council has no control over now.	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

2	Resident 1	New developments with gardens should have water storage (butts or below ground).	The approach of seeking greenfield run-off rates for new major development and small residential schemes is resulting in more storage of surface water on site which can be used for other non-potable purposes, e.g. irrigation or toilet flushing. This is left to the applicant to consider taking account of their surface water strategy, it may be for example that overall above ground water storage features such as ponds provide wider environmental/ ecological features and are less carbon intensive than the carbon heavy <u>underground storage facilities.</u>	No change.
3	Resident 1	New larger developments at least should have provision for renewables, e.g. solar hot water heating is the most efficient use of solar. No mention is made of wind renewables potential.	Renewable technologies are sought on major development to address the carbon neutral approach, but it is considered better to allow the applicant to decide how they prioritise particular technologies. On small schemes, the Council encourages the applicant to consider renewables. The energy sector is highly variable across time in terms of benefit/ cost and site location / characteristics related to the technologies/ power source used, which makes a prescriptive approach, e.g. 10% by wind, 30% by PV, etc. unreasonable. Whilst small scale wind turbines were popular in the early 2000s, as a technology it has fallen out of favour on development sites due to comparative cost and post implementation adverse impacts on occupiers, e.g. noise, vibration and flicker, as well as need for maintenance, e.g. bearing replacement. This resulted in many turbines being decommissioned, even if they still have not	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			been removed from developments. Again, it is considered most appropriate for the Council to consider what the applicant considers are the most appropriate solutions taking account of the site's characteristics.	
4	Resident 2	In general, the SPD is hard to understand for the general public. The technical/ abstract presentation makes it difficult to understand likely outcomes. In general, I hope it is positive.	It is accepted that the document can be complicated in parts, this reflects the technical nature of some of the aspects it covers. Some changes more specifically related to other representations will improve the understanding/ usability of the document.	No change.
5	Resident 2	Welcome the mention of green infrastructure and using greenery to soak up pollution and generally make the environment more aesthetically pleasing.	Support welcomed.	No change.
6	Resident 2	Agree with making more green space available for locals to grow their own food. Whilst allotments exist in Brent, other space is available that could be used for free to grow fresh fruit and veg to help struggles with higher cost of living. A patch of 5m ² or less can be sufficient to grow more than enough tomatoes to meet a family's needs.	Agreed, small spaces can make a big difference to people.	No change.
7	Resident 2	It would be great if the Council can do more to deliver initiatives where Brent residents can share large gardens with non-garden owners, for example by trading gardening skill and tending for a space to grow veg. Growing your own without harmful chemicals, locally, with almost zero food miles is best for our environment and our pockets and fosters community cohesion. A website 'allotme'	Realistically the Council doesn't have the resource to do this but is aware of large (e.g. Facebook communities) and specialist websites, plus other local community based initiatives to encourage garden sharing, or use of fruit within residential gardens that would otherwise not be used by homeowners, which is then used for either juice or additions to foodbank sources. It encourages people to seek out such	Paragraph 3.8.5 Add: <u>"...In addition, there are likely to be opportunities in existing residential areas to access shared gardens/ growing spaces, or support initiatives to put into productive use produce gained from fruit trees in</u>

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		facilitates this, but it would be great if the Council can connect Brent residents with Brent growing spaces.	initiatives. Additional wording can be put in the SPD to promote people searching out such initiatives.	<u>gardens, etc. Residents are encouraged to use active local social media forums to promote or seek out such opportunities."</u>
8	Resident 2	Brent definitely needs more greenery and flowers to improve biodiversity for wildlife and insects to return. Westminster's funding allows it to have street flower baskets, but similar in Brent would help brighten the dismal mood.	The Council does through sponsorship and other activities such as town centre managers seek to incorporate seasonal planting/ flower boxes where possible. However, its activities again are limited by the resource constraints and prioritisation of its limited funds on higher priority issues.	No change.
9	Resident 2	The Sustainability Assessment screening says it's unlikely to have a significant environmental impact, which is confusing. Is it not supposed to have this impact? It is hard to know explicitly what these changes will look like, especially when the change won't be significant.	In terms to the reference of the guidance providing a lack of significant impact, this is because the SPD does not generate the sustainable policies from which the significant impacts are derived (compared to if they did not exist) but only interprets them. This will improve outcomes, but it cannot be considered that the additional impact of the guidance on its own will be significantly above that which would have been achieved if only the policies as set out in the London and Local Plans were used when determining applications.	No change.
10	Resident 3	Sustainable development can help protect our natural resources and reduce pollution. This can lead to better health outcomes and a more liveable environment, improving people's quality of life, economic growth, social development, and environmental protection.	Support welcome.	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

11	Resident 3	Electric cars and special green zones are important. They potentially help reduce the transportation's environmental impact; a significant contributor to air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Special green zones, such as pedestrian-only areas or bike lanes, can encourage more sustainable transportation modes, reducing reliance on cars altogether.	The document references the Council's Healthier Neighbourhoods scheme which seeks to reduce traffic and improve local air/noise pollution and the general safety of residential streets. As noted, the Council has also embarked on several trial 'Green Neighbourhoods', which seek to improve the general sustainability of an area, particularly through reducing traffic and increasing the uptake of walking and cycling. The measures taken reflect those included within the Sustainability SPD which are required for new developments. In these Green Neighbourhoods the Council is undertaking a concerted effort to improve their sustainability outside of the planning process, improving the existing public realm where there is not necessarily a new development proposed. Through off-set payments secured via S106, planning helps contribute towards these schemes via the Council's Carbon Offset Fund. The measures in this document are required for developers to secure planning permission and will be directly delivered by them. Where direct delivery does not take place, the applicants will provide financial payments to off-set any impacts, which the Council will use towards delivering on its sustainability agenda. The implementation costs borne as a result of the SPD and associated policies/guidance, therefore, will generally not come from taxpayer money.	No change
12	Resident 3	The cost and community resilience of implementing green policies in Brent	Agreed. Much of the actions are developer focussed as they result from expected	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		council may also take time to see a return on this investment. This can be difficult to justify to taxpayers.	actions associated with planning applications and are incremental, gaining in significance as more developments incorporate them. In cases where public sector funds are involved, projects are usually subject to a cost/benefit analysis as a form of ensuring value for money or considering how funding for projects is prioritised.	
13	Start Easy Ltd	Generally supportive of the SPD, and welcome the consideration of designated Open Spaces, the Urban Greening Factor, air quality, and waste management reduction.	Support welcomed.	No change.
14	Resident 4	Generally supportive of the SPD.	Support welcomed.	No change.
15	Resident 5	Very heavy document which would benefit from more visual aids to help break it up, including case studies. As such, it will be difficult for people to use and ensure intended outcomes are delivered. A checklist/summary at the end of each section on what needs to be achieved should be included. Perhaps the background information could be placed in the appendix to reduce the documents length.	The document seeks to deal with all matters related to sustainability, bringing them together into one comprehensive document. These matters are of a technical nature, and therefore unfortunately technical detailing which it is agreed might be complicated cannot be avoided. Where possible, the document seeks to make this concise through the use of flow charts and figures, including the use of colour to break it up and make it more visually stimulating. As the document seeks to address a range of matters for a range of application types and sizes, it is not possible to provide complete summaries of what is to be provided. Rather the material is summarised under each section of the themes (i.e. policy overview, policy considerations etc.) which applicants can use to determine what is required for their development.	Amend the document to include more photographs and graphics to break up the text.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

16	Resident 6	Generally supportive of the SPD, particularly as it relates to improving Brent's poor air quality, and the inclusion of green infrastructure as being mandatory in new developments. This should go further to ensure that there is a set quantity of green space required per new home delivered.	Support welcomed. The current approach towards green infrastructure is to achieve a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of 10% upon the existing baseline, and to achieve the London Plan Urban Greening Factor (UGF). In instances where existing green infrastructure is poor on site, the UGF helps to ensure that a good level is achieved above and beyond the BNG requirement. The approach to most on site open space delivery is more clearly set out in the Amenity Space and Place Quality SPD. The approach is to ensure that access to private external amenity (gardens and balconies) is maximised in accordance with Local Plan policy BH13, which sets out minimum quantities for each dwelling. Where this cannot be provided as private amenity, the shortfall should be delivered as communal on-site amenity space. This, in combination with the BNG and UGF requirements, ensures that wherever possible a sufficient level of green outdoor amenity space is provided per resident within a development. Where this cannot be achieved, a contribution towards enhanced off-site provision is sought.	No change.
17	Resident 7	No reference to protected views which should be included, with reference to fewer high-rise buildings, or at least for building heights to be capped.	The SPD addresses sustainability matters. Although protected viewing corridors can reduce the heights of taller buildings which themselves can exhibit unsustainable characteristics, they are more appropriately addressed in the Tall Building Strategy and other design related documents. If designed correctly, tall buildings can have high	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			performance when considered against a number of environmental measures. They can contribute towards delivering higher density neighbourhoods which are inherently more sustainable, particularly in relation to reducing unnecessary vehicle trips, given their ability to support, and be supported by localised and concentrated infrastructures. The individual characteristics of taller buildings which need to be managed to ensure they are sustainable are addressed by the various standards such as BREEAM or considering embodied carbon/ whole life building assessments which are referenced throughout the document. This is having a significant impact on construction methods to reduce embodied carbon and on-going energy use. The Local Plan sets out appropriate heights for each Tall Building Zone. Nevertheless, an inflexible approach to capping building heights would not be appropriate and may unreasonably constrain development which may otherwise bring significant benefits to the borough.	
18	Resident 8	Object to use of photo which shows plastic grass and leads me to question your understanding of sustainability.	There is no photo in the SPD which includes plastic grass, however it is accepted that this does occur in the draft Residential Amenity SPD which was subject to a simultaneous consultation. These comments have been passed on to the relevant officer, with a view to encouraging its removal.	Addressed by the officer taking forward the Residential Amenity SPD.
19	Resident 9	No comment	Noted.	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

20	Resident 10	Long detailed and technical but impressive document; Pavements need to be smoother/ repaired to reduce risk of tripping.	Support welcomed. The document deals with matters regarding the sustainability of new developments. Where the existing public realm is of poor quality, the Council will seek to ensure (where this is adjacent to new development which will impact upon it) that it will be improved, although this is not the focus of the document. The document does include measures to improve the public realm toward making it a better place to walk and cycle, including reference to the TfL Healthy Streets concept, which will include improving pavements and reducing hazards.	No change.
21	Resident 10	Cycle infrastructure needs to be improved to encourage safe cycling, especially to address the risks on roads.	Chapter 6 addresses Sustainable Transport, with 6.3 in particular seeking to increase the uptake of active travel. This includes improvements to existing, and the delivery of new cycle infrastructure.	No change.
22	Resident 10	More trees need to be planted and mature trees to be left where possible.	Section 3.7 addresses trees and woodland. This identifies that the priority is to retain existing trees, and plant new ones to enhance green infrastructure to achieve the Biodiversity Net Gain and Urban Greening Factor requirements. Where on site trees are lost, the existing canopy cover of those trees is to be replaced, therefore resulting in no net loss of cover, and a likely increase in the number of trees. Other potential adverse impacts on biodiversity/ protected species that older trees can support will also need to be addressed in relation to biodiversity net gain.	No change.
23	Resident 10	Food retail stores should mainly be plant based to reduce carbon emissions.	Planning cannot reasonably prescribe the types and ingredients of food sold in a retail	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			outlet. This is determined by the market and government regulation.	
24	Resident 10	Flood risk information should be made easily available, especially to allow those in high flood risk areas to protect themselves and their homes.	This document goes some way towards providing readily available guidance for how to adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate related flooding. The Council's Planning Policies Map includes those areas most at risk of both surface water and fluvial flooding, which can be used by residents to determine what courses of action may be appropriate for them in accordance with this SPD.	No change.
25	Harlesden Mutual Aid	Generally supportive of the SPD.	Support welcomed.	No change.
26	Resident 11	Generally supportive of the SPD, and the theme of sustainability. More concrete actions should be included for air quality.	Support welcomed. The Council has produced and is now updating an Air Quality Action Plan which goes further towards addressing existing air quality problems than is appropriate in this SPD. The SPD seeks to reflect the aspirations of the Action Plan, translating them into requirements for developers when determining appropriate mitigative measures for planning applications.	No change.
27	Resident 12	Support the inclusion of the green infrastructure section (section 3). 3.5.1 in particular focuses on Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), although ignores other aspects of biodiversity such as sites for nesting birds. Natural England now refer to these types of features, which are generally outside the scope of the BNG, as "species features". Therefore in addition to BNG, other "species features" should be considered as part of the SPD.	This issue has been addressed in relation to comments received from the Brent Swifts Group in representation 40.	See proposed change in response to Rep 40.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		This should include swift bricks, which are the government bird box of choice (NPPG Natural Environment para 23).		
28	Kilburn Neighbourhood Plan Forum	Support the SPD, and the concern it suggests the Council takes with these matters. The document is complex and refers to numerous other complicated documents. Therefore it is difficult to determine where this document introduces new policy/ guidance, above and beyond that existing. It would be useful for the purpose of consultation to note where this has occurred.	Support welcomed. The document seeks to deal with all matters related to sustainability, bringing them together into one comprehensive document. These matters are of a technical nature, and therefore technical detailing cannot be avoided. As a SPD, it cannot introduce new policy above and beyond what is already set out in the Development Plan. The SPD rather seeks to bring together previously disparate guidance into one comprehensive guide.	No change.
29	The Coal Authority	No comment.	Noted	No change.
30	National Highways	Focusing on sustainable movement, the aim is to embed sustainable movement into schemes as a significant planning consideration. We support the principles identified in focusing on sustainable movement that are consistent with the NPPF and the emphasis Brent places on it as a significant planning consideration. This will ensure that planning decisions are in line with the aim for the UK to achieve a net zero carbon status by 2050.	The support is welcomed, and the Council will continue to prioritise reducing unnecessary use of vehicles with its associated benefits to the strategic road network of reducing congestion or the need for additional infrastructure capacity increases.	No change.
31	TfL Spatial Planning	Commend the comprehensive coverage of the Sustainable Movement chapter and its consistency with London Plan policies. Welcome the endorsement of the Mayor's mode share targets, adoption of the Healthy Streets Approach and 'Vision Zero' and the 20 minute neighbourhood approach. It may be helpful to state how	Support welcomed. It is agreed that inclusion of the Mayor's specific contribution anticipated within Brent to assist in delivering the 80% modal shift target should be included.	Add sentence to the end of paragraph 6.2.4 as follows: ' <u>To assist the Mayor of London in achieving the 80% target, he has identified that within Brent a minimum of 78% of trips</u>

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		the London-wide 80% mode share target translates into a Brent target of 78%.		<u>need to be undertaken by walking, cycling or public transport by 2041.'</u>
32	TfL Spatial Planning	Support the key policy considerations in section 6.4 - Reduce journeys by private vehicle and section 6.5 - Increase take up of zero emission vehicles. However, 6.5.3's suggestion that e-bike charging facilities should be provided within cycle parking may not be appropriate in new developments with communal cycle parking where this may pose a safety risk.	Support welcomed. It is not clear where the safety risk is anticipated but it is assumed it might either be from trailing wires or hazards of battery charging. For clarity there could be inclusion of appropriate wording related to satisfactorily addressing any potential safety concerns.	Amend paragraph 6.5.3 to: 'Provision of large cycle parking spaces are encouraged, <u>where it is safe to do so</u> , to provide charging facilities for e-bikes <u>cycles....'</u>
33	TfL Spatial Planning	Support the approach set out in section 6.6 – Planning to mitigate transport impacts including steps 1 to 5, as well as the requirements for Transport Assessments, Travel Plans, Construction Logistics Plans, Delivery and Servicing Plans, Parking Design and Management Plans and Healthy Streets Assessments in line with London Plan and TfL guidance.	Support welcomed.	No change.
34	TfL Spatial Planning	Support the development management requirements in section 6.7, the approach to planning conditions and obligations in section 6.8 and monitoring requirements in section 6.9.	Support welcomed.	No change.
35	Natural England	No comments. The SPD does not relate to our interests to any significant extent.	Noted.	No change.
36	Greater London Authority	These are GLA officer comments. We welcome the additional focus and guidance on environmental sustainability and have no significant comment. The	The Air Quality LPGs are referenced in the policy and guidance section should anyone need further information on air quality, or trip rates etc. The SPD will be amended to take	Amend TEB definition under paragraph 2.3.2 to read: 'emissions from <u>private</u>

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		<p>SPD's air quality guidance should however align with adopted London Plan Guidance (LPGs) on Air Quality Neutral and Air Quality Positive. As these have been adopted, this needs to be reflected in the SPD.</p> <p>Air Quality Neutral Transport benchmarks should be amended so they align with those in the LPG, as should the AQN flowcharts. Para 2.3.2 – The TEB definition should be amended to: “emissions from private vehicles travelling to and from the development.” This prevents questions about operational and servicing trips. There should also be a reference to ‘excluded development’ and the simplified procedure as per section 2.2 in the AQN LPG. Para 2.3.6 – Step 1 – Should the text state ‘trip rates’ instead of ‘energy sources’? It may be useful to refer to the text in the AQN LPG (see para 4.2.1 of the LPG).</p>	<p>account of any changes that occurred to the final adopted LPGs and the comments related to 2.3.2 and 2.3.6.</p>	<p>vehicles travelling to and from the development.’</p> <p>Add paragraph: <u>‘2.3.9 Any developments which do not include additional sources of air pollution, notably from either transport and/or boilers, are assumed to be AQN, and do not need to demonstrate compliance.’</u></p> <p>Amend step 1 in Table 3 to read: ‘Locate information on proposed energy sources <u>trip rates</u> in the Transport Strategy*’</p>
37	Greater London Authority	<p>Para 2.3.7 - Recommend a change to address a concern of non-alignment with the LPG's Section 5 to reflect that development unable to achieve the benchmark should firstly seek agreement to secure on or off-site mitigation measures. If this is not possible, the applicant should agree an offsetting payment.</p>	<p>This is a fair point and the SPD should be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 2.3.7 to read: ‘A development must meet both benchmarks separately on-site. If the AQA shows it does not do this, the priority is to amend the proposal so it does, <u>the applicant should first seek agreement with the council as to whether or not on-site or off-site</u></p>

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

				mitigation is required. If development is unable to achieve this <u>either of these</u> , the council will secure off-site mitigation measures within the borough. This will be based on the Defra damage cost toolkit completed by the developer.'
38	Greater London Authority	Para 2.4.4 – Does not correctly reflect the requirements/ guidance in the Air Quality Positive (AQP) guidance. An AQP approach is about identifying and implementing ways to push development beyond compliance with both the Air Quality Neutral benchmarks and the minimum requirements of an air quality assessment. To achieve this, an AQP Statement should be submitted that demonstrates how benefits to local air quality have been maximised, and how measures to minimise pollution exposure will be implemented. Therefore, is it not about meeting a benchmark or being subject to any mitigation measures.	Paragraph 2.4.4 agrees, in accordance with 2.4.3, that the approach toward achieving AQP development is to maximise benefits to local air quality improvements. 2.4.4 identifies a last resort way forward should it not be after all possible options have been exhausted for a development to achieve the AQP requirement on site through the provision of appropriate off-set payments.	No change.
39	Greater London Authority	Para 2.8.2 – The SPD may want to reference that the Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition SPG may be updated.	The SPD cannot reference where documents will be updated in the future unless there are clear timescales and commitments to such updates. It is assumed that documents will be superseded, in which case applicants would be expected to refer to the latest iteration of	1.6.2 amend: "...This will better ensure a development can reach the necessary standard. <u>Please note that the SPD refers to many documents or standards, which</u>

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			any guidance. This can however be made clear near the beginning of the document.	<u>inevitably over time are likely to be superseded through either wholly new or amended documents or standards. Where this is the case, the most contemporary version should be used to address the particular topic matter and standard referred to in this SPD."</u>
40	Brent & Westminster Swifts Group	Inclusion of Green Infrastructure is positive, however Urban Greening Factor and Biodiversity Net Gain focus excludes many aspects of nature from those calculations, especially bats and endangered red-listed bird species that nest and roost in buildings, e.g. swifts and sparrows. It is not true in para 3.5.1 that biodiversity net gain 'includes all species of wildlife and planting'.	Agreed, however the commentary on UGF in the Local Plan indicates a preference on pursuing options that support increased delivery of biodiversity. Focusing on specific aspects of biodiversity can potentially limit options for the developer to pursue to best reflect the solutions that best respect the opportunities on site. On this basis inclusion of examples/ prompts is considered a better approach, rather than being a requirement. The reference in 3.5.1 can be amended to reflect the position set out in the representation.	Amend section 3.1 title " <u>Green Infrastructure and biodiversity in Brent</u> " Amend 3.1 Paragraph 1 to: " <u>There are a variety of sizes and typologies of open space within the borough. These play a critical role in supporting biodiversity within the borough, with some having recognised national and London wide status of importance. Other features such as residential gardens, or buildings/ structures can also support important habitats for flora and fauna, e.g. roofs or</u>

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

				<p><u>eaves for bats and birds and gaps/ holes for insects.</u> However, in comparison to some areas, There are parts of the borough <u>that have comparatively more limited green infrastructure, including</u> with a lower percentage of accessible public <u>open space....."</u></p> <p>Amend para 3.5.1: "This includes all<u>most</u> species of wildlife and planting. <u>Notable exceptions are currently species that nest and roost in or on buildings, such as bats, swifts, swallows, martins, sparrows and birds of prey. These are in themselves an important consideration in addition to BNG."</u></p> <p>Amend para 3.5.2 "All developments are encouraged to plan for green infrastructure <u>and wildlife</u> in a way that complements and co-exists with the existing elements."</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

				<p>Amend para 3.5.3 to add at the end: <u>"Notwithstanding the need to address BNG, applicants will also need to consider the extent to which existing buildings and sites subject to development proposals support wildlife that BNG does not capture, such as hedgehogs, bats, birds and insects. This includes which features could be kept, replaced, enhanced or even incorporated into sites where they do not currently exist, e.g. swift bricks, badger highways and bat boxes."</u> Amend 3.9 to "Planning to Mitigate Impacts on Green Infrastructure <u>and Biodiversity.</u>" Amend 3.9.1 to "Provision of <u>green infrastructure,</u> new open spaces <u>and enhanced biodiversity</u> should a) Involve <u>landscape and ecological</u> experts, considering green infrastructure at the early design process;..."</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

				<p>Amend 3.10 to: "The following section aims to provide a clear and consistent approach for stakeholders to meet the borough's greening <u>GI and biodiversity</u> priorities."</p> <p>Amend 3.10.2 G to: "<u>Ideally retain any existing positive biodiversity, even if outside those species covered by the BNG metric and should improve opportunities for these species as well as deliver 10% increase on existing biodiversity and incorporate measures listed in para 3.5.6</u>"</p> <p>Amend 3.10.2 M to "<u>Ideally retain any existing positive biodiversity, even if outside those species covered by the BNG metric and should improve opportunities for these species as well as deliver 10% increase on existing biodiversity.</u>"</p> <p>Amend 3.11 to: "Planning conditions will</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

				where necessary secure green infrastructure <u>and biodiversity measures.</u> "
41	Brent & Westminster Swifts Group	Nesting spaces for swifts which have recorded nest sites e.g. Wembley, Cricklewood and Willesden Green (see RSPB Swift Mapper website) are rapidly being lost due to building renovation and extension.	Noted.	No change.
42	Brent & Westminster Swifts Group	National planning guidance (NPPG Natural Environment 2019 paragraph 023) and the London Plan (policy G6 B4) require swift bricks in most new planning policy documents being adopted in London boroughs. These are a universal nest brick for a wide range of small bird species. Paragraph 023 also refers to the benefits of bat boxes and hedgehog highways. We request a requirement for all of these features to be installed in new developments in accordance with best-practice guidance. (BS 42021: 2022, and from CIEEM: https://cieem.net/resource/the-swift-a-bird-you-need-to-help/ and NHBC Foundation: Biodiversity in New Housing Developments (2021) Section 8.1 page 42: https://www.nhbcbfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/S067-NF89-Biodiversity-in-new-housing-developments_FINAL.pdf).	It is accepted that these identified features can be included in the SPD as examples, nevertheless their inclusion as requirements is not considered appropriate.	This has been addressed in response to representation 40.
43	Historic England	No comment.	Noted.	No change.
44	Thames Water	Section 4.8 relates to planning conditions and obligations for water management.	It is agreed that it would be clearer if the SPD was amended to label the box	Change title of each subject matter's

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		The blue box is titled 'Planning Obligations', but includes conditions, and would therefore be better titled 'Planning Obligations and Conditions'.	'Planning Conditions and Obligations'. This appears to be the case throughout the document where some sections either refer to planning conditions or alternatively planning obligations, where in fact an element of both might be appropriate.	'planning obligations' or 'planning conditions' box headings to ' <u>Planning Conditions and Obligations</u> '.
45	Thames Water	Keen to ensure that water and wastewater infrastructure is provided as needed. Upgrades to support development are not progressed until there is certainty that development will come forward to avoid abortive costs. This means that occupation may need to be phased to allow for necessary infrastructure upgrades, but that required works do not need to be agreed prior to commencement of works. Therefore the second condition should be reworded, replacing reference to 'commencement' with 'occupation'.	This suggested amendment is accepted and actually reflects the approach set out in infrastructure requirements sections of the Local Plan's site allocations. On reflection the SPD's sole focus on Thames Water is not considered appropriate however, as Affinity Water and other providers that the developer can chose can also provide supply infrastructure in Brent and developers themselves may undertake required infrastructure improvements that have been agreed with the statutory undertakers.	Amend second condition/obligation in the section 4.8 planning obligations box to read: 'Where there are clean or waste water infrastructure concerns, development <u>is not to commence</u> be occupied until strategies detailing on and / or off site works have been submitted and approved by the LPA in consultation with the <u>relevant statutory water undertaker and required water infrastructure improvements have been completed</u> Thames Water . Phasing conditions may be applied if applicable'
46	Brent Cycling Campaign	Brent Cycling Campaign has widely canvassed it membership on the SPD and its response reflects this input. The Council realistically is taking neither its and the SPD's proclaimed need to "address climate change as a priority" and	Addressing climate change is a significant priority of the Council within the resources that are available to it. It is agreed that net zero carbon emissions from road transport, given the current emphasis on carbon rich fuels, is unlikely by 2030, but that doesn't	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		<p>aim to reach “net zero carbon emissions from road transport by 2030” seriously. It will fail both aims with the present approach. This will only be reached by building new, high quality cycle infrastructure on all Brent main roads, and by significantly restricting motor vehicle use of minor and residential roads. No new high quality cycle infrastructure built since the Carlton Vale Cycle Lanes, which is Brent’s first (and only) protected cycle route has been retained.</p>	<p>mean that the Council should not try as best as it can. Whilst there may well need to be an element of compulsion, at a local level the best way to change habits will be through encouraging people to make change themselves and providing opportunities for more carbon neutral travel options will be part of that. Nevertheless, the Council's potential to invest in sustainable transport infrastructure has and is likely to continue to be heavily hampered by reductions in GLA funds available for the LIP and other budgetary pressures. Given this there are indeed unfortunately unlikely that substantive capital funds/ projects available to deliver infrastructure of the magnitude sought by BCC.</p> <p>The Council is in the process of developing an Active Travel Implementation Plan which will detail our priorities and proposals for improving conditions for active travel in the borough and to enable more people to walk or cycle. The Plan will include details of new/improved cycling and walking links and supporting infrastructure required to improve cyclist/pedestrian safety and accessibility and to encourage more journeys by these modes. Subject to approval, we aim to consult on a draft plan in late Summer 2023 which will provide the opportunity for the public and key stakeholders to feed into the development of the plan.</p>	
47	Brent Cycling Campaign	The SPD's laudable aims are utterly toothless in the face of Brent’s existing motor vehicle dominated environment.	The extent to which the Council can address these matters is to a large degree dependent on the funds that it has available,	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		Additional immediate action is required by the Council including: • bringing forward a network of protected cycle routes on main roads, • a borough-wide network of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, • and a borough-wide 20 mph limit.	in particular to support the delivery of the associated infrastructure changes. This will be informed by the availability of funds that historically have been provided by the Mayor through the LIP. Whilst the need for interventions is likely to be high to achieve the modal shift, the funding from this source in the coming years is unclear given the on-going funding pressures on TfL.	
48	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 1.1.1 - There is little to no evidence of this “proactive approach” in physical infrastructure.	Noted.	No change.
49	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 1.5 The use of appropriate standards is supported. The Council must use the most recent cycle and active travel design standards including: LTN 1/20: Cycle infrastructure design, London Plan (2021), Mayor’s Transport Strategy (revised 2022) and Sustainable Transport, Walking and Cycling London Plan Guidance - which clearly sets out what development plans should do and the Chief Medical Officer’s Annual Report (2022) which also highlights how development and transport infrastructure can encourage active travel	The Council is aware of these documents and encourages their use to inform its own schemes and those of developers.	No change.
50	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 1.9 - Long term behaviour change in transport choices is only achievable by “structural” and importantly infrastructure changes. Any focus on individual responsibility is an abdication of the Council’s responsibility for the structural environment.	It is agreed that infrastructure changes will be a key consideration in helping people determine the choice of whether they walk or cycle, but individual responsibility is also a key component in encouraging behaviour change.	No change.
51	Brent Cycling Campaign	Support aim for publicly accessible open space which “cater[s] to various users” as	Support is welcomed. Given the breadth of uses and users of open space the	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		set out in paragraph 3.1. This must include accessible cycle infrastructure for non standard and adapted cycle users. To ensure this is achieved, reference should be made to: Highways England's 'cycle design vehicle' or Wheels for Wellbeing inclusive guide; or the London Cycling Design Standards' 'inclusive cycle' concept.	suggested change is considered to be too detailed and too narrow in its focus for what is a general point.	
52	Brent Cycling Campaign	Support the use of SuDS (para 4.4.3), although reference to 'resisting' impermeable surfaces on front gardens and driveways is insufficient, and should instead state that action will be taken against developers who do not use permeable solutions. Paragraph 4.4.7 should include an example of SuDS used in traffic management and road reduction schemes.	The SPD is essentially addressing how the Council will deal with applications; the specification of drainage solutions will be agreed via conditioned strategies, drawings and specifications. If the developer departs from these then as the developer will be aware there is the opportunity for the council to take enforcement action to remedy any unpermitted solutions that would otherwise increase flood risk.	No change.
53	Brent Cycling Campaign	Electric vehicles consume a disproportionate amount of electricity, and will place a significant burden on the grid compared with electric cycles. E-cycle parking with charging facilities, in addition to regular cycle parking should therefore be provided in new developments.	Agreed, the SPD already makes provision for encouraging bike charging facilities within cycle storage areas as set out in 6.5.3.	No change.
54	Brent Cycling Campaign	Waste & Circular Economy - The automotive industry produces a significant quantity of waste. The only solution to reduce this waste is to rapidly reduce the number of vehicles on the road, and trips taken by motor vehicles. Point v) "Avoid providing cycle storage in bin storage areas" should be rewritten to "Provide	Disposal of disused cars will also generate waste, but in general the point about waste generation will be reduced by moving towards modes that aren't significant waste generators is agreed. On point v) the suggested change provides greater clarity and is accepted.	Change Para 7.3.8 v) " Avoid providing <u>Provide separate</u> cycle storage in and bin storage areas."

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		cycle storage separate to bin storage areas”.		
55	Brent Cycling Campaign	Other Environmental Impacts - The significant noise, dust, light pollution, and vibration impacts caused by motor vehicles in Brent can only be reduced by reducing the number of motor vehicle journeys.	It is agreed that vehicles contribute significantly to these environmental impacts.	No change.
56	Brent Cycling Campaign	Appendix - 9.1. No checklist provided. We assume the “Checklist” is combined from tables in the document above.	Yes, unfortunately this was missed out when the document text was transferred over to the publishing software.	Appendix 9.1: Add the checklist that was inadvertently missed out.
57	Brent Cycling Campaign	Support acknowledgement that a reduction in vehicle journeys is essential to reach net zero. In relation to changing travel behaviour, new infrastructure is required to support sustainable movement. Little change in Brent infrastructure has occurred.	See above response to representation 47. Since 2016 the Council has made significant investment in new and improved walking and cycling infrastructure, road safety improvements, community initiatives and promotional events in the borough to encourage more people to reconsider their travel options and walk and cycle more. However, we are aware that more needs to be done before Brent can be said to have a coherent and attractive active travel network in place - one that is accessible to all ages and abilities.	No change.
58	Brent Cycling Campaign	Support the Healthy Routes programme. This must cover all main roads in Brent by 2030 in order to achieve net zero emissions from road transport.	The coverage of the routes will largely be dependent on the extent to which funds exist for changes to infrastructure, to ensure effective change in their character can occur. The Active Travel Implementation Plan will include details of new/improved cycling and walking links and supporting infrastructure required to improve cyclist/pedestrian safety and accessibility	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			and to encourage more journeys by these modes.	
59	Brent Cycling Campaign	Support school streets and healthy neighbourhoods. These must be in place at every Brent school and neighbourhood to meet net zero road transport targets.	See response to representation 58, similar issues with regards Healthy Routes apply the extent of coverage of school streets and healthy neighbourhoods.	No change.
60	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.2 - Policy and guidance should include reference to LTN 1/20, which is the current and supersedes some of the guidance listed.	This is acknowledged and its inclusion in the list is appropriate.	Add to 6.2: " <u>Local Transport Note 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design</u> "
61	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.2.2 - Support statement: "All new developments are to be designed to make sustainable travel, including cycling and walking, the first choice for journeys [...]"	Support welcomed.	No change.
62	Brent Cycling Campaign	Figure 1 is low quality and therefore unreadable.	Agreed, this needs to be amended.	Amend Figure 1 so that it is legible.
63	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.3.3 - Support "Vision Zero" aim	Support welcomed.	No change.
64	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.3.4 - Support the cycle permeability requirement and the "20-minute neighbourhood approach".	Support welcomed.	No change.
65	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.3.5 - Support "Developments should also be well-connected to the cycle network." They must be built to include or at the very least not hinder any possible future cycle network link.	Support welcomed.	No change.
66	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.3.7 - Support "Mobility Hubs" proposal and suggest that these are included in the cycle parking standards to ensure e-cycle provision and non-standard cycle provision.	Support welcomed. 6.7.2 sets out the need for major developments provide cycle parking and charging facilities. Provision in line with standards in these developments will also address on-standard cycle provision.	No change.
67	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.3.8 - Strongly support "safeguard[ing] new sites/spaces and	Support welcomed. Widening the reference as suggested would give greater	Add to 6.3.8 "....It should also safeguard

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		route alignments to provide future capacity.” It needs to be made clear that all possible routes adjacent to major roads are safeguarded for future cycle routes.	acknowledgement/ raise awareness about the need to consider the extent to which sites along main roads can support modal shift/ better quality cycle routes.	new sites/spaces and route alignments to provide future capacity, the West London Orbital, <u>or for possible cycle routes along major roads</u> , for example.
68	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.4.2 - Support “car free development” as a “starting point”. Where car free development is not achieved in PTAL 4 and below locations, developers should fund/ deliver required improvements for active travel.	In such situations, the Council will seek to reduce as far as practicable provision for car parking/ car use. This will divert occupants to either public transport, or active travel. Where it is appropriate and reasonable to require contributions from developers to address any significant impacts on associated infrastructure (existing or needed) the Council will seek a financial contribution or provision in lieu.	No change.
69	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.4.4 - Car-free development is the focus, but then reference on-street parking permits for occupiers other than blue badge holders is made which is contradictory. Parking permits should not be allowed for non disabled residents in car free developments. Acknowledgement is required for inclusive cycle parking for disabled residents as only 28% of disabled Londoners drive; 81% are passengers, and 17% use a cycle as a mobility aid.	This is a fair point, the expectation would be that all but blue badge users would not be able to benefit from residents' parking permits in such locations. The cycle parking of disabled people can be facilitated through following cycle parking standards. In nearly all developments such facilities have provision in accessible locations.	Amend 6.4.4 "In car free developments, <u>no</u> access to on-street parking permits for future development occupiers other than for disabled blue badge holders will be <u>allowed limited</u> .
70	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.4.5 - Support the provision of “blue badge” parking. This must also include provision for adapted cycle parking for residents (within buildings) and visitors (at the kerbside).	This is a fair point. Cycle parking provision needs to be addressed and also adapted cycle parking.	Amend 6.4.5 to add: " <u>Cycle parking provision consistent with amount and quality standards including adapted cycle parking for residents</u>

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

				<u>(within buildings) and visitors (at the kerbside) will be required."</u>
71	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.5 - Electric Vehicle charging provision should not compromise the future provision of cycle infrastructure. e.g. kerbside charging can prevent the creation of protected cycle lanes and other cycle or pedestrian friendly infrastructure. Kerbside charging/ parking on main roads should not be allowed due to this likely adverse impact on active travel.	This is a fair point and should be highlighted.	Amend 6.5.2 to add " <u>Electric Vehicle charging provision should however not unacceptably compromise future provision of active travel infrastructure. e.g. prevent the creation of protected cycle lanes and other cycle or pedestrian friendly infrastructure."</u>
72	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.5.3 - Support e-cycle charging facilities provision in all developments. Recommend using "e-cycle"; not all cycles are "bikes".	Agreed, the term cycle is more inclusive of a wider range of pedal vehicles than bicycle.	Amend 6.5.3 to: Provision of large cycle parking spaces are encouraged to provide charging facilities for e-cycles bikes . Charge points at public buildings, stations, in town centres, at libraries could also support e-cargo cycles <u>bike deliveries</u> or e-cycle bike use."
73	Brent Cycling Campaign	Table 22: Support the use of "Transport Assessment and Travel Plans"	Support welcomed.	No change.
74	Brent Cycling Campaign	Table 26: Support the proposed purpose of the "Healthy Streets Assessment. Strongly recommend increasing the larger	Support welcomed. The appropriate score is a matter for TfL who design the assessment.	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		developments threshold score above 1 which remains insufficient.		
75	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.7.2. - "Remove drop kerbs where no longer required" is unclear. The alternative that drop kerbs for pedestrian and cycle access must be retained and / or added, while drop kerbs for motor vehicle access must be removed is clearer.	Agreed, this needs to be amended.	Para 6.7.2 amend c) : "Remove <u>unnecessary redundant vehicle cross-overs and associated</u> drop kerbs where no longer required "
76	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.7.2 - Support applying the major development rules proportionately to minor developments, Change of Use, and Permitted Development.	Support welcomed.	No change.
77	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.9.2 - Support monitoring requirements including a "summary of the modal split of employees/residents/users".	Support welcomed.	No change.
78	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para 6.9.2 - The "plan for future actions" identified at years 1, 2, and 3, must be monitored at subsequent reports (2, 3, and 5 respectively) with appropriate action taken against developers where plans have not been implemented.	It is agreed that it could be made clearer that for each year identified that a monitoring report is provided, currently it could read as one.	Amend 6.9.2. "...A survey should be undertaken at years 1, 3 and 5 and a Monitoring Report <u>for each</u> submitted to the council for approval."
79	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para - 2.1.3 recognises that road transport is the largest contributor toward poor air quality in Brent, and therefore this should be the Council's principal focus in improving air quality.	The SPD focus is on new development. The air quality action plan which is subject to review currently addresses the priority placed on reducing the contributions as a whole.	No change.
80	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para - 2.1.4 Support aim of providing for walking and cycling infrastructure to reduce transport emissions, although the Council must go further and build and improve this infrastructure directly.	This section sets out the key actions identified in the Air Quality Action Plan; this is factual information which the SPD cannot amend. That document is subject to review and separate consultation this year. The	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			relevant team have been passed the Campaign's representation on this matter.	
81	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para - 2.2.6 Ignores the key step to reducing pollution: reducing the number of motor vehicle journeys.	The paragraph does identify 'sustainable modes of transport', but it is accepted that arguably it could be more explicit on the need to reduce vehicle journeys.	Amend 2.2.6 "This will require <u>a focus on sustainable travel to reduce unnecessary vehicle use,</u> improvements in vehicle technology, sustainable modes of transport , improved building standards and construction management."
82	Brent Cycling Campaign	Table 3: Brent Council must aim to go well beyond the Transport Emissions Benchmark (TEB).	The TEBs are identified by the GLA LPGs which provide a consistent approach across London and reflect the Mayor's priority to improve air quality. It is not considered appropriate for Brent to unilaterally amend these benchmarks.	No change.
83	Brent Cycling Campaign	Para - 2.5.10 seeks to direct active travel away from busy roads. This is unsuitable as all busy roads must have safe pedestrian and cycle routes. The SPD should therefore ensure developers build and improve infrastructure for active travel.	This part of the SPD relates to reducing exposure to potential sources poorer air quality which busy roads currently are. Ideally this would not be the case, but in the short to medium term this is a sensible solution until pollution is reduced to acceptable levels. This should however not deflect from the need as identified to ensure all busy roads move towards having an environment that is safe for pedestrians and include cycle routes. However, this is not the focus of this section. On reflection the bullet point "Maintain suitable separation distances between air pollution sources and receptors, especially for sensitive land uses	Amend 2.5.10: "Encourage pedestrian and cycle routes away from busy roads and reduce severance."

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			and public realm" replicates the intent of bullet point that is subject to the comment from BCC. On this basis, the busy roads bullet point should be removed.	
84	Brent Parks Forum	Para 1.9.3 - Encourage Net Zero needs to be the target as BREEAM alone has loopholes to reach Net Zero.	Major commercial developments would still be expected to achieve net zero as well achieving BREEAM excellent.	No change.
85	Brent Parks Forum	Para 2.1.4 There needs to be a stronger commitment to cease engine idling across all forms of transport and in particular around uses with a higher prevalence of sensitive receptors, as well as better enforcement, commitments to shift to low emission fleets in an expedited timeline. This should be supported with existing funding and new sources such as the Mayor's Air Quality Fund.	This section sets out the key actions identified in the Air Quality Action Plan; this is factual information which the SPD cannot amend. That document is subject to review and separate consultation this year. The relevant team have been passed the Forum's representation on this matter.	No change.
86	Brent Parks Forum	Paras 2.2.4-2.2.6. There is a need to expedite air quality improvements with funding due to the levels of particulates proximate to main roads, with the greatest levels intensifying from Northeast Welsh Harp SSSI Blackbird Hill, to North Circular connections into Neasden, Willesden High Road and Kilburn, through to the south of the borough. In areas of severe non-compliance with air quality objectives increase from Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) declared to Air Quality Focus Areas (AQFAs). On sustainable energy, sustainable travel and open spaces there is a need to be careful with brownfield site designations to ensure they promote the equivalent greenfield outcomes and do not actually result in a	The areas of poor air quality are clearly identified on the Local Plan policies map so do not need naming in the SPD. The value of some brownfield sites in terms of their contribution for example to existing biodiversity is understood. The Plan's policies to seek a net gain in biodiversity and in some cases mimic greenfield outcomes, e.g. surface water run-off rates can improve on the current situation. Designated open space is identified on the policies map with associated protection policies. It is agreed that in terms of emphasis that 2.2.6 should give greater priority to active travel rather than initially identifying improvements to vehicle technology. This point was raised by Brent Cycling Campaign and a suggested change	Amend 2.2.6 " <u>In addition to attenuating sources of air pollution, incorporating measures such as green infrastructure can help mitigate some of those remaining pollutants.</u> "

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		loss of green space. The priority of moving to electric vehicles, is misplaced. These are heavier, producing more of a proven carcinogen of rubber tyre air pollution. The focus should be on active travel and novel (e.g. pedal power) local delivery schemes. Green infrastructure should not be at the expense of addressing reducing the causes of air pollution but in addition to it.	to the SPD as a result has been accepted. On green infrastructure, this is agreed. The paragraph could focus on both attenuations and mitigations.	
87	Brent Parks Forum	Para 2.3.7 - Mitigation should be limited to the very last resort. If relied on to get around not reducing the source, refusal should be robustly applied.	The text is clear that if benchmarks are not initially achieved the priority is to amend the proposal so it does, and that off-site will only be considered when this does not occur.	No change.
88	Brent Parks Forum	Paras 2.4.4 - 2.5.2 - Mitigation should be a last resort. Air Quality Positive (AQP) shouldn't be limited to just Focus and Growth Areas and should be based on the location, type of use, sensitivity of adjacent uses and receptors.	As stated in response to the point on para 2.3.7, mitigation is only considered after source control is exhausted. The Council's approach which goes beyond the London Plan/LPG requirements is set in policy in the Local Plan. The SPD cannot go beyond the parameters set by those documents.	No change.
89	Brent Parks Forum	Para 2.5.4 - Air Quality Neutral should not be limited in its area scope otherwise you will create areas of lower air quality. The SPD should also include areas of lower pollution levels/ higher air quality and aiming for AQP there too.	As a minimum the air quality neutral standard applies to all qualifying developments in the borough. The SPD cannot go beyond the parameters set by the development plan in terms of where AQP will be required.	No change.
90	Brent Parks Forum	Para 2.5.8 - Enforcement of demolition asbestos should include Artex decorative plaster prevalent in many buildings where identified and if suspected it be treated as such. Again with the aim of wherever possible, achieving AQP.	This is essentially a matter for other regulatory controls outside planning, which planning should not duplicate.	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

91	Brent Parks Forum	NPPF, London Plan and Local Plan - Should make reference to AQAPs and this SPD .	Reference is made to the AQAP. The SPD shouldn't make reference to itself.	No change.
92	Brent Parks Forum	2.6.2 - Amend criterion B in the Major Developments Box so that it does not exclude areas which have lower air pollution (i.e. higher air quality). Permitted development should aim for Air Quality Neutral.	Noted. Criterion B states that major developments within Growth Areas must be Air Quality Positive. This is in accordance with Local Plan policy BSUI2. Growth Areas are where the majority of new housing, and therefore new people are projected to live. Given the high density of people living in these areas, it is especially important to ensure that air quality in these areas is improved, and therefore be Air Quality Positive. This is in addition to major developments in Air Quality Focus Areas, which are high density areas which have particularly poor air quality, and therefore further interventions beyond Air Quality Neutral are considered to be required and justified. Outside of these areas, all development is still required to be Air Quality Neutral in accordance with London Plan policy SI2, and therefore new development should not negatively impact air quality. Permitted development is development which does not require planning permission. Under the regulations, the Council can only consider a number or prescribed matters when determining whether or not permitted development meets the requirements of the regulations. The regulations do not include provisions for the council to ensure development is Air Quality Neutral. As an SPD, this document cannot go against regulations, or create new	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			policy and therefore it is not possible to require permitted development to be Air Quality Neutral.	
93	Brent Parks Forum	2.7.2 and 2.7.3 - Where required Air Quality Neutral (and air quality positive where appropriate) should be achieved on-site, including in areas of higher air quality, and reliance on off-site mitigation measures should be limited.	Noted. 2.3.7 for Air Quality Neutral, and 2.4.4 for Air Quality Positive make clear that it is the Council's expectation that the requirements are delivered on-site. Only where it is demonstrated that this is not possible will the Council accept payments in lieu of on-site delivery toward the delivery of off-site provisions.	No change.
94	Brent Parks Forum	Page 32: Planning Conditions: Ensure that these are fit for purpose and that suitable monitoring and enforcement takes place.	The Council will seek to ensure that any planning obligations or conditions are suitably monitored and enforced.	No change.
95	Brent Parks Forum	2.8.1 - Financial implications should not mean that required air quality mitigation measures are not delivered. 2.8 Monitoring box - Should include reference to the management and treatment of artex decorative coatings during demolition, assuming all coatings contain Asbestos in accordance with the Health and Safety Executives best practice, particularly where adjacent to sensitive receptors.	Noted. The Council has to ensure that its planning requirements do not render development unviable, and therefore undeliverable in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Therefore, sufficient flexibility of approach towards ensuring development is viable is required. Having said this, it is not anticipated that measures to ensure development are air quality neutral/positive would be so financially demanding that they would ever be squeezed out for viability reasons, and that therefore most development should be able to achieve these requirements in full without impinging upon their viability. The monitoring of asbestos related materials where they have been identified will be addressed through the construction management plan.	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

96	Brent Parks Forum	Amend 3.1 to ensure that outside of areas of open space deprivation, loss is minimised and where lost re-provided elsewhere on-site. Areas of non open space deprivation are not to be used as S106 drivers.	Noted. Policy BGI1 seeks to ensure that all occupants of new developments have access to open space. In areas identified with a deficiency, it is expected that this is delivered on-site. In areas without a deficiency this is still the case, unless there is appropriate provision within 400m of the proposed development, in which case a financial contribution will be sought toward the improvement of the existing open space. It is not the case that the development of open space is acceptable in areas of non-deficiency, but rather open space is protected in all cases where it provides a functional public amenity space in accordance with London Plan G4. In exceptional cases where open space was being lost as a result of development, it would be expected that the applicant reprove or provide financial contributions toward the delivery/improvement of open space elsewhere in the local area.	No change.
97	Brent Parks Forum	3.2.3 - A 10% increase in tree canopy cover should be the minimum starting point and increased where possible.	Noted. The 10% figure is not for individual developments, but for London, and therefore Brent, as a whole, and is a significant target. There are no specific policies which require the explicit delivery of a 10% increase in canopy cover for developments, and therefore it cannot be required in the SPD as this would go beyond the bounds of what an SPD can do. There are however a number of complementary policies, such as London Plan policy G5, which requires developments to increase Urban Greening,	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			which in order to achieve the requisite score, is likely to require the delivery of new trees. This is in addition to the achievement of the national 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement. It is also typical of good place making that development delivers new street trees.	
98	Brent Parks Forum	3.4.5 - Strongly agree with f-h. However, for e) the area under PV panels should not contribute toward green roof calculations.	Support welcomed. There is a tension between ensuring the delivery of green roofs, and PV solar panels, as both will tend to occupy the same space. Therefore, to ensure they are not mutually exclusive, and the Council does not prejudice against the delivery of one or the other, as set out in the London Plan UGF scoring mechanism the green roof area beneath solar panels is to be included.	No change.
99	Brent Parks Forum	3.5.5, 3.5.6, and criterion e) - Offsetting should be avoided Criterion i) management, monitoring and reporting should be 2, 5 and 10 years	Noted. 2.3.7 for Air Quality Neutral, and 2.4.4 for Air Quality Positive make clear that it is the Councils expectation that the requirements are delivered on-site. Only where it is demonstrated that this is not possible will the Council accept payments in lieu of on-site delivery toward the delivery of off-site provisions.i) The list includes requirements to be included as part of submitted Biodiversity Management Plans. The timeframes for monitoring are likely to vary depending on the applicant's approach toward biodiversity enhancements, and therefore fixed timeframes are unlikely to work for all proposed schemes. The monitoring box under section 3.12, criterion V identifies that monitoring will be required for at least 30 years. Step 10 of table 7 also	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			identifies that the habitat is to be secured, and therefore managed, for a minimum of 30 years. This is in accordance with national biodiversity net gain requirements. Therefore, minimum requirements are set out.	
100	Brent Parks Forum	3.6 - The Council should ensure the required Urban Greening Factor score is achieved in most cases, and that green corridors are not relied upon.	This is the intention although it is accepted it could be clarified in the SPD. It is not clear what the reference to green corridors regards. It is assumed that the representor is concerned that applicants may use existing green infrastructure to inflate the proportion of urban greening being delivered on-site toward the achievement of the Urban Greening Factor. On the rare occasion that green corridors are included within a development site, the applicant would still be expected to ensure a biodiversity net gain of 10%, and therefore even if significant swathes of existing green infrastructure are included, development will still result in increased biodiversity on-site.	Add to the end of paragraph 3.4.6:"... <u>The Council expects that the score is achieved in full where it is considered feasible to do so. Where applicants have not achieved the required score, they will need to demonstrate that all options have been exhausted and further urban greening is not feasible.</u> "
101	Brent Parks Forum	3.6.6 strongly agree with below I, J Agree with K	Support welcomed.	No change.
102	Brent Parks Forum	3.7.1 - Tree retention should not be limited to category A trees only. If lost, category B and C canopy cover should be replaced with trees of a suitable species and maturity. Replacement of those lost should be increased to 5 years.	Agreed. The Council seeks to retain all existing trees where possible. Where this is not possible, the Council takes a hierarchical approach toward tree retention, ensuring that development retains as many existing trees where possible, but especially those of high amenity and biodiversity value (i.e. category A and B trees). Where any canopy cover is lost, it is expected that the same canopy cover is replaced on-site, irrespective of the existing trees category, or	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			a financial contribution toward off-site delivery is provided where wholly on-site delivery is not possible. The current 3-year period for monitoring/ requiring replacement of new planting is considered sufficient to allow an understanding of whether a tree will become established and its replacement where it fails.	
104	Brent Parks Forum	3.7.4 Robustly apply table 8.	All commitments in the SPD will be robustly applied by the Council as appropriate.	No change.
105	Brent Parks Forum	Table 8 - Avoid overreliance on step 5, financial contributions	As stated by step 3 of Table 8, tree retention is always the Council's preference.	No change.
106	Brent Parks Forum	3.7.5 - strongly agree to reprovision of damaged trees, and should be robustly enforced.	Support welcomed. All commitments in the SPD will be robustly applied by the Council as appropriate.	No change.
107	Brent Parks Forum	3.7.6 - Ensure developments are scrutinised against points c) and d) as developers may use these as reasons to exclude tree planting from certain locations.	Applications will be scrutinised to ensure that trees are removed unnecessarily, and replacement canopy cover is delivered on-site. Opportunities for on-site maximisation will be required prior to accepting off-site compensation measures.	No change.
108	Brent Parks Forum	3.7.7 and 3.7.8 - strongly agree.	Support welcomed.	No change.
109	Brent Parks Forum	3.8.1 - use of meanwhile spaces for green infrastructure provision should not contribute toward calculations as they are temporary.	Meanwhile provision will not count towards an application's final UGF score.	No change.
110	Brent Parks Forum	3.8.2 - Minimise use of contemporary urban agriculture as this is invariably reliant on chemical fertilisers and pesticides and has no biodiversity gain, mostly highly detrimental to BNG.	The SPD essentially referenced differing food growing solutions. The reality is in most developments personal food growing opportunities are most likely to be delivered. This is only likely to contribute a small score on the UGF due to the unpredictability of its biodiversity outcomes. It will be for the food	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			growers to decide what propagation methods they use and its intensity.	
111	Brent Parks Forum	3.8.6, and 3.8.7 - Agreed	Support welcome.	No change.
112	Brent Parks Forum	3.9.1 Strongly agreed - agree to all of A-G.	Support welcome.	No change.
113	Brent Parks Forum	3.9.2 Agreed. Management and Maintenance Plan should be at 2,5,10 years.	The monitoring box under section 3.12, criterion V identifies that monitoring will be required for at least 30 years. Step 10 of table 7 also identifies that the habitat is to be secured, and therefore managed, for a minimum of 30 years. This is in accordance with national biodiversity net gain requirements.	No change.
114	Brent Parks Forum	3.9.6 - A robust suitable commuted sum should be secured for ongoing maintenance.	The spaces provided are to be managed and monitored by the development. As long as minimum requirements are met, the long term source of income to do this is not a matter for the Council.	No change.
115	Brent Parks Forum	3.10.2, criterion d) - Avoid offsite compensation by refusing the loss of open space.	Open space is protected in accordance with London Plan policy G4. On very rare occasions the benefits of development may on balance outweigh the proposed loss of open space taking account of the development plan as a whole. In such instances, suitable mitigation will be sought. An error has been identified in 3.10.2 which should be corrected.	Amend 3.10.2 D to: "Avoid loss of open space. In cases where this is <u>unavoidable</u> , off-site compensation site should be provided;"
116	Brent Parks Forum	Strongly agree with criteria J-N on page 58. Minor development box page 58 - avoid off-site replacement of trees, and deliver on-site. Also avoid over-reliance on green roofs, and preference should be given to enhanced planting and	Support welcome. The mix of water attenuation solutions will be reliant on the site. Green roofs as set out in the UGF are considered an acceptable solution with an associated score based on their robustness/provision of biodiversity applied.	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		alternative methods of surface water attenuation.		
117	Brent Parks Forum	Page 59, criterion r), bullet 2 - avoid over reliance on off-site delivery.	The Council's expectation is that all forms of green infrastructure are delivered on-site. Only where applicants have demonstrated that this is not feasible will the provision of financial contributions towards off-site delivery be considered acceptable.	No change.
118	Brent Parks Forum	3.11 Planning Obligations - Agreed.	Support welcomed.	No change.
119	Brent Parks Forum	3.12 - Agreed. Include biodiversity enhancing trees, hedging and shrubs.	Support welcomed. All expected biodiversity proposals will be monitored to ensure delivery.	No change.
120	Brent Parks Forum	Page 62 - Thames Water Environment Agency has changed status of river Brent and section of Wealdstone Brook from Wembley to Welsh Harp to 'Poor'. NW London Alliance has taken action to improve this.	The problems of misconnections which may be causing much of the poor water quality by allowing sewage/foul water to enter the surface water network is addressed in para 4.3.8 can be amended to identify examples such as the Wealdstone Brook when this is an issue.	Amend 4.3.8 to add a final sentence: " <u>Poor river water quality is for example being experienced in the Wealdstone Brook due to likely misconnections and potential abuse of surface water drainage network by individuals for disposal of liquid contaminants.</u> "
121	Brent Parks Forum	Para 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 - Kilburn estate flooded in July 2021, and should therefore be included.	Noted. The paragraphs do not include reference to specific parts of the borough. All areas identified as being at risk of flooding are to be treated accordingly. The area is at a high risk for pluvial issues. A potential scheme is proposed in Kilburn with a feasibility report and options study to commence in 2024	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

122	Brent Parks Forum	Para 4.2.3 - Work with applicants to ensure flood risk management is robust to protect areas from flooding. Funding could be used by nationally recognised Friends Of groups to improve brooks.	The Council does work to ensure flood risks are not unacceptably increased and where possible existing risk is reduced. The Friends are welcome to engage with relevant parts of the Council when they see and opportunity to apply for funding that the Council might have a reasonable chance of being successful in attaining. Different parts of the Council have been seeking to deliver improvements to blue infrastructure, e.g. landscape team with Brent Catchment Partnership/ Thames 21 which has previously delivered on improvements/ naturalisation within Monks Park.	No change.
123	Brent Parks Forum	Page 66 - Council should take a top down approach, including CEO, with engineers to scrutinise flood risk management, who should be empowered to act.	The LLFA has input into applications which have associated conditions to build mitigation and attenuation measures as agreed and ensure their on-going maintenance/ fitness for purpose.	No change.
124	Brent Parks Forum	Para 4.3.7 - This needs better enforcement through Brent Engineer/s and additional support to ensure providing sufficient infrastructure to address acceptable surface water and sewerage solutions to reduce pollution risks.	The SPD deals with development. Where insufficient infrastructure exists, sufficient safeguards exist to prevent occupation of development until adequate infrastructure is in place.	No change.
125	Brent Parks Forum	Section 4.4 - A review of sites not yet built against these criteria needs to be considered, e.g. Lidding Rd. HA3 and similar.	Recent extant applications have been subject to input from the statutory undertakers, the Environment Agency and Brent's LLFA and include measures that will keep them safe and not unacceptably increase flood risk elsewhere.	No change.
126	Brent Parks Forum	Para 4.4.2 criteria N-O - Development has occurred close to the Wealdstone Brook which would now not have been approved when considering this SPD. More	Policy and guidance around flood risk has improved significantly over the last 20 years now the threat of climate change and the consequences of inappropriate development	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		engineers are required/ resources available to them.	within the floodplain have been better acknowledged.	
127	Brent Parks Forum	Para 4.5.7-4.5.8 - Strongly agree.	Support welcomed.	No change.
128	Brent Parks Forum	Section 4.7 Robustly apply approach to smaller developments and permitted development. Care should be taken that existing sites prone to flooding under 8 m from a waterway should not increase dwellings. This has occurred at Wealdstone Brook and will have a high risk of erosion, flood and sewer contamination.	It is unlikely that new buildings will encroach closer to the existing ones within 8 metres of a watercourse due to the Environment Agency's byelaw. Where an existing building/ structure exists within the 8 metres then its replacement with another building/ structure might be permitted on the basis of absence of additional harm being shown. NPPF sets out the process for additional homes proposed in Zone 3, this will be followed by the Council to ensure no unacceptable risk to prospective and existing residents.	No change.
129	Brent Parks Forum	Para 4.8-4.9 - Strongly agree the development management obligations and monitoring measures should be applied in a robust manner - will require resourcing through engineers' posts.	Support welcomed, monitoring of conditions and input into the planning process is given by the LLFA officers.	No change.
130	Brent Parks Forum	Para 4.1 - Disagree with the statement 'Water quality is "moderate". Very serious pollution of all the waterways in Brent occurs. Wealdstone Brook has declined into an abused, polluted waterway with high levels of ammonia and low levels of dissolved oxygen. It has peaked at times - for all intents and purposes to be classified as a "dying river". It takes time, protection, working with local groups, Rivers Alliances, EA, Thames Water, funding bids to support and enable sustained improvements. The Council	The statement in the SPD reflects the position set out in the Thames Catchment Management Plan published for the area. However, it is recognised that regular monitoring occurs, and it is true that whilst the ecological status is moderate, chemical content is poor. This can be amended. As LLFA Brent does have a role in planning for and reducing incidences of surface water flooding caused by high levels of run-off, which can impact on sewage systems. Privatisation of the water utilities changed the historic role and responsibilities of	Amend para 4.1 " ...Water quality. In Brent rivers and lakes operational catchment all monitored waterbodies have is a "moderate" <u>ecological status in all water bodies but score a "fail" for their chemical content.</u>

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		<p>should be putting pressure on Thames Water and the Environment Agency to end the pollution of all waterways in Brent and to bring back life to them. The Thames Water foul sewer discharge map (EDM Map Storm discharge data River health Thames Water) regularly shows even with light rainfall foul discharges at the Lindsay Drive roundabout in Kenton and this pollution goes directly into the Wealdstone Brook. Several areas along the Wealdstone Brook are shown as potential flood zones 3a and 3b on the Environment Agency flood maps yet approval for housing occurs. In 1977 Wealdstone Brook overflowed and flooded Kenton. Substantial capacity improvements reduced but did not eliminate flooding possibilities. The main problem is surface water runoff capacity during storm events. Brent has a golden opportunity to not only improve the quality of the waterways in the Borough but to utilise these for ecological, educational and leisure purposes. There should be no planning approvals within 10 metres of the Wealdstone Brook. All rear garden developments within this exclusion zone should be banned. Thames Water is responsible for pollution control. Maintenance of the banks of the waterways is the responsibility of Brent Council. Where is there a report on when and how often this has been done?</p>	<p>councils. The LLFA role is a relatively new responsibility given in response to a recognition that the previous arrangements were inadequate in identifying who was responsible. Given limited resource however, emphasis will be more targeted on preventing harm to people and property. Whilst the NPPF seeks to ensure a sequential approach to flood risk, it does not ban development in flood zone 3, identifying it can be acceptable. The pressure for homes, along with poor quality brownfield sites in the floodplain that cannot be left to decline/ become derelict means that the Council has to consider appropriate development in Zone 3 that does not unacceptably increase flood risk to occupants or elsewhere. Surface water runoff is recognised as a problem. A substantial part of this has been caused by residents paving over garden areas for car parking or to reduce maintenance, with water actively or passively being diverted to watercourses. New development seeks to address this issue and, in some cases, e.g. Wembley Park will lead to substantial benefits compared to historical run-off rates caused by older developments. Policies in the Plan seek to work cooperatively to increase ecological and water management benefits as well as leisure opportunities in Brent's blue network. The Council is not in a position to ban development within 10 metres of the Wealdstone Brook. Maintenance of the banks of the</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			Wealdstone Brook is not actually the responsibility of Brent Council, although it does have powers to intervene where such maintenance is not occurring and presents a risk. Where it is not identified as main river it is the responsibility of riparian owners, i.e. those who own the land over which the river flows. In main river locations repair should be the responsibility of landowners however due to their importance the Environment Agency can take the lead which is why the 8m setback byelaw is in place. The Council can and does act to overcome issues related to maintenance, or blockages within the upper catchment channels that increase flood risk.	
131	NW London Rivers Alliance	Para 4.3.9 - Thames Water admits Brent's surface and foul water system is based mainly on Victorian construction. Full separation the answer to removing sewage outfall would be at considerable cost.	Agreed, the southern part of the borough in particular is Victorian age. Full separation of the existing system is probably unlikely, but Brent's policies hopefully will reduce the impacts of new development on existing problems.	No change.
132	NW London Rivers Alliance	Para 4.4.1 – Present foul and surface water pipes infrastructure of simply incapable of dealing with storm conditions and they are neither resistant nor resilient to all sources of flooding.	New development can only address its impacts and the policies in the Plan through control of surface water, limiting potable water use and where necessary requiring upgrades to water infrastructure give the ability to address those development specific outcomes.	No change.
133	NW London Rivers Alliance	Para 4.4.2 - None of this is possible without adequate staffing and regular checking through building development.	It is agreed that whilst planning can address the specifications of development, in relation to the quality of the build/ consistency with the measures required/ identified that the process is heavily reliant on the quality of	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			the implementation in following those specifications.	
134	NW London Rivers Alliance	Para 4.4.3. - Although SuDS is an NPPF requirement there are no checks that this is actually being delivered with it left to the developers to show that they have adhered to the policy. This needs to change with external monitoring. All parties agree EA, Thames Water, Rivers Trust, London Waterkeeper, et al. In addition, whilst 'Impermeable surfacing will be resisted on front gardens and driveways...' it needs to be banned.	The LLFA visits sites to look at the drainage solutions delivered. The Council cannot ban impermeable surfacing but can ensure that adequate compliance with policies associated with green infrastructure coverage and attenuation/ mitigation of potential increased flood risk associated with surface water run-off occurs.	No change.
135	NW London Rivers Alliance	Para 4.4.4 - Includes the concept of 'attenuation'. Uxendon Manor Primary School was meant to have this. It now has extensive Astroturf with no 'attenuation'. There needs to be much more joined up thinking and indeed planning in close working with Building Control. Attenuation needs to be proven for Uxendon, documentation not yet provided to us.	Consent for the new Uxendon Manor School shows a series of attenuation tanks under hard surfacing around the buildings to reduce to greenfield run-off rates the surface water run-off. The sewage outfall was subject to agreement with Thames Water. There is no application for AstroTurf/ variation of condition for the landscaping in respect of the playing pitches laid out. If such a change has occurred it should be brought to the attention of planning enforcement and either an application, or S73 variation sought to regularise the situation. This will require details of how surface water run-off generated will be attenuated.	No change.
136	NW London Rivers Alliance	Para 4.4.5 - Most rainwater discharge goes directly into the local watercourse. The 6 stage process is another example of a misguided approach to surface water runoff and flooding in the local areas of Brent.	The six stages are the suggested hierarchy that is applied to surface water within a development site. Applicants are encouraged to use this approach which is reviewed by the Council's LLFA officer who ensures that a suitable surface water	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			drainage strategy is applied to each development.	
137	NW London Rivers Alliance	Para 4.4.6 - There is simply not the capacity within the drainage network to calculate discharge arrangements – Thames Water engineers have conceded that in heavy rainfall conditions around the Kenton area their drainage system is attempting to work at over 130% capacity – in other words every manhole in the area will be discharging. And all that discharge goes into the river network – eventually.	The borough's approach is to where possible achieve greenfield run-off rates. In many cases, as the majority of development in the borough is brownfield, this in all but the most extreme events will lead to significant improvements in reducing run-off rates. This will reduce surface water flow to watercourses reducing localised flooding and in the combined sewer network will result in likely less incidences of overflow of sewage into watercourses. The Thames water network has not been designed for the most extreme events and typically adoption standards for pipes are limited to 1:20 year events. In cases where this is exceeded surface water may well be discharged into the highway or across other land and subsequently into watercourses/ rivers via uncontrolled means.	No change.
138	NW London Rivers Alliance	Para 4.5.3. - Naturalisation has not been applied up to now.	The opportunities for naturalisation to a large extent depend on the characteristics of the channel and the space around it that can be devoted to more natural processes. The Wealdstone Brook in particular is heavily canalised along its most significant lengths that are adjacent to the largest developments. Riparian ownership typically extends to the middle of the channel. Technical assessments have indicated that removal of half of the concrete channel will present significant structural weaknesses for the remainder. This limits the potential for significant interventions in a lot of stretches.	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			There will however be some improvements. e.g. Monks Park channel in association with the St Raphs estate will be delivered. In addition, the Argenta House development introduces significant improvements to the channel.	
139	NW London Rivers Alliance	Para 4.5.6. - the minimum set back from main rivers should be 10 metres and should cover ALL (not 'certain' – a catchword for anything) developments. A permit 'may be' required – should be changed to 'will be'.	The set back is set by the Environment Agency (EA), not the Council. Development is a broad term and does not necessarily only mean buildings. The set back is only likely to be sought for buildings/ structures that may impede access or have implications for flood flows/ storage. The permit is discretionary on the part of the EA and only sought where they require it.	No change.
140	NW London Rivers Alliance	Para 4.5.8 - Replace 'should' with 'will'.	The wording 'should' is considered appropriate as it is aimed at providing advice to developers to incorporating urban greening and supporting biodiversity in schemes in a co-ordinated manner, ideally going beyond minimum policy requirements.	No change.
141	NW London Rivers Alliance	Para 4.6.1 - Is 'regard' suitable word?	This word is considered appropriate. As national policy is not part of the development plan, it has a different status to this with regards to the determination of applications. Applications will be assessed against the wide range of policies and other material considerations that apply.	No change.
142	NW London Rivers Alliance	Para 4.6.2 - Financial resource impacts on applications. Brent could ban any development within at least Flood Zones 3a and 3b and better still within Flood Zone 2 which would remove the need for Mitigation Impacts Assessments. Brent needs to weigh up its decision making,	Brent has to be consistent with the NPPF which does not ban development in these zones but sets out higher tests depending on the zone and the vulnerability/ compatibility of the use/ zone. Brent already takes a more cautious approach by identifying surface water zones as having	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		not only to protect the green and blue networks but future savings from decisions now which prevent future property flooding.	the same policy context as fluvial zones, which isn't entirely clear in the NPPF which seems to imply the zones are fluvial. The pressure for development and extent of coverage of those zones means it would be unrealistic to exclude development within them. However, a strong emphasis on requiring appropriate measures in place to ensure that development does not unacceptably increase the flood risk on site or elsewhere is necessary where development does occur in those areas with the higher flood risk.	
143	NW London Rivers Alliance	Para 4.6.3 a) - The approved Brent Housing Management Planning Application for Lidding Road Kenton did not include any of these measures. The policies look good in theory but are ignored in practice. Kilburn Estate (flooded once already) - SuDs in various forms and other mitigation works would help to protect the new housing, seeing where the lost river can be de-culverted is another possibility. None of the mitigation measures have been applied nor checked on in the past 10 years.	The scheme provides better access to this part of the Wealdstone Brook, the improved landscaping has enhanced its setting and the set-back of buildings/ structures is appropriate. Within the Kilburn Estate significant improvements have occurred with regards surface water drainage compared to what existed previously and this will also occur in the next phases. All schemes are considered by the LLFA for their compliance in not creating unacceptable flood risk and ideally reducing it.	No change.
144	Brent Parks Forum	Pg 85 5.1 Energy: Agree with comments made by another resident on this section.	No other comments were received to the consultation on this section.	No change.
145	Brent Parks Forum	Section 6.1 - aware of and overall agree with the points made by London Cycling Campaign's submitted response.	Noted.	No change.
146	Brent Parks Forum	Pg 119 Brent were part of the CRP 'boroughs that CRP works with' - why did this cease and what is Brent's intention going forward?	The Council has worked with CRP for example in piloting cargo cycles promoted as part of a wider CRP programme of encouraging their use by small businesses.	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			It will work with CRP when the opportunity arises but in terms of main partners its focus is with the West London Alliance.	
147	Brent Parks Forum	Para 6.2.1 - states government's target for all new cars and vans to be zero emission is 2040 – this should be 2035 unless there has been a change of policy.	Agreed. This is a mistake and should be 2035.	Amend 6.2.1 to "The government has a target for all new cars and vans to be effectively zero emission by <u>2040</u> 35 ."
148	Brent Parks Forum	Pg 136. Environmental campaigners have identified that 2050 is too late to move to a complete circular economy. 2030 should be key to remove and replace all single-use plastic in all supermarkets and non-recyclable films and packaging by 2028-30 at the latest. Recommend making use of alternative products within Brent as soon as possible with pilots and phasing in.	The national targets arguably are not that ambitious. There needs to be a strong lead by Government to create a national consistency that encourages producers and company users to move to alternative recyclable products. Whilst individual actions do have a significant impact, the lack of labelling or ability to recycle products is a significant issue currently. The use of pilots is something that as a waste collection authority the Council or West London Waste Authority may wish to pursue.	No change.
149	Brent Parks Forum	Pg 138 - Stage 5 - Disposal to Landfill should be minimised by targeted dates.	There are no set figures for Brent. Nevertheless, there is significant incentive to reduce this route for disposal to the minimum amounts as quickly as possible due to the cost of this method of disposal and the increasingly limited capacity available.	No change.
150	Brent Parks Forum	Para 7.1.10 Strongly agree and support its robust application.	Support welcomed, although it must be recognised that this is encouraged, not required.	No change.
151	Brent Parks Forum	Para 7.3.9 Table 28 - Strongly agree with keypad access for refuse storage areas. Such consideration also needs to be	Support welcomed. The Council encourages consideration of Secured by Design analysis of developments, although not an always a	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		applied to non-adopted access roads within developments to possibly include gating to ensure safety is maintained, with emergency service access at all times. In addition access roads should be properly lit, with CCTV cameras - ideally connected to Brent's system to prevent crime/ anti-social behaviour. Designing Out Crime should occur and limited access should not automatically be regarded as gentrification. New builds have to be both safe and sustainable.	rigid adherence to its principles/ detailed comments received from the relevant advisor due to their occasional inconsistency with place making ideals/ good urban design. Ideally designing out crime and the desire to create well-designed places are not mutually exclusive, but it is recognised that in some instances measures such as passive surveillance are not always deterrents to some criminal or anti-social activities. In such instances the Council will take a pragmatic and justified approach to any final solutions decided.	
152	Brent Parks Forum	Para 7.4.2 - Net Zero should focus on forms of biomass energy production only.	The paragraph sets out the Mayor's approach to reducing bio-degradable material sent to landfill by 2026. This includes diverting much current household and commercial organic waste not specifically intended for energy generation, but which cannot be dealt with in other ways to energy production through a range of measures. This is factual.	No change.
153	Brent Parks Forum	Para 7.4.4 d) and e) - Strongly agree: hence supportive of the Cross River Partnership and associated borough working. Brent is not noted as part of 'CRP' at present. Please advise.	The Council is not part of the CRP but is part of the West London Alliance of London Boroughs. It takes a co-ordinated approach to many issues with this group and the majority of these boroughs (along with some others) co-ordinate their waste policies through the West London Waste Plan. It has worked with CRP on a pilot for cycle cargo bikes in Willesden.	No change.
154	Brent Parks Forum	Para 7.6 C - You are advised to use Net Zero as BREEAM has loopholes and can lead to missing Net Zero target.	This section relates to waste management and are suggested accreditations, they will not overcome the need to address the GLA's approach to carbon neutrality.	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

155	Brent Parks Forum	Para 8.1.3 - Brent should be 'Risk Averse' towards all forms of asbestos and follow HSE Guidance.	Agreed. The issue of hazardous material is currently addressed in the contaminated land part of the SPD. Nevertheless, there are hazardous materials that may be prevalent above ground and asbestos with its principal risk being through dust should realistically be addressed as at least an issue.	8.4.1 amend: "It can have substantial temporary <u>and in some cases longer lasting</u> impacts; the most common impacts are increased particulate matter (PM) concentrations and dust soiling. <u>There may however, with hazardous substances, such as asbestos and an increasing range of older building materials, be serious health risks from very limited forms of exposure. These can also be subject to separate hazardous substances controls and require careful handling and disposal.</u> "
156	Brent Parks Forum	Para 8.4.4 - Robust application should be applied and any review or changes to 2014 SPG should be swiftly met.	The SPD refers to many documents and over time many are likely to be replaced with more up to date advice. The SPD should make reference to using the most up to date document in these cases.	See proposed change in response to Rep 39.
157	Brent Parks Forum	Para 8.6.3 - Agree with b-e and strongly agree with f,g, and k. For f) consider all wildlife corridors, for i) suggest consulting the local Parks Group/s and Brent Parks Forum as occurs in other boroughs.	Support welcomed. The issue of light spill beyond the boundary of the property is addressed in a), whilst the emphasis on valuable corridors in f) does appear to exclude other potentially ecologically significant features. As such, an amendment	8.6.3 f) amend: Avoiding light spill near valuable <u>adverse lighting impacts on ecological corridors assets</u>

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

			is considered appropriate to remove this limitation.	
158	Brent Parks Forum	Para 8.7.5 criteria A & B. Brent should seek to avoid the same errors that occurred recently in Harrow which resulted in pollution incidents, albeit mud runoff, with its associated water quality and biodiversity impacts.	It is recognised that in close proximity to waterways in particular that the risk of pollution through pathways being created for polluted surface water run-off during the construction phase is heightened. This is usually addressed through an appropriate construction management plan or contaminated land plan addressing the points in 8.8.8 j) and l).	No change
159	Brent Parks Forum	Para 8.11.1 - Proposals with a requirement to be 8m distance from the waterway (should be 10m) will need monitoring. Finance should be sought at the Building Control stage or through central / local planning means.	The 8m distance is set by the Environment Agency related to their permitting regime. Appropriate monitoring will occur in relation to addressing usually conditioned approved management plans around the relevant environmental protection matters to the development. These reports will be passed on to the relevant experts within the Council. The costs to the Council will where it is appropriate usually be addressed through a S106 obligation monitoring fee paid. This matter is addressed in the Planning Obligations SPD.	No change
160	Atlip Road Limited	Paragraph 5.1.7 – District Heat Network There is a requirement to contribute toward the establishment of a District Heating Network. The SPD should confirm what contribution is expected. If, in accordance with London Plan policy SI3, this relates to the provision of a physical connection and/or development design to facilitate a new/existing network, then this would be supported where feasible. If however this was for a S106	The emphasis is as the representation has set out, if a district heating network does not exist, then the potential has to be initiated and this is through a development providing/ facilitating the opportunity for a new network that other developments may be able to connect to.	No change.

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		financial contribution as suggested by paragraph 5.8.3, then this would be opposed, and would not comply with the CIL regulations (2010) 122 test.		
161	Atlip Road Limited	Clarification is also required regarding the definition of renewable energy technology. This should be set out in Table 14.	Paragraphs 5.2.14 sets that table 14 sets out the types of energy technologies identified in the preceding two paragraphs that count towards renewable energies and technologies and that where these rely on the external energy grid that this energy used should be offset by on-site renewables as much as possible.	No change.
162	Atlip Road Limited	Paragraph 5.8.4 - Energy Strategy: Supporting DocumentsThe SPD states that prior to the occupation of major developments a 'heat scan of thermal bridges' and a 'Home Quality Mark or Passivhaus certification must be provided. It is assumed that these will be secured via condition.NPPF paragraph 154 part b), in terms of sustainable development requirements, states that local requirements should reflect government policy for national technical standards. The proposed requirements are considered overly onerous and beyond the scope of the national technical standards, as well as requirements as set out in the Local and London Plans. The ability of local authorities to apply new standards which exceed those laid out in the Code for Sustainable Homes were removed by the government in March 2015 in accordance with the "Housing: optional technical standards" publication.	Yes, these will be supported by condition. The HQM and Passivhaus standards are not compulsory but suggested as forms of certification that will give occupiers of homes the assurance that minimum quality benchmarks have been met, as set out in 1.5.2 and 1.5.4. This can be clarified where relevant in the SPD such as in 5.8.4.	Amend 5.3.2 "Step 4: Post-Construction final review: Submit a BREEAM Certification, HQM and/ or Passivhaus certificate (<u>where it is proposed residential developments will meet these standards</u>)." Amend 5.8.4 to: "A HQM and or Passivhaus certification <u>where being pursued by the developer.....</u> • Alternative assessments (Passivhaus and/or HQM) <u>where being pursued by the developer</u> "

Schedule of comments received and Brent Council responses to them. (underline = additions, ~~strikethrough~~ = removals of SPD text)

		<p>This states that technical requirements which go beyond building regulation minimum standards for access, water, and space standards are required to be justified by evidence and set out in Local Plan policy. The standards discussed here are in relation to energy and sustainability, not access, water or space, are not justified, and are not being set out in policy but an SPD. The requirements to undertake a 'heat scan of thermal bridges' and a 'Home Quality Mark or Passivhaus certification' should therefore be removed.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--