

# Consultation Report

## London Borough of Barnet

Hendon Hub  
The Burroughs  
Hendon

5 July 2021

### Prepared by

#### GL Hearn

GL Hearn Limited  
4th Floor  
65 Gresham Street  
London EC2V 7NQ

T: +44(0)20 7851 4900  
glhearn.com

Public

## Contents

Section	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	4
2 METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH	7
3 FEEDBACK RECEIVED	18
4 TEAM RESPONSES	60
5 CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS	72

## Appendices

APPENDIX A: FEBRUARY CONSULTATION LEAFLETS	75
APPENDIX B: SCOPE AREAS USED FOR LEAFLET MAILOUTS	75
APPENDIX C: MARCH CONSULTATION LEAFLETS	75
APPENDIX D: MAY CONSULTATION LEAFLETS	75
APPENDIX E: INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS	75
APPENDIX F: COUNCIL SOCIAL MEDIA POSTS	75
APPENDIX G: HENDON HUB WEBSITE	75
APPENDIX H: CONSULTATION BOARDS	75
APPENDIX I: MAY DROP-IN INVITATION	75
APPENDIX J: CO-DESIGN STREET SESSION LEAFLET	75
APPENDIX K: PROMOTION VIA FIRST TEAM	75
APPENDIX L: HENDON LIBRARY SURVEY	75
APPENDIX M: HENDON LIBRARY SURVEY ANALYSIS	75
APPENDIX N: CONSULTATION FEEDBACK FORM	75

**Quality Standards Control**

The signatories below verify that this document has been prepared in accordance with our quality control requirements. These procedures do not affect the content and views expressed by the originator.

This document must only be treated as a draft unless it has been signed by the originators and approved by a Business or Associate Director.

DATE	ORIGINATORS	APPROVED
5 July 2021	Asha Saroy Associate Director	Matthew Evans Director

---

**Limitations**

This document has been prepared for the stated objective and should not be used for any other purpose without the prior written authority of GL Hearn; we accept no responsibility or liability for the consequences of this document being used for a purpose other than for which it was commissioned.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The London Borough of Barnet (LBB) appointed GL Hearn's Strategic Communications team, as part of a wider project team, to undertake a programme of public consultation in support of, and to inform, its proposals to redevelop several sites in Hendon. This project is known as the 'Hendon Hub'.
- 1.2 The Hendon Hub proposals comprise a mixed-use development opportunity in Hendon's The Burroughs, providing services to the community and Middlesex University. There are three core sites to the scheme: Ravensfield, Fenella and Car Park (RFC); Building 9 (including the Town Hall, Town Hall Annex, and Hendon Library), and the Meritage Centre (MC) site. Other satellite sites are to be incorporated to house relocations and landscaping improvements.
- 1.3 The RFC Site currently comprises of well-used academic buildings with ancillary retail and a car park. This is intended to be redeveloped into 388 student accommodation units (50% affordable tenure, 50% market rates), a performing arts building, new Library, 28 affordable key worker accommodation dwellings, and ancillary retail and commercial facilities.
- 1.4 The Building 9 Site includes partial demolition and re-development of the existing Building 9 and 9a, converting to provide additional academic space for the University.
- 1.5 The Meritage Centre site incorporates the re-development of 214 student accommodation units, as well as 33 new Independent Living units for young adults and respite care, and a health and wellbeing centre, currently being discussed with the appropriate council services.
- 1.6 There will be no loss in community facilities, with the following services to be relocated as part of the proposed development:
- Hendon Library to the RFC Site
  - Meridian from the MC Site to the RFC Site
  - African Cultural Association from the MC Site to the RFC Site
  - Citizen's Advice Bureau to RFC Site
- 1.7 Off-site developments will include the re-provision of the School Library Resources Service (SLRS) (moved from the existing Building 9 site) relocated to the former Quinta Club near Chipping Barnet,

Mencap to 154 Station Road, and the relocation of the PDSA to Fuller Street Car Park. These proposals were consulted on and the feedback detailed in this report.

- 1.8 Consultation and stakeholder engagement were undertaken by LBB Hendon Hub project team and GL Hearn between February and June 2021. Members of the project team included representatives from Barnet Council, Middlesex University, and various consultants, including planning consultants, architects, project management, heritage, transport, and finance consultants.
- 1.9 The COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown restrictions put in place by the Government has meant that the consultation undertaken on this project has been “virtual first”, with information about the project contained on a dedicated GL Hearn Hendon Hub consultation [website \(www.hendonhub.co.uk\)](http://www.hendonhub.co.uk). The consultation and a link to the website was also promoted on LBB’s [Engage Barnet](https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/hendon-hub-consultation) consultation portal (<https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/hendon-hub-consultation>). Several virtual presentations and meetings have been provided over Zoom and Microsoft Teams to interested residents and stakeholders. Printed copies and other alternative formats of the consultation materials were also made available on request, and with the easing of restrictions in May 2021, the team was able to hold some in-person events as well.
- 1.10 Consultation on the Hendon Hub proposals started on 26 February 2021 when the project website ([www.hendonhub.co.uk](http://www.hendonhub.co.uk)) went live, and several virtual presentations were held during March. The team had to pause their active promotion of the consultation and engagement during the pre-election period for the 2021 local elections in London (for the Greater London Authority and some LBB by-elections), which had been delayed from 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Interested parties were still able to view the proposals online and provide feedback during this time. Once the elections had taken place, the team was then able to hold further virtual and in-person events.
- 1.11 The project team has engaged with local councillors, community groups and members of the wider public prior to the submission of the planning application. It has also undertaken extensive pre-application discussions with planning officers at LBB and other statutory planning consultees.
- 1.12 The consultation that has been undertaken is in line with LBB’s own adopted policy documents, specifically the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (Oct 2018) which sets out the council’s expectations around how developers will consult communities on draft development proposals prior to submission. For this project LBB will be applicant and developer and so is seeking to comply with its expectations of other developers. Section 4.1.2 states *“The aim of pre-application consultation is to encourage discussion before a formal application is made, enabling communities to have an*

*influence on a planning proposal before it is finalised. The process can help to identify improvements and overcome objections at a later stage. Such pre-application consultations can take the form of exhibitions, presentations, workshops or simply a letter or mail shot.”*

- 1.13 Section 4.1.3 goes on to say, *“In order for stakeholders to have evidence of how they have helped shape the proposal and any subsequent planning application that follows pre-application consultation must set out the outputs of such engagement in a Statement of Pre-application Consultation.”*
- 1.14 This report summarises the programme of public consultation undertaken by the project team between February and June 2021, and the feedback received as a part of this. The feedback has been summarised in chapter three, and responses to these are set out in the ‘Team Response’ table in chapter four.
- 1.15 A modified version of this report (badged as a ‘Statement of Pre-application Consultation’ in line with the Council’s adopted SCI) would be submitted as part of any planning application(s) submitted for the various development sites within the project, although this would not happen unless the Full Business Case were to be approved by the Policy and Resources Committee at LBB. Other accompanying documents (for example the Design and Access Statement and Planning Statement) would provide further information about the consultation undertaken and how feedback has been incorporated into the final proposals.
- 1.16 If a planning applications were to be submitted, interested local residents and stakeholders will have a further opportunity to provide comments and feedback through the Council’s public access system as part of the statutory consultation that is undertaken on all applications.
- 1.17 It should be noted that prior to the work set out in this report, a separate consultation on The Burroughs and Middlesex University Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was undertaken by the LBB planning policy team in January and February 2021. This was undertaken in Barnet Council’s role as the Local Planning Authority and is different from the consultation undertaken on Hendon Hub, which was undertaken by the team acting as a developer for a planning project. The SPD aimed to support the ambitions of enhancing the educational and civic offer The Burroughs provides to its existing communities in Hendon and as home to Middlesex University.

## 2 METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

2.1 This section outlines the approach GL Hearn, on behalf Barnet Council, has taken towards public consultation and engagement, which is based on established best practice and informed by the scale and mix of the proposed development.

2.2 The aim was to conduct an appropriate and robust programme of consultation, which provided the opportunity for interested individuals and groups to get involved in the development process. This included opportunities for the public to view and ask questions about the proposals and provide feedback for the development team to consider before submitting the planning application.

2.3 A comprehensive communications plan was applied to ensure the consultation reached different communities. The team has sought to ensure the collateral produced is easily understandable and not rely solely on one channel of communication.

2.4 The following principles were followed throughout:

- outline the approach to consultation and how people can get involved
- identify and consult those parties who will potentially be affected by or interested in the proposals
- provide the opportunity for feedback on the proposals to be submitted and reviewed by members of the project team
- clearly outline timescales for the application and what happens next after the programme of consultation
- Report back on the feedback that has been received and the project team's responses to that feedback. We put this feedback before the committee to help inform the decision-making.

### ***Consultation timescales***

2.5 The consultation started on Friday 26 February 2021 and concluded on Monday 7 June 2021, lasting over 14 weeks. The deadlines for feedback were extended several times during the overall consultation, as follows:

- the original deadline for feedback was Friday 21 March but this was extended to Friday 21 May to provide more time for people to provide feedback on the proposals

- the deadline was then extended from Friday 21 May to Friday 4 June to allow for in-person events to be held during May, following the easing of lockdown restrictions on Monday 17 May. These events had not previously been proposed due to uncertainty over lockdown but became a possibility during consultation; and
- over the May bank holiday weekend (Saturday 29 May – Monday 31 May), the website feedback form experienced a technical issue which meant some people were unable to complete and submit feedback forms (although they were still able to use the contact form on the project website and contact the team via telephone and email). This was rectified on Tuesday 1 June and the deadline for feedback was extended to Monday 7 June to allow for the days when the feedback form could not be submitted online.

### ***Promotion of the consultation***

2.6 It was important to promote the consultation, the online consultation website and submission form and virtual presentations to ensure that the community and stakeholders were aware of the draft proposals and how they could provide their views and thoughts on the proposals. The following pages give further details on how the consultation was promoted.

#### *Leaflets*

2.7 To promote the consultation and let people know how they could take part, a set of leaflets was produced by the project team. These leaflets provided an initial overview of the project, contact details for the project team, and the dates and times of upcoming virtual consultation events.

2.8 At the end of February 2021, a first round of leaflets was delivered to people living around the three areas where sites were located. All three areas were leafleted on Friday 27 February 2021. The leaflet distributor sent confirmation reports once delivery of the leaflets had been completed.

- For the main Hendon Hub sites along The Burroughs in Hendon, a leaflet was delivered to 13,005 addresses (including residential and business addresses) in the Hendon and West Hendon wards at LBB.
- For the Osidge Lane site, a leaflet was delivered to 1,853 addresses (including residential and business addresses) in an approx. 500m radius around the site.



- For the former Quinta Club site, a leaflet was delivered to 742 addresses (including residential and business addresses) in an approx. 500m radius around the site.

2.9 Copies of these leaflets can be found at **Appendix A**. Copies of the scope areas shown on a map can be found at **Appendix B**.

2.10 Following our four virtual events and the decision to extend the consultation deadline to Friday 21 May, another flyer was produced to notify people of this change. Some people who attended events stated that they had not received leaflets and this second mailing sought to address this. Copies of the leaflets distributed in late March can be found at **Appendix C**. The same scope areas were used for each flyer as mentioned in 2.8. The leaflet confirmed that the consultation had been extended to Friday 21 May and gave dates and times for the next four virtual consultation events that were scheduled in May. Copies of the leaflets were also mailed to those who registered for updates.

2.11 Further leaflets were produced and delivered at the start of May to the same scope areas to provide a reminder of the dates and times of the upcoming virtual events and offer another opportunity for people to receive a flyer and be notified of the plans. These leaflets can be found at **Appendix D**. The Hendon flyer also announced that in-person events would be possible, and that people could get in contact with the project team if this was of interest. This was possible due to the change in government Coronavirus guidelines.

#### *Direct contact*

2.12 Each time that the leaflets were hand distributed to the scope areas mentioned at 2.8 and 2.9, the project team also emailed copies of the flyer directly to identified local stakeholders and community groups (including schools and religious buildings), LBB councillors, local MPs and those who had consented to being updated and provided their contact details.

2.13 Methods of how to contact the team were also listed on the leaflet and invited those that were unable to attend the consultation events or meet in-person to provide their feedback to contact the team. In addition, the online consultation website was updated with all relevant information on how to submit their feedback, with a feedback form available to complete.

### *Libraries*

- 2.14 Copies of the leaflets were also available at three libraries: Hendon Library, Osidge Library and Chipping Barnet. These three libraries were chosen as they were closest to the Main Hendon Hub sites, Osidge Lane and the former Quinta Club respectively.
- 2.15 A4 printed copies of the consultation material were also provided at these three libraries. Copies were available to borrow with a library card via the Libraries Select and Collect service. Items had to be requested in advance and users were notified when the items were ready for collection.

### *Local press*

- 2.16 At the same time the leaflets were distributed, press releases were issued to local news media. This led to several stories being published in the Barnet Times, the local newspaper covering Hendon and the surrounding areas. A briefing session was also set up with a local journalist at the time of the first consultation events to introduce the project.
- 2.17 This local news coverage provided a further way for people to hear about the project, the virtual consultation platform and upcoming events.

### *Social media*

- 2.18 LBB has promoted the project and consultation events through its own social media channels, including its corporate Facebook and Twitter accounts, as well as internal communications to promote the consultation to staff. A copy of the example of the internal communications can be found in **Appendix E** and examples of the social media posts can be found in **Appendix F**.

### *Online consultation website*

- 2.19 The GL Hearn project team created a dedicated website <https://hendonhub.co.uk/> which hosted the virtual consultation platform. The website address was referenced on all consultation collateral. A screenshot of the website can be found at **Appendix G**.
- 2.20 The website was designed to provide details of the project, including all consultation boards, dates of all the online consultation events and in-person events, and how people could get in contact with any queries. A copy of the consultation boards can be found at **Appendix H**.

- 2.21 The website initially provided a copy of the leaflet and details of the consultation events, along with an online feedback form, which users could complete. Throughout the consultation, the website was updated to provide information about the project and for stakeholders to read about the proposals.
- 2.22 The website continues to be updated to keep the public informed of the project's progress. Any announcements or important updates about the project will be added to the website.
- 2.23 Much of the information provided on the Hendon Hub website was also available on the council's own consultation portal Engage Barnet <https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/>. This included links through to the main Hendon Hub site and links to the virtual presentations. The consultation information was also available in other languages upon request, although no requests for this were made.

### ***Accessibility***

- 2.24 The online consultation platform was designed to make the website text as simple as possible to understand so as many people as possible would be able to use the website. This meant that users of the website were able to:
- change the font size
  - zoom in to increase the size of the text
  - navigate most of the website using just a keyboard
  - navigate most of the website using speech recognition software
  - listen to most of the website using a screen reader (including the most recent versions of JAWS, NVDA and VoiceOver)
- 2.25 It was not possible to change the font size at the touch of a button, however the user could increase the font size using the tools within their browser.
- 2.26 If any user wanted information on the website in a different format, such as, accessible PDF, large print, easy read, audio recording or braille they were encouraged to email the team via [hendonhub@glhearn.com](mailto:hendonhub@glhearn.com) for details on this. No such requests were received.

2.27 If any resident who received a consultation leaflet wanted to request a feedback form in an alternative format to those advertised, they could contact GL Hearn via email, the online consultation website, telephone or by Freepost Mail. No such requests were received.

#### **Request for copies of consultation materials**

2.28 Contact details were provided on all collateral for members of the public and stakeholders to get in contact if they had any questions/queries/comments. It was noted on collateral that some members of the public/recipients may not have online access to the consultation material and so they were invited to contact us if they wanted hard copies of the consultation material. This flexibility was important given lockdown restrictions and the need to allow for people who may not be completely comfortable taking part in the virtual consultation.

2.29 In total, the team was contacted by 15 people who requested copies of the consultation material. Materials were provided to all of these individuals via post. Where possible, we also offered to email these residents copies of the materials.

#### ***Consultation activities***

2.30 This section sets out the consultation activities that were undertaken in support of the proposals, in addition to the distribution of our leaflets, and as part of the pre-planning application process.

##### *Online feedback form*

2.31 The project team created a feedback form that was available on the online consultation website (<https://hendonhub.co.uk>) to allow the public and stakeholders to offer their feedback on proposals.

2.32 There were 44 questions in total, and respondents could answer as many questions as they chose to. There were questions on the various sites included in the proposals, as well as questions relating to equalities and ward information.

2.33 The online feedback form took on average 10 minutes to complete and allowed respondents to complete questions at their own pace. It was the most popular choice of providing feedback to the team.

*Virtual public engagement*

2.34 The project team organised eight virtual events that took place over Zoom (a well-known and popular example of video meeting software) to provide the public and stakeholders the opportunity to view the draft proposals and comment on them prior to the submission of the planning application. The decision to use Zoom was guided by feedback given to the Council that people wanted to be able to speak to and ask questions directly of the project team, rather than watching a webinar and only being able to submit text questions. It was also chosen as it was seen to be more accessible to the maximum number of people compared to the alternative which was Microsoft Teams which was deemed too specialist.

2.35 The events which were held are listed below (all meetings took place between 6pm and 7.30pm):

<b>Virtual meeting date</b>	<b>Focus of presentation</b>
Thursday 4 March 2021	Main Hendon Hub proposals
Monday 8 March 2021	Former Quinta Club proposals
Tuesday 9 March 2021	Osidge Lane proposals
Thursday 18 March 2021	Main Hendon Hub proposals
Monday 10 May 2021	Former Quinta Club proposals
Tuesday 11 May 2021	Osidge Lane proposals
Thursday 13 May 2021	Main Hendon Hub proposals
Thursday 20 May 2021	Main Hendon Hub proposals

2.36 The virtual events consisted of a presentation that lasted between 30 and 45 minutes by the team, followed by one hour (or more when sessions overran) of discussions and Q&A. Attendees were able to provide their feedback and ask questions by raising their hand in the Zoom call and being invited to address the team, or via the chat function available throughout.

2.37 Members of the project team including representatives from Barnet Council, Middlesex University, and consultants from the project team (communications consultants, planning consultants, architects, project management, heritage, transport, and finance consultants) were at the virtual events to discuss the proposals and any associated matters with attendees. All virtual events were led by a senior officer, including the CEO and Deputy CEO of the Council.

*In-person public engagement*

2.38 Due to an easing in the Government's social distancing guidelines during the consultation period, the project team was able to hold several outdoor drop-in in-person events during May. These were organised by Mobilise Public Ltd (Mobilise), a consultancy appointed to form part of the project team, and other members of the project team attended including senior representatives from Barnet Council and Middlesex University. The events were held outdoors in line with restrictions to help protect people. Hand-sanitiser and Covid-19 tests were also available. As it was on the university campus, attendees were encouraged to test themselves before attending.

2.39 Four in-person events were held at the Scholars Courtyard at Middlesex University during the week commencing Monday 17 May 2021. The times were as follows:

- Monday 17 May: 2pm – 5pm
- Tuesday 18 May: 4pm – 7pm
- Thursday 20 May: 10am – 1pm
- Friday 21 May: 2pm – 5pm

2.40 Details of the drop-ins were shared at online consultation meetings, on the Hendon Hub website, through social media and through an electronic leaflet. A leaflet was designed (see **Appendix I**) and emailed to those who had registered for email updates on the scheme.

2.41 At the event, the consultation boards available on the project website were displayed and used to present the proposals.

2.42 A total of 45 people, including councillors, attended the drop-in sessions over the course of the week, with approximately an additional 50 people spoken to at the entrance but who did not enter the event.

- 2.43 An additional street co-design session based around the Prince of Wales Estate and Fuller Street was held on 26 May 2021. This session was organised by Mobilise with members from the GL Hearn landscape team attending. A leaflet was designed (see **Appendix J**) and hand-delivered to properties on the estate.
- 2.44 The focus of this session was primarily on potential landscaping and parking improvements which could be delivered as part of the Hendon Hub project, although it also provided an opportunity to discuss other aspects of the scheme, answer questions, and receive feedback.

*Council officer engagement*

- 2.45 Throughout the pre-application period, the project team has met with LBB planning officers through a series of formal pre-application meetings. The proposals for each of the sites have been guided and informed by this engagement, which is in line with LBB's stated expectations around developers taking part in pre-application engagement.
- 2.46 Council planning officers are separate from the project team which has been working on Hendon Hub and have scrutinised the proposals independently.

*Political stakeholder engagement*

- 2.47 Throughout the pre-application consultation process, LBB councillors have been kept informed of the public consultation activities being undertaken and progress being made with the developing proposals. This has included regular briefings for Hendon ward councillors and specific meetings for members representing the other sites outside of Hendon, as well as sessions for other interested councillors.
- 2.48 Briefings have also been offered to the MP for Hendon and MP for Chipping Barnet, the two Parliamentary constituencies covering the sites within the Hendon Hub project.

*Middlesex University engagement*

- 2.49 The University has also been undertaking its own local engagement in parallel to the work being carried out by the project team in order to foster better links between itself and the local community.
- 2.50 To date, this engagement has included:
- setting up a resident forum to allow regular meetings between neighbours and the University

- individual meetings and walking tours around the area with key figures from the University and local residents
- meetings with local councillors and MPs
- hosting the in-person Hendon Hub consultation sessions mentioned at **2.39** on campus.

*Other planning consultees and stakeholders*

2.51 The project team has also met with various consultees and stakeholders to help inform the plans.

*Council promotional activities*

2.52 The Council also supported the promotion of the consultation and this included:

- news items in the council's residents' e-newsletter magazine, Barnet First
- news release issued on the Communications Hub of barnet.gov.uk website
- widely promoted via staff communications mechanisms: First Team, the Chief Executives weekly message, and BEA staff networks (**see Appendix K**)
- news items in the Communities Together Network newsletter

*Barnet Libraries consultation*

2.53 The Barnet Libraries team has undertaken its own consultation exercise in parallel to the main consultation, asking people what kinds of features and services they would like to see in a new Hendon Library. There was an online questionnaire, which was widely promoted, and alternative formats were made available on request. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in **Appendix L**.

2.54 The libraries consultation was hosted separately on its own project page on Engage Barnet <https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/proposed-new-hendon-library> and remained up for the duration of the Hendon Hub consultation. This separate page also provided a summary of the Hendon Hub plans and a link to the consultation for the design of the proposed new Hendon Library. Details of the library survey and Hendon Hub consultation were also emailed to library stakeholders by the Barnet Library team.



2.55 The Barnet Libraries team have analysed the feedback provided to them via their survey. Data analysis can be found in **Appendix M**. It is important to note that this analysis was provided by the Barnet Libraries team.

### 3 FEEDBACK RECEIVED

3.1 This chapter provides an overview of the feedback received during the public consultation on Hendon Hub.

3.2 All responses received have been considered equally regardless of the method used to return them (i.e. whether it has been through the online feedback form, verbally related over the phone, comments at virtual consultation events). The feedback received has been recorded and collated by GL Hearn. Throughout the consultation, key stakeholders, including LBB officers and Middlesex University staff, were updated with the number and nature of responses received.

3.3 There were various methods that respondents could provide their feedback to the Hendon Hub project team, these were:

- email
- phone
- project website: feedback form and 'contact us' form
- post/letter.

3.4 Below is a breakdown of the feedback in terms of numbers:

Method of feedback	Number received
Emails	105
Phone	10
Project website – contact us	22
Project website - feedback form	341
Post/Letter	11
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>489</b>

*Emails, calls and letters*

3.5 The team received 126 enquiries, in the form of emails, letters and phone calls. These focused on specific questions on the plans and were answered by GL Hearn on behalf of LBB.

Type	Number	Feedback/themes
Emails	105	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about the loss of the library, with respondents saying the library is a source of community pride</li> <li>• Opposition to the expansion of the university and additional students living in the area.</li> <li>• Uncertainty over the public benefits of the project</li> <li>• Objection to the loss of car parking spaces locally, linked to concerns that parking was already an issue in Hendon and by Osidge Lane. Emails expressed concerns about the impact on businesses if car parking spaces were taken away</li> <li>• Concerns about the proposed heights of buildings and potential for overdevelopment. There were worries as to the impact on the character of the area</li> <li>• Support for the Meritage Centre as an important community hub, with some respondents providing personal experiences and their gratitude for the Centre</li> <li>• Comments on the importance of new buildings being accessible for disabled users</li> </ul>
Letters	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns the community had not been given enough information during the consultation.</li> <li>• Criticism of the consultation process, for example not enough time allowed at virtual presentations for comment</li> <li>• There were concerns about the loss of car parks along with the proposed height of some buildings.</li> <li>• Importance of social and community spaces for mental health purposes.</li> <li>• Importance of inclusivity and gender-neutral toilets being part of the plans</li> </ul>

Type	Number	Feedback/themes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion that photovoltaic panels should be used to combat the climate change challenge.</li> <li>Question of whether a theatre or cinema could be introduced into the area.</li> </ul>
Phone Calls	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about the loss of the library and where the replacement was going to be</li> <li>There were also concerns about whether the plans constituted overdevelopment</li> <li>Requests for copies of the consultation material to be posted out</li> </ul>

#### *Virtual events*

3.6 A total of eight virtual consultation events were held over Zoom during the consultation period, as shown below. During each of these sessions, those attending were able to make comments in the chat section and ask questions directly to the team.

3.7 The table features an approximate attendance for the virtual events. As some people joined and left during different stages of the meeting or were anonymous it wasn't possible to keep an exact count of those in attendance.

Virtual meeting date	Focus of presentation	No. of attendees
Thursday 4 March 2021	Main Hendon Hub proposals	76
Monday 8 March 2021	Former Quinta Club proposals	12
Tuesday 9 March 2021	Osidge Lane proposals	23
Thursday 18 March 2021	Main Hendon Hub proposals	70
Monday 10 May 2021	Former Quinta Club proposals	17
Tuesday 11 May 2021	Osidge Lane proposals	16

Virtual meeting date	Focus of presentation	No. of attendees
Thursday 13 May 2021	Main Hendon Hub proposals	79
Thursday 20 May 2021	Main Hendon Hub proposals	64

3.8 The first two virtual events on the main Hendon Hub proposals were held on 4 and 18 March 2021. The feedback received at these sessions was consistent (i.e., the themes of feedback, comments and questions were largely the same) and has been summarised in the following table. This includes questions and comments put directly to members of the team verbally and comments left in the chat box.

Theme	Commentary
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to the loss of car parking facilities within Hendon as part of the proposals, particularly the large car park on The Burroughs (used by local residents and businesses), the Fuller Street car park (used by local residents on the Prince of Wales estate and parents dropping children off at nearby school) and the small council car park at the end of the Ravensfield and Fenella site</li> <li>• Concerns about continued parking pressure from students on local roads, as well as parking displaced from the car parks proposed to be built on</li> </ul>
Hendon library	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-principle objection to the relocation of Hendon Library from its current building, which is considered to be attractive, historic and that is a source of positive memories for people who have used it over time</li> <li>• Questions about why it is not possible to expand or improve the library services provided in the current building, especially given changes to this provision over time and in recent years (e.g. asking why currently unused space can't be reused)</li> <li>• Fears about a loss of civic buildings in Hendon to the university; other examples given including Church Farmhouse Museum</li> <li>• Worries about the demolition of alteration of the building</li> </ul>

Theme	Commentary
University expansion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-principle objection to the expansion of the university and increase in student numbers living locally</li> <li>• Perception of a “take over” of the area by the university, turning Hendon into a campus or “university town” without local input into that decision</li> <li>• Concerns about antisocial behaviour linked to or targeting students and impact on local residents</li> <li>• Suggestion that other nearby areas (e.g. Colindale or Brent Cross) would be more appropriate locations for new student accommodation</li> <li>• Doubt that the proposals would lead to a reduction in the number of HMOs occupied by students locally</li> </ul>
University relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples given of frustrations or problems local residents have with the university and students at the moment and concerns that these will increase or worsen if the proposals were to go ahead</li> <li>• Lack of awareness of public access currently available to university facilities, linked to feelings that residents do not currently benefit from living close to the university</li> </ul>
Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns around the technical language used in some consultation material and the overall town planning, SPD and business case processes were difficult to engage with</li> <li>• Questions about the appropriateness of undertaking consultation during COVID-19 lockdown restrictions</li> <li>• Confusion around how Supplementary Planning Document consultation and Hendon Hub consultations differed, their purposes and timescales for completion</li> <li>• Doubt or scepticism about whether local feedback would be acknowledged or considered by the project team</li> </ul>
Building design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns or objections to the draft proposals shown for the proposed new buildings, which some attendees felt were too tall, too large / bulky, too contemporary in appearance or otherwise not in keeping with the local character of Hendon</li> </ul>

Theme	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some related concerns about local conservation and heritage and whether the new buildings would detract from local listed buildings or Conservation Areas</li> <li>• Concerns linked to building heights around loss of privacy or amenity in back gardens on sites that could be overlooked by the new buildings</li> </ul>
Local infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perception that local social infrastructure (e.g. doctors) are already at capacity and will not be able to cope with an increased number of students living locally</li> </ul>
Compulsory Purchase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Worries about the potential use of Compulsory Purchase Order powers by the council as part of the project</li> <li>• Objection to the use of these powers to acquire land for the project given local concerns about it</li> </ul>
PDSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to the loss of the PDSA from Hendon</li> <li>• Perception that the proposed new location on Osidge Lane is too far from the current one and that people will not want or be able to travel to the new one</li> <li>• Worries about not being able to afford or source veterinary support once the PDSA has moved</li> </ul>

3.9 The second round of events on the main Hendon Hub proposals took place on 13 and 20 May 2021. Again, the feedback received during these two sessions was largely consistent with each other, and the first two events in March (and as such the points listed in the table at 3.8 also apply here). Some new or additional themes of feedback were linked to the updated proposals shown. These new themes of feedback are listed below.

Theme	Commentary
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the removal of the larger Burroughs Car Park from the plans but further queries as to how parking would be dealt with across the project</li> <li>• Continued objection to any development on Fuller Street car park</li> <li>• Scepticism about how the Fuller Street car park spaces could be re-provided within the Prince of Wales estate</li> </ul>

Theme	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions about where people visiting the nearby churches will park at weekends if car parks are redeveloped</li> </ul>
Hendon library	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued opposition to the loss of the library and questioning why the services and facilities shown in the expanded consultation material could not be provided in the current library building</li> <li>• Pleased to note efforts to avoid the need for a temporary library, meaning there would be a single move from the current location to the new one</li> </ul>
University expansion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued objection to the expansion of the university and increase in student numbers locally. Whilst the reduction in overall student numbers was welcomed, the amount proposed was still considered too much</li> <li>• Suggestion that if student accommodation was to be developed, it should be on sites within the main university campus and away from the Burroughs</li> </ul>
Anti-social behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognition that staff and management from the university had met with many local residents since the first events to discuss concerns around anti-social behaviour and crime in more detail and to gain an understanding of areas of concern</li> <li>• Continued concern about the potential for further problems in the future</li> <li>• Support from some for the introduction of a Metropolitan Police Safer Neighbourhoods Team within the project in principle (this had been a suggestion previously)</li> </ul>
Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question of whether Historic England had been consulted on the emerging proposals, with reference to its submitted comments on the SPD</li> <li>• Residents were also concerned their feedback was not being listened to, and the consultation was merely a tick-boxing exercise.</li> </ul>
Building height and design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Despite the updates and changes to the design of the proposed buildings, there remained concerns that the heights and appearances were unacceptable and would change the character of the area, with more references to Historic England.</li> </ul>



Theme	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some recognition that the Meritage Centre detracted from the look of the Conservation Area and would benefit from redeveloped (but also concerns that even three and four storey was too tall for the site)</li> </ul>
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mixed response to the potential to add new affordable and key worker housing within the project, replacing some of the previously proposed student accommodation. Some support for the principle of this, some objection to new housing generally in Hendon and questions as to why key work accommodation was needed</li> </ul>

### 3.10 Summary of themes of feedback at first Quinta event (8 March 2021)

Theme	Points
Proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surprise that refurbishment is proposed rather than outright redevelopment given condition of building</li> <li></li> </ul>
Quinta open space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmation sought that the Quinta open space would not be built on or developed as part of the proposals</li> <li>The Village Green status of the open space should be acknowledged in planning documents</li> <li>Questions about whether providing public car parking spaces will attract greater use of the open space by people not living locally, with an impact on traffic and parking on local roads</li> </ul>
Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information wanted on how will the site be kept secure out of hours from antisocial behaviour in the car park, or people trying to drive vehicles onto the open space</li> </ul>
Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions about the consultation and how this had been advertised and some people did not think they had received leaflets</li> </ul>

3.11 Summary of themes of feedback at second Quinta event (10 May 2021)

Theme	Points
Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will the site be kept secure out of hours from antisocial behaviour in the car park, or people trying to drive vehicles onto the open space?</li> <li>• Support was expressed for proper security lighting and CCTV to act as a visible deterrent</li> </ul>
Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the proposals lead to an increase in trips to the site and if so, how will traffic be managed?</li> <li>• Has the access to and from the site for vehicles been properly assessed, perception that traffic is quick along this road</li> </ul>
External uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More information was sought about who would be able to hire or make use of the training space within the site (i.e., large groups, birthday parties etc.) – the suggestion being that the site was not thought suitable for big events</li> <li>• It was felt that the proposals including this space was positive and could “benefit small organisations, charities and the community”</li> </ul>
Timescales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some attendees asked about timescales of the project and wanted to know when renovation works would be carried out and completed by</li> </ul>

3.12 Summary of themes of feedback at first Osidge Lane event (9 March 2021)

Theme	Points
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main point of feedback made by multiple speakers was concern about (and objection to) the loss of public parking spaces as part of the development</li> <li>• Neighbours were concerned about the potential for overspill parking on nearby residential roads</li> <li>• It was stressed that the car park was used by people for lots of different reasons, including drop offs for nearby schools and nurseries, shoppers visiting the nearby local centre, users of the park, and the nearby scout hut and hall.</li> </ul>
Pet Hospital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns around the operation of the pet hospital (noise, hours of operation, increase in people travelling to the area) and introducing this use in a residential area</li> </ul>

Theme	Points
Impact on local businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was mentioned that there was an existing vets practice in the nearby local centre and the viability of this business could be impacted by the new pet hospital</li> </ul>
Support for proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some support was expressed for the proposals, calling it a “great idea” that “would offer a service to those who can’t afford expensive vet bills”</li> </ul>
Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions about the consultation and how this had been advertised and some people did not think they had received leaflets</li> </ul>

### 3.13 Summary of themes of feedback at second Osidge event (11 May 2021)

Theme	Points
Support for change in plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attendees were pleased to hear that the team was now proposing the Osidge Lane site be removed from the project and not redeveloped</li> </ul>
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst noting the recommendation was not to redevelop the site, attendees asked if it did go ahead whether there would be sufficient parking spaces in the area for the variety of people who used the car park. It was stated again that the nearby Brunswick Primary School relied on the car park for parents doing drop off</li> </ul>
Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were some questions again about the radius used for the leaflet drop, and some suggestion that Brunswick Park school had not been notified of the plans</li> </ul>
Timeframes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions around timescales of the project if it were to go ahead, including when the car park would be closed and how long until the public spaces were available again</li> </ul>
Relocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attendees asked whether the PDSA was still planning to move out of Hendon, if the move to Osidge Lane did not go ahead</li> </ul>

Face-to-face events

3.14 In-person drop in events were held at Middlesex University over four days during the week commencing 17<sup>th</sup> May (see 2.38). The main themes of feedback and discussion were as follows:

Theme	Commentary
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the main issues most frequently mentioned at the in-person events. Attendees wanted clarity on the proposed changes to parking at the Prince of Wales Estate and suggested the Fuller Street car park should be a pay and display, due to lack of parking availability in the area.</li> <li>• Complaints about student parking on residential roads nearby, including the Prince of Wales estate</li> </ul>
Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern the proposed scheme would contribute to the already high levels of traffic in Hendon</li> <li>• Congestion around Fuller Street and traffic during school drop-off and pick-up times at nearby schools were cited as concerns</li> </ul>
Height and Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed heights of some of the new buildings (the RFC site in particular) were felt to be too tall, with some saying the maximum height of these buildings should be four storeys</li> <li>• Doubts that the proposed design and style of the new buildings were in keeping with existing architecture in Hendon</li> <li>• Some acceptance that some of the buildings in Hendon (and within the Hendon Hub proposals) could use “a <i>facelift</i>”</li> </ul>
University Expansion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions around the number of students who would be living in the community as a result of the proposals and questions as to whether new student accommodation could be phased in over time</li> <li>• Suggestion that other locations would be better for new student accommodation, e.g. Colindale</li> <li>• Concerns the expansion would lead to Hendon becoming a “<i>university town</i>” which some strongly feel it is not and should not be</li> <li>• Worries about antisocial behaviour and crime linked to or targeting students</li> </ul>
PDSA Hospital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for keeping the PDSA Pet Hospital in Hendon rather than seeing it relocated to the proposed location of Osidge Lane</li> </ul>

Theme	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some opposition from people living close to the Fuller Street car park due to the loss of parking spaces</li> </ul>
Library	Attendees did not want the library to move out of its current home and expressed their preference for it to stay where it is, even if it was reduced to one floor of usage. It was also suggested that if the library is to be moved, community space should be above it rather than in a separate building.
Community Space	There were questions as to whether enough space was being provided in the new community space for all existing groups that would be moved. Residents from Prince of Wales Estate considered the Meritage Centre as their venue for local activity and did not want to lose it.
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appreciation for the ability to attend an in-person event</li> <li>Questions around the status and timings for the draft Supplementary Planning Document</li> <li>The role and use of Compulsory Purchase Orders</li> <li>Whether any archaeological site investigations had yet been undertaken or were planned to be</li> <li>Is Hendon Fire Station part of the proposals? Will it be moved?</li> </ul>

3.15 Much of the feedback and discussions at these in-person events were consistent with those coming out of the virtual events. Attendees were on the whole appreciative of the opportunity to speak to members of the team in-person. Some who had not attended the virtual events expressed support for the proposals as they felt the area needed some redevelopment and improvement particularly in the areas of focus.

*Co-design session*

3.16 An in-person co-design session was held with residents of the Prince of Wales Estate on 26<sup>th</sup> May 2021 (see 2.43). The main themes of feedback and discussions were as follows.

Theme	Commentary
Main scheme objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Making clear at the start that many attendees objected to the overall Hendon Hub proposals, in particular the perceived loss of the Meritage Centre and concerns about the increase in students locally and associated antisocial behaviour</li> </ul>

Theme	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Having made this clear, the walkabout and co-design session was then very constructive in providing feedback and suggestions for the proposals as they related to the Prince of Wales estate</li> </ul>
Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about the condition of the estate at present and perceived decline</li> <li>Support for improving landscaping, greenery, sight lines and re-provided or increased parking</li> <li>Recognition some of the former laundry / drying areas are used and others aren't</li> <li>Support for replacing ground floor bin storage area</li> <li>Desire to see the entrances to current estate blocks modernised, new secure entrances, better estate lighting, general renovation and improvement etc.</li> </ul>
Garages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions around the loss of garages within the estate and whether these would be re-provided</li> </ul>
PDSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for keeping the PDSA Pet Hospital in Hendon rather than seeing it relocated elsewhere</li> <li>Some opposition from people living close to the Fuller Street car park due to the loss of parking spaces</li> </ul>
Green / Play space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for some kind of landscaped greenspace that children could play in but not a formal playground</li> <li>Desire to see growing spaces or allotments provided, potentially on green space to rear of Claddagh Ring</li> <li>Concern any new green or landscaped space would be taken over by students rather than estate residents</li> </ul>
Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perception that crime and antisocial behaviour on the estate has worsened recently, support for gating / CCTV / making external areas feel more private and secure</li> </ul>

### *Feedback forms*

- 3.17 In addition to speaking to team members at the virtual and drop-in events, attendees were able to comment on the proposals via a feedback form that was provided online as well as the face-to-face and drop-in events.
- 3.18 The feedback form could be completed and submitted instantly online or handed in at one of the in-person events or returned subsequently via a complementary Freepost envelope provided by the team.
- 3.19 The feedback form provided the same contact information (postal address, telephone number and email address) as on the community newsletter, allowing respondents the opportunity to provide further feedback after the events.
- 3.20 In total, 341 feedback forms were completed. This comprises 58 feedback forms received before Thursday 18 March, at which time the feedback form was changed, and 283 forms received afterwards.
- 3.21 The original feedback form, which had 29 questions, went live on the project website at the same time the consultation was launched, on Friday 27 February 2021. In total, 58 people completed the original form, although not all chose to answer every question.
- 3.22 The feedback form was updated on 18 March to include equalities monitoring questions. The addition of equalities monitoring questions meant that the information collected needed to be anonymous, so questions asking for people's personal information (e.g. the name and address of respondents) were removed. The updated feedback form without the request for personal information went live on Thursday 18 March.
- 3.23 Some of the questions asked people to rate parts of the proposals on a rating scale from 1-10, with 10 being the highest rating. Other questions offered text boxes to allow people to write out comments or explain the rating they had given. The results of this are as follows:

Question No.	Question	Number of respondents	Key points raised / example comments
1	In what capacity are you responding?	56	53 respondents stated that they were residents, with three respondents saying they were a local business or employee.
2	Other	2	One respondent said they used to live in the area, whilst the other said they were the daughter of a resident who did not use the internet.
3	Do you have any comments on the overall Hendon Hub proposals?	55	<p>Comments did not always explicitly state their support or objection for the proposals, however nine respondents suggested they were in favour completely or partially.</p> <p>An example comment of this was “I support the project, regenerating run-down buildings and building on under-utilised land (car parks).” Another was “I think it is a good idea but parking has to be reviewed”.</p> <p>24 respondents expressed objections and/or concerns about the plans. The themes of comments related to the loss of the library, height of proposed buildings, lack of benefits for the local community and future parking provisions e.g. “The buildings are too tall and are not aligned to the buildings that exist which means these designs are not sensitive to the height and style of the town hall and fire station”, “I have been living in the area for over 35 years and have always used the library, however now the library is a shadow of its former self with hardly any books and resources. I hope the new library will have better resources however my main concern is that the new buildings will be sympathetic to the existing heritage of the area and respect the lives of the</p>



Question No.	Question	Number of respondents	Key points raised / example comments
			<p>residents” and “Against it as I fear it goes too far with student accommodation. I’m all for revamping some of the older buildings but not at the cost of an influx in students and removal of parking.”</p> <p>One example comment was “The proposals appear to entirely benefit the University at the expense of local residents... Furthermore, the plans as they stand (increasing residential student population by several hundred whilst simultaneously taking away 75% or more of the area parking spaces) do not add up from any practical, logistical viewpoint. The designs for the proposed new buildings do not in any way reflect the heritage look of the area”.</p> <p>There were seven further comments showing concern/objecting to the relocation of the PDSA Hospital to Osidge Lane. Examples included: “Yes I oppose the relocation of the PDSA Pet Hospital to East Barnet. The proposed site in East Barnet is a car park used for school drop off which will cause excess traffic in and already busy area at peak times” and “I am concerned by the proposal to relocate the PDSA animal hospital to the car park on Osidge Lane.”</p>
4	How would you rate these proposals as they currently stand?	57	The average rating for this question was 3.15.
5	Do you have any comments on our proposals for the new public Hendon library?	55	Again, comments did not always explicitly support or oppose the proposals for the new public Hendon library. Four respondents offered support/positive comments for these plans. One respondent said, “I am happy that the proposals see the continuation of a library

Question No.	Question	Number of respondents	Key points raised / example comments
			<p>in Hendon”, whilst another respondent said it “looks like a good permanent solution”.</p> <p>21 respondents had concerns or were in opposition to the proposals, with it evident that some residents had a strong attachment to the current library. One respondent said “why is there a need for a new library when the old one is great. Waste of money.” Others said: “A modern low-rise purpose-built library building cannot compete with the stunning 1920s Hendon Library that was recently refurbished at taxpayers’ expense. Please restore the library to its original use - all floors for the public”, “Very upset with the plan to replace it, there is nothing wrong with the one we have”, and “The current building should be retained.”</p>
6	How would you rate the Hendon Library proposals as they currently stand?	53	The average rating for this question was 3.18.
7	Do you have any comments on our proposals for Building B9 and the new academic space?	51	<p>23 respondents stated that they had no comments on these proposals.</p> <p>Two respondents supported the plans. One said that were “happy with building proposals”.</p> <p>15 respondents offered commentary suggesting they were in objection or worried by the proposals. Example comments on the height included: “the height of this development will be badly at odds with the low-rise, heritage feel of the area” and “It should be in line with the historical character of the area, and the height should not exceed the height of the buildings on that side of the street.”</p>

Question No.	Question	Number of respondents	Key points raised / example comments
			<p>There were also concerns that the expansion of the University was taking over the area with one respondent stating “the university MUST build on their own land, not ours!” and “The university currently causes enough problems in the area and can extend on its own property if necessary.”</p> <p>One respondent suggested that there should be gender-neutral toilet facilities on each floor.</p>
8	How would you rate the Building B9 proposals as they currently stand?	49	The average rating for this question was 3.39.
9	Do you have any comments on our proposals for the Ravensfield and Fenella site?	53	<p>Most respondents suggested that these buildings needed regeneration and so were supportive of the plans. An example comment was that they were a “huge improvement on the present buildings”, and another was “Glad it's being redeveloped!”</p> <p>Some respondents stated that they thought these plans were a “waste of money”. There were also concerns that the proposals were “not fitting the sensitivity of the area” and “they need to be low, and in keeping with the local area.”</p>
10	How would you rate the Ravensfield and Fenella proposals as they currently stand?	52	The average rating for this question was 3.38.
11	Do you have any comments on our proposals for the Meritage Centre site?	51	21 respondents stated that they had no comments on these proposals.

Question No.	Question	Number of respondents	Key points raised / example comments
			<p>Respondents who provided comments stated that the Meritage Centre was “an important community hub for the elderly and those with mental health needs”. One respondent suggested “This would seem to be a marked improvement on the current buildings.”</p> <p>There were also questions as to where the services the Centre offered would be re-provided.</p>
12	How would you rate the Meritage Centre proposals as they currently stand?	52	The average rating for this question was 3.37.
13	Do you have any comments on our proposals for Fuller Street car park and the Prince of Wales estate?	50	<p>Respondents were clear that parking was essential and wanted to know where the parking spaces that would be lost be re-provided.</p> <p>Comments included “Car parking is an essential resource for the local community. The project as a whole will remove a large number of parking spaces, that will not be easy to replace. More effort should be made to maintain as much as possible of the existing parking capacity, even if in different locations or underground” as well as “Where are the residents that already live there going to park?” and “Happy enough with the general proposal, but what are you going to do about parking?”</p>
14	How would you rate the Fuller Street and Prince of Wales estate proposals as they currently stand?	51	The average rating for this question was 2.76.
15	Do you have any comments on our	53	18 people did not answer this question.

Question No.	Question	Number of respondents	Key points raised / example comments
	proposals for The Burroughs Car Park?		<p>Most respondents were opposed to the plans and stated the car park was used regularly. They had concerns about where people would park and the “knock-on effect” this could have on the surrounding streets.</p> <p>One respondent commented that “more effort should be made to maintain as much as possible of the existing parking capacity, even if in a different location or underground”. Another indicated the impact on their disabled bay access and that the local homes that park outside is by “a red route with nowhere to stop.”</p>
16	How would you rate The Burroughs Car Park proposals as they currently stand?	50	The average rating for this question was 2.56.
17	Do you have any comments on our proposals for Osidge Lane?	49	<p>19 respondents did not answer this question.</p> <p>A few respondents were in support of the plans, with examples of comments including: “a good solution” and “the proposals look good”.</p> <p>Some respondents opposed the proposals and stated that the Osidge Lane car park was used by staff and parents of Brunswick Park Primary School and those visiting the shops of Hampden Way.</p> <p>There were also concerns that the PDSA was being moved too far from its current location. Respondents suggested that it would be too far for elderly residents to travel to and unfair to the existing users of the PDSA – example comments included: “The elderly and vulnerable residents of</p>

Question No.	Question	Number of respondents	Key points raised / example comments
			Hendon, many of whom utterly depend upon their pets for company, deserve to have the PDSA hospital nearby, not right over in East Barnet. That journey is going to be impossible for many of them.”
18	How would you rate the Osidge Lane proposals as they currently stand?	52	The average rating for this question was 2.77.
19	Do you have any comments on our proposals for the former Quinta Club?	43	31 of the respondents had no comments.  Two respondents said that the proposals looked “fine”.  Other respondents wanted to know why the building had been “allowed to come to ruin in the first place” and want security measures would be put in place for the site.
20	How would you rate the former Quinta Club proposals as they currently stand?	44	The average rating for this question was 3.31.
21	Do you have any comments on the community benefits that we have identified could be delivered as part of this project?	51	Most respondents suggested that the community would not receive any benefits from this project, with the University and/or University students set to receive the majority of the benefits.  Other respondents offered their suggestions as to what other benefits could be delivered, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting sustainable modes of transport</li> <li>• Traffic calming measures that do not impact the congestion in the area</li> <li>• A greater focus on tree planting and general sustainability</li> <li>• More facilities and parking</li> </ul>

Question No.	Question	Number of respondents	Key points raised / example comments
22	Do you have any suggestions about further community benefits that could be delivered as part of this project?	48	<p>Respondents had a range of suggestions which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of more CCTV in the local area to help combat ASB</li> <li>• Include more housing for low income families</li> <li>• More cycle routes to help the congestion in the area</li> <li>• Help those suffering with addictions</li> <li>• Floral planting along all approaches</li> <li>• A monthly forum for residents to express feedback on future plans</li> <li>• More opportunities for students to get involved in local community groups</li> <li>• More green spaces</li> </ul>
23	This project could generate approximately £1.6million of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money. Do you have any comments or suggestions of how this CIL money could be spent to contribute and further improve the local area?	48	<p>Respondents again had a range of suggestions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An e-scooter or electric bike hire scheme in Barnet</li> <li>• Improve path down the back of Sunningfields Park</li> <li>• Plant more trees and improve Brent Street and Hendon Central</li> <li>• Community infrastructure such as the parks and keeping the community safe and clean</li> <li>• A well-funded and staffed Hendon police station</li> </ul>
24	Do you have any comments on parking in the area, how it is currently used and managed, and what might be reasonably required in the future?	52	<p>Respondents stated that parking was already difficult in the area along with congestion. They expressed concerns that the proposals would worsen the parking situation in Hendon. Examples of comments include: "Car parks are essential and must not be jeopardised" and "Certainly need more parking spaces available to regenerate the shopping areas."</p>

Question No.	Question	Number of respondents	Key points raised / example comments
			There were also some suggestions. Two respondents asked for more renewable energy charging points to be introduced.
25	What kind of community facilities would you like to see provided as part of the Hendon Hub project?	46	<p>Respondents offered a range of suggestions including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A multi-purpose community centre</li> <li>• Workshops</li> <li>• A police station</li> <li>• A pub</li> <li>• Youth clubs</li> <li>• Tennis courts</li> <li>• Playgrounds, greenspaces with trees, water fountains, accessible paths for the elderly and disabled.</li> <li>• Less parking spaces and more well-lit walking spaces</li> </ul>
26	What kind of public spaces (e.g. piazza or courtyard areas, green spaces, play space etc.) would you like to see created as part of the Hendon Hub project?	42	<p>Respondents had various opinions, and examples included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green spaces with paths that those who limited mobility could access</li> <li>• A coffee shop</li> <li>• Playgrounds</li> <li>• Water fountains</li> <li>• Creation of a pedestrianised zone</li> </ul>
27	Do you currently make use of any Middlesex University facilities? If so, which ones? If not, what might you want to use in the future?	46	<p>The University facilities that respondents said they used included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Grove</li> <li>• The Atrium</li> <li>• Tennis courts</li> <li>• Football pitches</li> </ul> <p>A number of respondents stated that they were not aware they could access the University's facilities.</p>
28	How did you find out about this consultation?	54	20 respondents said they found out through a leaflet they received. Seven respondents said they found out through social media.



Question No.	Question	Number of respondents	Key points raised / example comments
			Other ways respondents found out about the consultation included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Word of mouth</li> <li>• Local councillor informed them</li> <li>• Newspaper/ Barnet First</li> <li>• Local school</li> </ul>
29	Are you happy for the project team to contact you about this project in the future?	58	13 respondents answered “no” and 45 respondents answered “yes”

*Updated feedback form March 2021*

3.24 As stated at 3.20, in total 283 people provided their feedback via the updated feedback form.

3.25 The updated feedback form asked 44 questions of respondents, with space for respondents to expand on their answers. Odd-numbered questions from 1-19 were tick box questions meaning respondents could answer with one of the following responses:

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neither support nor object
- Object
- Strongly object
- Don't know
- (leave blank / no answer)

3.26 The results of this are below.

Question no.	Question	No. respondents	Themes of feedback
1	To what extent do you support or oppose the updated Hendon Hub proposals?	274	<p>In total:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of the 274 respondents strongly objected to the proposals</li> <li>• 8% of the 274 respondents objected to the proposals</li> <li>• 4% of the respondents strongly supported the proposals</li> <li>• 4% of the respondents supported the proposals</li> <li>• 4% neither supported nor objected</li> </ul>
2	Please explain your answer	239	<p>Those in support commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hendon needed investment and modernisation</li> </ul>

Question no.	Question	No. respondents	Themes of feedback
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There needed to be improvement to educational and community facilities in the area</li> </ul> <p>Those in objection said:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There were very few benefits for the residents of Hendon, with the University benefitting far more favourably</li> <li>● The development would be detrimental to the character of the area especially the height of the buildings</li> <li>● They were unhappy about the prospective loss of car parking facilities</li> <li>● They were concerned about the “loss of the library” and the number of student accommodation units being proposed</li> <li>● Feared the “overdevelopment”</li> <li>● Local infrastructure would not be able to take more people/pressure on services</li> </ul>
3	To what extent do you support or oppose the updated proposals for the new Hendon public library, which do not require a temporary relocation of the library?	274	<p>In total:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 5% of the 274 respondents strongly supported the proposals</li> <li>● 7% of the respondents supported the proposals</li> <li>● 71% of the respondents strongly objected to the proposals</li> <li>● 9% of the respondents objected to these proposals</li> <li>● 7% of respondents neither supported nor objected to the plans</li> <li>● 1% of respondents selected “don’t know”</li> </ul>
4	Please explain your answer	235	<p>Those in support commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A new library would encourage more people to visit it, with one respondent</li> </ul>

Question no.	Question	No. respondents	Themes of feedback
			<p>saying “the new library will offer a better environment for people to use”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They liked the design of the new library</li> </ul> <p>Those in objection commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current library means a lot to the local community, with residents keen for it to remain as part of the community</li> <li>• They wanted to preserve historical and listed buildings in Hendon</li> <li>• There was no need to replace the current library</li> <li>• Concern about the library services being diminished</li> <li>• The new library is unnecessary as the current library can be used</li> </ul>
5	To what extent do you support or oppose the proposals for the temporary relocation of Hendon Library to The Burroughs car park, which may be required as part of this project?	278	<p>In total:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2% of the 278 respondents strongly supported this</li> <li>• 3% of respondents supported the proposals</li> <li>• 73% of the respondents strongly objected to the temporary relocation of Hendon Library</li> <li>• 11% of respondents objected to the proposals</li> <li>• 10% of respondents neither supported nor objected to these plans</li> <li>• 2% of respondents selected “don’t know”</li> </ul>
6	Please explain your answer	233	<p>Those in support commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposal was a “fair solution”</li> <li>• “Minor inconvenience to members”</li> </ul> <p>Those in objection commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They were worried about the services the temporary library would provide</li> </ul>

Question no.	Question	No. respondents	Themes of feedback
			<p>and if poor structures like “portacabins” will be used</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Burroughs Car Park was essential and was used daily, it being used for the temporary library would have a detrimental impact on residents and businesses</li> <li>• They wanted the library to remain where it currently was due to its history and architecture</li> <li>• It was a “waste of money”</li> <li>• It’s location under student accommodation is “inappropriate and insensitive”</li> </ul>
7	To what extent do you support or oppose the current proposals for Building B9?	277	<p>In total:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3% of the 277 respondents strongly supported these proposals</li> <li>• 8% of the respondents supported the proposals</li> <li>• 56% of respondents strongly objected to the proposals</li> <li>• 8% of respondents objected to the proposals</li> <li>• 18% of respondents neither supported nor objected to the plans</li> <li>• 7% of respondents selected “don’t know”</li> </ul>
8	Please explain your answer	224	<p>Those in support commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Seems to make sense”</li> <li>• “Positive change”</li> <li>• The proposals would not have a detrimental impact on residents, and were a better use of the space</li> <li>• “The current building is awful. The new plans look amazing. They respect the area and add something architecturally as well as better facilities”</li> </ul> <p>Those in objection commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals were too dense for the area and unattractive</li> </ul>

Question no.	Question	No. respondents	Themes of feedback
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They did not want to see the loss of a historic 1930s building</li> <li>• The proposed height was too much and not in keeping with the area</li> <li>• “Inappropriate architecture in the context of two conservation areas”</li> <li>• “Show no benefits to local residents”</li> </ul>
9	To what extent do you support or oppose the current proposals for the Ravensfield and Fenella site?	276	<p>In total:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4% of the 276 respondents strongly supported the proposals</li> <li>• 6% of the respondents were in support</li> <li>• 60% of respondents strongly objected to the proposals</li> <li>• 11% of respondents objected to the proposals</li> <li>• 14% of respondents neither supported nor objected to the plans</li> <li>• 5% selected “don’t know”</li> </ul>
10	Please explain your answer	228	<p>Those in support commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The buildings were unattractive and needed to be redeveloped</li> <li>• The proposals would enhance the area</li> </ul> <p>Those in opposition commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals were too high and were out of character with the local area</li> <li>• These buildings should not be used for student accommodation</li> <li>• “This is not benefitting the long-term residents in the borough”</li> <li>• “It would make a quiet road busy and noisy”</li> <li>• “Please be creative and have infrastructure for the residents”</li> </ul>
11	To what extent do you support or oppose the current proposals for the Meritage Centre?	274	<p>In total:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5% of the 274 respondents strongly supported the proposals</li> </ul>

Question no.	Question	No. respondents	Themes of feedback
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5% of the respondents supported the proposals</li> <li>• 68% of respondents strongly objected to the proposals</li> <li>• 7% of respondents objected to the proposals</li> <li>• 11% of respondents neither supported nor objected to the plans</li> <li>• 5% selected “don’t know”</li> </ul>
12	Please explain your answer?	226	<p>Those in support commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Meritage Centre needed redevelopment and that the designs were impressive</li> <li>• “Proposals are an improvement on the current buildings”</li> </ul> <p>Those in objection commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals constituted overdevelopment</li> <li>• They did not want to see student accommodation placed here</li> <li>• They wanted to see all organisations that currently use the Meritage Centre remain there</li> <li>• “Take away one of the hearts of our community totally disrespectful to us”</li> <li>• “They do not blend with historical setting + conservation areas”</li> </ul>
13	To what extent do you support or oppose the current proposals for Fuller Street Car Park and the Prince of Wales Estate?	274	<p>In total:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4% of the 274 respondents strongly supported the proposals</li> <li>• 6% of the respondents supported the proposals</li> <li>• 59% of respondents strongly objected to these proposals</li> <li>• 9% of respondents objected to the proposals</li> <li>• 15% of respondents neither supported nor objected to the current proposals</li> <li>• 6% of respondents selected “don’t know”</li> </ul>

Question no.	Question	No. respondents	Themes of feedback
14	Please explain your answer?	225	<p>Those in support commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● New additional homes were required</li> <li>● “Green spaces allowed for so ideal development”</li> <li>● “This seems reasonable I can’t say I know anyone who’s ever used the car park as is, and I live virtually next door to it.”</li> </ul> <p>Those in objection commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The PDSA should not relocate to Fuller Street</li> <li>● Parking spaces were needed for local residents</li> <li>● “PDSA should not move to Fuller Street nor homes be built on it”</li> <li>● “Parking is at a premium in these areas. When the university and the schools are fully functional there is no available parking and disputes between residents and students are a daily occurrence.”</li> <li>● “Fuller St car parking is necessary. Re-provision of spaces is inadequate and residents will have issues trying to park near home.”</li> </ul>
15	To what extent do you support or oppose the current proposals for the Burroughs Car Park?	277	<p>In total:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 3% of the 277 respondents strongly supported the proposals</li> <li>● 4% of respondents supported the proposals</li> <li>● 63% of respondents strongly objected to the proposals</li> <li>● 14% of respondents objected to the proposals</li> <li>● 12% of respondents neither supported nor objected to the proposals</li> <li>● 4% of the respondents selected “don’t know”</li> </ul>



Question no.	Question	No. respondents	Themes of feedback
16	Please explain your answer?	222	<p>Those in support commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This area needed to be redeveloped</li> <li>• Using this site for housing was a good idea</li> <li>• “Creating buildings which complement the historic nature of the area is to be applauded”</li> </ul> <p>Those in objection commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The car park was essential and should not be built on. The car park was used by parents dropping off their children to school, local businesses and visitors to churches</li> <li>• Townhouses were not needed, and would potentially cause overlooking issues</li> <li>• “Hasn’t been a strong case made”</li> <li>• “Far too many people in Hendon. The schools and GPS all full to bursting”</li> <li>• “Too big and dominant in the conservation area”</li> </ul>
17	To what extent do you support or oppose the current proposals for Osidge Lane?	276	<p>In total:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3% of the 276 respondents strongly supported the proposals</li> <li>• 9% of the respondents supported the proposals</li> <li>• 47% of respondents strongly objected to the proposals</li> <li>• 5% of respondents objected to the proposals</li> <li>• 26% of respondents neither supported nor objected to the plans</li> <li>• 9% of respondents selected “don’t know”</li> </ul>
18	Please explain your answer?	209	<p>Those in support commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plans looked good and would provide the PDSA Hospital with a good space to operate from</li> <li>• “A modern facility with proper parking for pet owners”</li> </ul>

Question no.	Question	No. respondents	Themes of feedback
			<p>Those in objection stated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The car park at Osidge Lane was needed for the local residents</li> <li>● The move to Osidge Lane was too far away from where the PDSA was currently located. Along with wanting the PDSA to remain in Hendon, they had concerns that the site was too isolated and difficult for elderly residents to get to</li> <li>● “Don’t want the PDSA in this far off location where public transport is so scant”</li> <li>● “Another pretty picture of development in a distant corner of the borough”</li> </ul>
19	To what extent do you support or oppose the current proposals for the former Quinta Club?	276	<p>In total:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 6% of the 276 respondents strongly supported the plans</li> <li>● 17% of respondents supported the proposals</li> <li>● 29% of respondents strongly objected to these proposals</li> <li>● 4% of respondents objected to these proposals</li> <li>● 32% of respondents neither supported nor objected to the plans</li> <li>● 11% of respondents selected “don’t know”</li> </ul>
20	Please explain your answer?	193	<p>Those in support of the proposals commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The current building needed to be redeveloped and this would be a good use of space</li> <li>● “Redevelopment of this site would serve a good purpose”</li> </ul> <p>Those in objection stated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● They wanted the SLRS (School Libraries Resources Service) to</li> </ul>

Question no.	Question	No. respondents	Themes of feedback
			<p>remain in Hendon and within the current library</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They believed the new proposed location was too isolated and difficult for visitors to get to</li> <li>• “If the older 1970s infill buildings of Hendon Library are demolished, gutted and rebuilt, there would no need for the SLRS to move”</li> <li>• “This will increase road traffic on an already busy and narrow road”</li> </ul>
21	Do you have any comments on the community benefits that we have identified which could be delivered as part of the project?	215	<p>The majority who commented were sceptical about the community benefits that would be delivered as part of the project. Respondents felt the University would stand to benefit much more than the community would. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “The negative effects outweigh the benefits for the residents”</li> <li>• “The university is taking over the area and its expansion is treating Hendon not as a community but as a resource to be used to the university's financial advantage”</li> </ul> <p>One respondent stated that keeping the Meritage Centre and the PDSA Hospital within Hendon and in new building would “benefit people’s feeling of well being”.</p> <p>Another respondent asked whether free courses could be offered to the community by Middlesex University.</p>
22	Do you have any suggestions about further community benefits that could be	198	<p>Suggestions about further community benefits included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essential road cleaning and public space maintenance</li> </ul>

Question no.	Question	No. respondents	Themes of feedback
	delivered as part of this project?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Safer Neighbourhood Team and police station</li> <li>• GP surgery</li> <li>• Affordable housing for the existing long term community</li> <li>• Children bike racks</li> <li>• More free parking</li> </ul>
23	This project could generate approximately £1.6million of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money. Do you have any comments or suggestions of how this CIL money could be spent to contribute and further improve the local area?	190	<p>Suggestions about how the CIL could be spent included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fixing potholes and road repairs</li> <li>• Improving Fuller Street Estate</li> <li>• Improving Hendon Park playground</li> <li>• Green landscaping</li> <li>• Creating a bus lane on A41</li> <li>• An additional medical centre of local residents, to take the strain off the Phoenix Practice and St George's Medical Centre</li> <li>• Youth projects</li> </ul>
24	Do you have any comments on parking in the area, how it is currently used and managed, and what might be reasonably required in the future?	215	<p>Respondents commented that parking spaces needed to be retained in the area and provision should be increased. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Parking is limited in the whole area, so shouldn't be removing spaces where they exist"</li> <li>• "More car parks definitely needed".</li> </ul> <p>There was also concern that if spaces were taken away due to car parks being redeveloped the parking situation would worsen.</p>
25	What kind of community facilities would you like to see provided as part of the Hendon Hub project?	192	<p>Suggestions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community hall</li> <li>• Improved playgrounds</li> <li>• Sports facilities</li> <li>• A swimming pool</li> <li>• More green spaces</li> <li>• Law centre</li> </ul>

Question no.	Question	No. respondents	Themes of feedback
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allotments</li> <li>• Dentist and GP surgeries</li> <li>• Restaurants and cafes</li> </ul> <p>There were also comments which indicated a desire for the library to keep where it is and the same services to remain.</p>
26	What kind of public spaces (e.g. piazza or courtyard areas, green spaces, play space etc.) would you like to see created as part of the Hendon Hub project?	192	<p>Many respondents wanted to see the introduction of more green spaces and children's play areas. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Safe, well lit, green spaces with benches. Swings and sand pits for children"</li> <li>• Green space essential. But how about investing in Sunny hill park?</li> </ul> <p>One respondent asked where the protected cycling infrastructure was.</p>
27	Do you currently make use of any Middlesex University facilities? If so, which ones? If not, what might you want to use in the future?"	201	<p>Some respondents were not aware that they were able to use some of Middlesex University's facilities.</p> <p>Some of facilities used by respondents included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gym</li> <li>• Tennis court</li> <li>• Library</li> <li>• The Atrium</li> <li>• Swimming pool</li> </ul> <p>Although they did not specify the type, one respondent suggested that they would like to see classes/workshops available to residents.</p>
28	Do you have any further comments or feedback you would like to give?	245	<p>Respondents typically reiterated their general sentiment and view of the proposals, as set out for the preceding questions.</p>

**Equalities questions**

- 3.27 The feedback form concluded with stakeholder and equalities-related questions. To assist the team in complying with the duty under the Equality Act 2010 respondents were asked to provide equalities monitoring data and it was explained that collecting this information will help understand the needs of different communities, and that all the information provided will be treated in the strictest confidence and will be stored securely in accordance with our responsibilities under data protection legislation (such as the General Data Protection Regulation or the Data Protection Act 2018). The response profile for each protected characteristic is shown below. Due to the low completion of these questions and small sample sizes it has not been possible to analyse or draw out any conclusion on the findings by protected characteristics.
- 3.28 More information on equalities and how this has been considered can be found in the Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) which has been prepared as part of the Full Business Case.
- 3.29 Below is a breakdown of the answers to the Equalities questions.

*Are you responding as:*

<b>Are you responding as:</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>
A Barnet Resident	256 (90%)
A Barnet Resident and Business	8 (3%)
A person who works in the London Borough of Barnet Area	6 (2%)
Not answered this question	6 (2%)
A Barnet Business	3 (1%)
A Student/Staff Member at Middlesex University	2 (1%)
A Resident/Business outside of Barnet	1 (<1%)
Representing a Voluntary/Community Organisation	1 (<1%)

*Which ward do you live in?*

<b>Ward</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>
Hendon	214 (76%)
West Hendon	16 (6%)
Mill Hill	9 (3%)
Brunswick Park	7 (2%)
Colindale	4 (1%)
Golders Green	4 (1%)
Edgware	4 (1%)
Finchley Church End	3 (1%)

High Barnet	2 (1%)
Underhill	2 (1%)
Burnt Oak	1 (<1%)
East Finchley	1 (<1%)
No answer	17 (6%)

*How did you find out about this consultation?*

Method	Number of responses*
Leaflet	84
Social Media (Facebook, Twitter etc)	72
Word of mouth/friends/neighbours	53
Other (including a petition, online and the library)	32
Not answered this question	16
Hendon resident forum/Neighbourhood Watch	10
Next door/Neighbourhood App	9
Newspaper/Press	6
LBB website	3
Middlesex University	3

*\*Totals more than 283 as some respondents stated they received notification of the consultation in multiple ways*

### **Profile of protected characteristics**

- 3.30 The council is required by law (the Equality Act 2010) to pay due regard to equalities in eliminating unlawful discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity, and fostering good relations between people from different groups.
- 3.31 The protected characteristics identified in the Equality Act 2010 are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation.
- 3.32 To assist the Council in complying with the duty under the Equality Act 2010 we asked respondents to provide equalities monitoring data and explained that collecting this information will help us understand the needs of our different communities and that all the information provided will be treated in the strictest confidence and will be stored securely in accordance with our responsibilities under data protection legislation (such as the General Data Protection Regulation or the Data Protection Act 2018).

3.33 The following tables show the responses of people who took part in the Hendon Hub consultation.

*In which age group do you fall?*

Age	Number of responses
16-17	2 (1%)
18-24	12 (4%)
25-34	40 (14%)
35-44	59 (21%)
45-54	71 (25%)
55-64	49 (17%)
65-74	16 (6%)
75+	6 (2%)
Prefer not to say	14 (5%)
Not answered this question	14 (5%)

*Are you:*

Sex	Number of responses
Male	116 (41%)
Female	126 (45%)
Prefer not to say	29 (10%)
Not answered this question	12 (4%)

*If you prefer to use your own term, please provide it here:*

Answer	Number of responses
Sdgsd ( <i>unclear if a typo or intentional</i> )	1 (<1%)
Not answered this question	282 (>99%)

*Are you pregnant and/or on maternity leave? (Please tick one option on each row)*

Are you pregnant?	Number of responses
No	90 (32%)
Yes	2 (<1%)
Prefer Not to Say	56 (20%)
Not answered this question	135 (48%)

Are you on maternity leave?	Number of responses
No	76 (27%)
Yes	1 (<1%)
Prefer Not to Say	54 (19%)
Not answered this question	152 (54%)



Is the gender you identify with the same as your sex registered at birth?

Is the gender you identify with the same as your sex registered at birth?	Number of responses
Yes	231 (82%)
Prefer Not to Say	40 (14%)
Not answered this question	11 (<4%)
No, it's different	1 (<1%)

What is your ethnic group? (Please tick one option only)

Ethnic Group	Number of responses
White British	140 (49%)
Prefer Not to Say	31 (11%)
Indian	25 (9%)
Any other white background	20 (7%)
Not answered this question	15 (5%)
Any other Ethnic Group	9 (3%)
Black British	8 (3%)
Irish	8 (3%)
Any other Mixed/Multiple Ethnicity	6 (2%)
Any other Asian Background	5 (2%)
Chinese	5 (2%)
Pakistani	3 (1%)
White and Asian	3 (1%)
Greek/Greek/Cypriot	2 (1%)
White and Black African	2 (1%)
Gypsy or Irish Traveller	1 (<1%)

You told us your ethnic group was... Please provide more info:

Ethnicity	Number of responses
Not answered this question	231 (82%)
Jewish	12 (4%)
No	4 (1%)
Afghanistan	3 (1%)
Ashkenazi Jewish	2 (1%)
Half Greek Cypriot/Half Seychellois	2 (1%)
American	1 (<1%)
Anglo/Indian/European	1 (<1%)
Black and White	1 (<1%)
European	1 (<1%)
European Jewish	1 (<1%)
From Continental Europe	1 (<1%)
German with British	1 (<1%)

Ethnicity	Number of responses
Iranian	1 (<1%)
South African	1 (<1%)
White European	1 (<1%)
UK Born and raised, Pakistani-Filipino parentage	1 (<1%)
UK resident since almost 30 years from Europe	1 (<1%)

*Do you consider that you have a disability?*

Disability	Number of responses
No	252 (89%)
Not answered this question	17 (6%)
Yes	14 (5%)

Those that ticked 'yes' had the opportunity to expand on their answer:

Disability	Number of responses
Prefer Not to Say	5 (2%)
Mobility	3 (1%)
Reduced Physical Capacity	3 (1%)
Learning difficulties	3 (1%)
Mental Illness	3 (1%)
Physical co-ordination	1 (<1%)
Other	1 (<1%)
Hearing	0
Vision	0
Speech	0
Severe Disfigurement	0
Not answered this question	264 (93%)

*What is your religion or belief? (Please tick one option only)*

Religion/Belief	Number of responses
Jewish	69 (24%)
Christian	64 (23%)
No Religion	46 (16%)
Prefer Not To Say	46 (16%)
Hindu	23 (8%)
Not answered this question	23 (8%)
Muslim	4 (1%)
Jain	3 (1%)
Buddhist	2 (1%)
Humanist	2 (1%)
Bahaai	1 (<1%)

What is your sexual orientation? (Please tick one option only)

Sexual Orientation	Number of responses
Straight or Heterosexual	167 (59%)
Prefer Not to Say	81 (29%)
Not answered this question	31 (11%)
Bisexual	3 (1%)
Gay or Lesbian	1 (<1%)

What is your marital status? (Please tick one option only)

What is your marital status?	Number of responses
Married	132 (47%)
Prefer Not to Say	50 (18%)
Single	47 (17%)
Not answered this question	19 (7%)
Co-habiting	16 (6%)
Divorced	11 (4%)
Widowed	4 (1%)
In a same sex civil partnership	2 (1%)

#### *Petition*

- 3.34 The council was also sent a petition on 9 June 2021 in relation to the proposal to relocate Hendon Library. This was submitted for Barnet Council's Policy & Resources Committee for consideration and discussion at the meeting on 16th June 2021.
- 3.35 The lead petitioner started the petition in response to the recent SPD consultation. The petition is for "Hendon Hub Library to stay as and where it is" and was signed by 1,382 signatories at the time of writing this report.

## 4 TEAM RESPONSES

- 4.1 The previous chapter sets out the feedback received on the Hendon Hub proposals during public consultation. This chapter responds to the feedback received, grouped by the identified themes.
- 4.2 The wider project team have provided comments on the feedback, clarifying the approach to redevelopment and the considerations informing the illustrative scheme layout, and highlighting where it has been possible to amend the proposals based on the responses received.
- 4.3 A number of potential changes to the overall plans have been identified and worked up by the project team, responding to feedback received. These changes need to be considered and agreed to as part of the consideration of the Full Business Case before they can be confirmed. The table below sets out the changes that the team are recommending be made.

Theme of feedback	Overview	Team response
University expansion	<p>Suitability of an expanding university campus in a residential area</p> <p>Concerns around increased dominance of the university in this part of Hendon</p>	<p>The emerging The Burroughs and Middlesex University Supplementary Planning Document will help to guide and influence development in and around the Middlesex University campus in the future, including these proposals for Hendon Hub.</p> <p>The University has an established presence in Hendon, leasing the two office buildings at Ravensfield and Fenella and the Building 9 unit. It has further leases over the Town Hall Annex and the majority of the Library building . The only site with no presence currently is the Meritage Centre and the proposals for this site include mixed use accommodation including student accommodation but also homes for independent living, a proposed GP surgery and a health and wellbeing facility.</p> <p>Whilst new student accommodation is proposed, the majority of these students would be in Hendon in the day as they are at present as they are attending lectures. There are also a substantial number of students who live locally in HMO's. The project team has taken on board the very clear feedback and concerns around the perceived growth of the university footprint and the scheme is now much more mixed in terms of the use of buildings, and the student numbers are proposed to be reduced.</p>

Theme of feedback	Overview	Team response
	<p>Concern about the increased number of students who would be living in the local area</p> <p>Questions about the demand for additional student accommodation given changes caused by COVID-19, Brexit etc.</p> <p>Concerns about potential increase in anti-social behaviour due to increase in students</p>	<p>The overall number of student units proposed has been reduced from what was originally consulted on, with the final number to be confirmed when a planning application is submitted. Following the first round of consultation sessions, a reduction of 200 units was proposed.</p> <p>Although COVID and Brexit will change the way university's students and staff work, learn and study, Middlesex University is at the beginning of implementing a new ten-year strategy and is thinking long-term. Importantly, therefore, these proposals give the University the flexibility to adapt the use of its estates and facilities in response to the changes that undoubtedly lie ahead in the operating environment. It also offers opportunities to redevelop older inefficient buildings that need renovation. Whilst the University will certainly be adopting a blended learning model post-pandemic, it focuses on practice-based learning, training (amongst others) key workers of the future such as police workers, nurses and midwives and these plans will enable us to have the facilities we require to continue to do so.</p> <p>Middlesex students are heavily invested in their neighbourhood. The majority of students' behaviour is excellent and those studying subjects such as nursing, social care and teaching work in the local area on their placements, and many students volunteer in the local community.</p> <p>The University is keen to work constructively and positively with its neighbours and respond quickly to any reports of antisocial behaviour thought to be linked to students. The security team can be contacted via 020 8411 7777 and a new University and Residents Forum has been set up to provide a regular point of contact. Following conversations with residents, Middlesex Deputy CEO and Head of Estates have held walk-arounds with residents and have met with the police and the Safer Neighbourhood Team to discuss how to work more closely together going forward. The University is looking into more regular patrols and increasing coverage, making it easier for those living and working in Hendon to</p>

Theme of feedback	Overview	Team response
		report crimes or suspected crimes, and reviewing CCTV coverage to eliminate significant blind spots.
Hendon Library	<p>Rationale for moving out of current building</p> <p>Loss of public access to popular community building</p> <p>Concerns about accessibility of temporary library</p>	<p>The current library building is unable to provide the kind of modern, flexible library service due to its age and condition, and the restrictions posed by being a listed building. The new library will be in an eye-catching and purpose-built contemporary building, designed to deliver a modern library service, with new warm bright, flexible and accessible open spaces, flooded with natural light.</p> <p>Public access would be maintained to the current Hendon Library building by the university. The project team and university are in discussions about how this would work and be managed in practice.</p> <p>If required, the temporary library would have the same access hours and arrangements. It would need to comply with the relevant legislation (e.g. Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964, Equality Act 2010)</p>
Consultation	<p>Publicity and awareness of the project</p> <p>Changes to feedback form during consultation being live</p> <p>Likelihood of changes being made to the proposals in response to feedback.</p>	<p>The project has been advertised intensively throughout the consultation period, including multiple rounds of leafleting, local news coverage, social media posts from the council and interested residents, direct contact with stakeholders and community groups etc.</p> <p>The feedback form was updated in order to add required questions around equalities. No feedback was discarded or lost as part of this and this report considers all feedback forms received.</p> <p>The project team has identified numerous changes to the originally presented proposals, made directly in response to feedback received. These changes are now being recommended as part of the Full Business Case.</p> <p>Whilst not all comments can be responded to, the team have sought to improve the proposals positively and</p>

Theme of feedback	Overview	Team response
	<p>Appropriateness of undertaking consultation during COVID-19 lockdown restrictions</p>	<p>proactively in response to the feedback provided throughout the consultation.</p> <p>The project team has sought to be as flexible as possible with its consultation, with a virtual consultation hub and Zoom presentations ensuring the plans could still be presented when gatherings in person were not possible. Materials have been posted to people who have requested physical copies. As soon as in-person events could be held, the team arranged these to provide those who wanted to attend that opportunity.</p> <p>Given this flexibility and use of technology it was felt appropriate to continue with the consultation. A similar approach was also taken by the LBB planning policy team for its consultation on The Burroughs and Middlesex University Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
<p>Parking</p>	<p>Loss of parking spaces, knock on impact of parking on neighbouring roads, for residents of the Prince of Wales estate, or for specific uses (e.g. visitors to local churches using the car park on Egerton Road)</p> <p>Concerns about parking spaces on Prince of Wales Close and Fuller Street</p>	<p>The proposals will re-provide approximately 30 of the 32 spaces which would be lost if the Fuller Street Car Park is redeveloped with a new PDSA Pet Hospital. This is achieved through providing additional spaces in a currently underused area within the Prince of Wales estate.</p> <p>The large Burroughs Car Park has been removed from the project proposal (see below) and so these spaces will not be lost as part of redevelopment.</p> <p>The project team is considering how parking is used in the area, so that all the parking that is reasonably required can be provided for.</p> <p>There are already parking controls on many of the roads surrounding The Burroughs which limit parking by non-residents. The project team would support the introduction of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) on the parts of the Prince of Wales estate which do not currently have them in place</p>

Theme of feedback	Overview	Team response
	Blue badge parking	The proposals currently show 3% of parking spaces as being blue badge spaces which is considered to be appropriate for student accommodation development. The requirements for this type of parking will be monitored on an annual basis.
Traffic	<p>Increase in traffic in Hendon</p> <p>Congestion around Fuller Street during school drop-off and pick-up times</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment will be submitted as part of any planning application which considers the potential impact of development on local roads. The analysis and modelling carried out by the team so far has not identified any significant increase in traffic on local roads as a result of the Hendon Hub development. An important rationale of the project is to reduce the need for students to drive to the university from home or accommodation elsewhere, which should reduce traffic and parking pressures locally.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Fuller Street car park currently experiences congestion on a weekday at school drop off and pick up times associated with St Mary's and St John's CE secondary school. This is a common issue with schools and may require council/school intervention to educate parents regarding possible alternative arrangements.</p>
Building design	Suitability of proposed new buildings in terms of height and design	The new buildings proposed as part of the Hendon Hub project will be of a high quality and replace ones which are not of architectural merit or which detract from nearby Conservation Areas. The designs of these buildings have gone through a robust and extended pre-application process with Barnet planning officers to ensure they make a positive contribution to the look and feel of The Burroughs.
Heritage and conservation	Concerns about whether building designs reflect the character and heritage of the area	The heritage and conservation aspects of Hendon Hub are important to the overall success of the project and have received careful consideration from the design team. The design team's intention has not been to try and reproduce the architecture of the historic listed buildings on The Burroughs (which are of their time) but instead create a new collection of contemporary buildings which



Theme of feedback	Overview	Team response
	<p>Consultation with Historic England</p>	<p>are high quality and meet the needs of modern users, with a distinct look and feel of their own (as the listed buildings had when they were developed).</p> <p>Historic England has met with the project team as part of the usual pre-submission engagement with important statutory consultees and design changes have been made in line with their feedback.</p>
<p>Antisocial behaviour</p>	<p>Antisocial or criminal behaviour carried out by students or people linked to them</p>	<p>Middlesex University has already sought to put new policies and procedures in place to tackle any potential antisocial behaviour from students, as well as better publicising existing channels for communication with the university.</p> <p>A new resident engagement forum has been set up to allow regular contact with neighbours.</p> <p>A Metropolitan Police facility is now proposed within the new Hendon Library.</p>
<p>Housing</p>	<p>Concerns about the increase in housing in the area</p>	<p>These sites are felt to be suitable for new housing and currently planning policy supports the delivery of new housing on brownfield land. They are sustainably located in walking distance of the Hendon District Shopping Centre and Hendon Central Underground Station.</p>
<p>Timescales</p>	<p>If approved, when would the demolition of current buildings and construction of new ones take place?</p> <p>How long will construction last for?</p>	<p>The overall timescales for demolition and construction have not yet been finalised and will depend on the outcome of the town planning process. The overall timetabling and programme also have to be carefully managed to fit in with the requirements of the university, library service and community uses being relocated. However, it is currently anticipated that work could start in a phased approach from May 2022.</p> <p>The final phases of construction work are currently anticipated to complete in approximately mid-2025. More information on project timescales will be able to be</p>

Theme of feedback	Overview	Team response
		confirmed in the future, should planning permission be granted.
Community facilities	<p>Concern about future community space for residents</p> <p>Meritage Centre a vital hub that cannot be lost</p>	<p>There will be no loss of community space as part of Hendon Hub; the uses currently based within the Meritage Centre and elsewhere within the site boundaries are to be relocated nearby as part of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PDSA is proposed to be moved circa 170 yards away from where they are currently located with their new building proposed to be located on the current Fuller Street car park just to the rear of their current facility. The time to walk from the existing to the proposed facility is likely to be less than three minutes for a person without mobility issues. The new facility will be modern, fit for purpose accommodation with dedicated car parking spaces and has been designed to PDSA's specification and requirements. It is proposed that a long lease of the site is provided to PDSA.</li> <li>• The African Cultural Association (ACA), Meridian and the community hall are proposed to be relocated to a new community hub that is to be located approximately 0.3 miles away from their existing facilities, on the RFC site. The time to walk from the existing to the proposed facility is likely to be circa six minutes for a person without mobility issues. The new facilities will be located adjacent to the proposed library building and will occupy a prominent location on The Burroughs. It is recommended that the Committee agrees to the use of the Community Benefit Assessment Tool (CBAT) on the grant of the new leases in respect of the following units. All these uses are currently assessed on the CBAT tool for their existing units. The Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) will also be located in the same 'community hub' on the RFC site.</li> <li>• The MENCAP unit is proposed to be relocated to 154 Station Road, Hendon, which is a council-owned building located approximately 0.6 miles away from their current facility on the Meritage Centre (a circa 14 minute walk for a person without mobility issues, or a</li> </ul>

Theme of feedback	Overview	Team response
		<p>five minute drive). MENCAP have a proposed change in service offer that this building will better facilitate and this relocation site has been worked up in tandem with them. It is recommended that the Committee agrees to the use of the Community Benefit Assessment Tool (CBAT) on the grant of the new lease in respect of this unit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACA, CAB, Meridian and the community hall will all require temporary facilities, whilst the development is taking place, with the earliest being required by May 2022. It is proposed that these are located locally to the existing facilities to ensure minimal service disruption. The project team are actively working on finding temporary relocation sites either on Brent Street, on the Burroughs or in other local facilities. The team are working with Middlesex University and also looking at the programming of the development, to ensure that the users who currently use the community hall can be fully facilitated during the development. Equalities Impact Assessments will be undertaken for both the temporary and permanent moves.</li> <li>• Hendon Library is proposed to move across the road on The Burroughs circa 110 yards away (a circa two minute walk away for a person without mobility issues). It is proposed to include an improved disabled access, better planned space to take into account equalities for all users with the addition of 100 sq m for the use of the community and local groups. The library will be rent free.</li> <li>• The Schools Library Service (SLS) is proposed to be relocated to the Quinta Club, which is located circa 6.3 miles away from its current facility in Hendon Library (or a circa 16 minute drive, depending on traffic). It is a destination use as it will be used specifically by schools and will not be a facility that is generally open to the public. It will provide a far superior facility for the Schools Library Service, who currently operate in cramped conditions in Hendon Library. It will provide larger, fit for purpose accommodation for the SLA as a designated facility, with better car parking and access for local schools.</li> </ul>

Theme of feedback	Overview	Team response
		<p>The accommodation is a Council owned facility and as such will be rent free for the service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equalities Impact Assessments will be undertaken for all proposed moves, in conjunction with the individual uses.</li> </ul>
Infrastructure	Concerns there would not be sufficient services to support all the additional residents	<p>The Hendon Hub project is expected to generate approx. £1.6million of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds which can be used to support infrastructure investment and local projects.</p> <p>The team are also looking to relocate a healthcare facility to within the project as part of the updated plans now being recommended, into modern and purpose-built accommodation.</p>
Benefits	Concerns that only the University would benefit from the plans	<p>The project will deliver numerous public benefits for the local community, as captured in the consultation materials. Examples include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new public Hendon Library with improved services</li> <li>• Replacement and purpose-built new PDSA Pet Hospital</li> <li>• Improved accommodation for the community uses currently based at the Meritage Centre in a new Community Hub</li> <li>• Improved open green space, landscape planting and seating</li> <li>• Improved green space around the Daniel Almshouses</li> <li>• Better signage and walking routes to/from Hendon Central along Watford Way</li> <li>• New pedestrian crossings and traffic calming</li> <li>• New shops and/or cafes opposite the Town Hall</li> <li>• Safer public spaces with CCTV and improved lighting to help prevent any anti-social behaviour</li> <li>• Improved open and green spaces within the Prince of Wales estate</li> <li>• New student accommodation and retail space to generate approximately £1.6million of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money, which can be used to support infrastructure investment and local projects</li> </ul>

Theme of feedback	Overview	Team response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional spend in local economy from students living in Hendon</li> <li>• Jobs and apprenticeships for residents created through the circa £90million construction programme</li> </ul>
PDSA	<p>Rationale for the redevelopment of the facility</p> <p>Desire to see the facility remain within Hendon</p> <p>Suitability of Fuller Street</p>	<p>The current PDSA Pet Hospital is not a purpose-built facility, and the Hendon Hub project provides an opportunity to deliver a much-improved facility for the charity.</p> <p>Whilst the proposals originally consulted on would have seen the facility relocated to the Osidge Lane site, the latest recommendation of the project team is that the PDSA is now moved to the Fuller Street car park site, close to its current location and within Hendon.</p> <p>This site is a very short distance from its current location and so will be familiar to those who currently visit the Pet Hospital.</p>
Large Burroughs Car Park	Loss of parking spaces, knock on impact of parking on neighbouring roads	<p>Having considered this point the proposal is that this site be removed from the Hendon Hub project, meaning it will not be redeveloped with new homes and would remain as a car park.</p> <p>It may still be required to provide a temporary location for Hendon Library whilst the new library site is developed. The team is working to try and avoid requiring this.</p>
Osidge Lane – Parking	Loss of parking spaces, knock on impact of parking on neighbouring roads and businesses	Having considered this point the proposal is that this site be removed from the Hendon Hub project, meaning it will remain a car park as it currently is.
Osidge Lane – PDSA	Introduction of a new pet hospital to a residential area, loss of facility from existing area and community it serves	<p>The recommendation of the project team is that this site be removed from the Hendon Hub project, meaning it will not be redeveloped with a new PDSA Pet Hospital.</p> <p>The team is now proposing the new Pet Hospital be developed on the Fuller Street car park in Hendon.</p>

Theme of feedback	Overview	Team response
Osidge Lane - Timescales	Duration of the project and date of completion	The recommendation of the project team is that this site is removed from the Hendon Hub project, meaning it will not be redeveloped with a new PDSA Pet Hospital
Osidge Lane – Disruption to local area	Concern about potential impact on the PDSA Hospital on residents living in Osidge Lane areas	The recommendation of the project team is that this site is removed from the Hendon Hub project, meaning it will not be redeveloped with a new PDSA Pet Hospital
Osidge Lane - Traffic	Potential increase in traffic in the area due to relocation of PDSA Hospital	The recommendation of the project team is that this site be removed from the Hendon Hub project, meaning it will not be redeveloped with a new PDSA Pet Hospital. Traffic in the area will now not be affected by this site.
Osidge Lane - Consultation	Desire to know radius used for the leaflet drop  Suggestion that local stakeholders were unaware of the plans	Leaflets promoting the consultation were sent to properties within a 500m radius of the site, which would have included for example the nearby Brunswick Park School.
Quinta Club – Village Green	Desire to see the Village Green status of the Quinta open space acknowledged	The Village Green status is now acknowledged in planning documents.
Quinta Club – Security	Potential unauthorised or illegal access to the Village Green	Bollards or similar security measures will be put in place to prevent vehicles accessing the Village Green, whilst ensuring some are moveable to allow access for maintenance.
Quinta Club – Traffic and road safety	Road traffic safety on Mays Lane	Available data suggests there have been very few recorded accidents in the vicinity of the site. Furthermore, there will be only a low level of travel to and from the site by SLRS staff. Visibility at the access to the site will be improved through some careful pruning and maintenance of the hedges either side of the access point.

Theme of feedback	Overview	Team response
Quinta Club - Consultation	Some residents unaware of the consultation	Leaflets promoting the consultation were sent to properties within a 500m radius of the site, and for the second round, the notification was emailed directly to people who had registered their interest.
Quinta Club – External uses	Types of external groups who will be able to rent out the facilities	This space will be available for hire by community groups or local residents. This hire will need to fit with the size of the space and use of building by the SLRS - it will not be suitable for parties or social gathering, for example, but for small-scale meetings.
Quinta Club - Timescales	Duration of the project and date of completion	The overall timescales for the refurbishment of the former Quinta Club have not yet been finalised and will depend on the outcome of the town planning process. However, it is currently anticipated that work could start in early 2022 and last for 12 months.
Hendon Fire Station	Is Hendon Fire Station a part of the Hendon Hub project?	No, the fire station is not within the Hendon Hub project and will not be redeveloped as part of it.
Compulsory Purchase	Concerns about the use of Compulsory Purchase powers on this project; questions about its suitability	The use of compulsory purchase powers is only ever a last resort. The project team would hope that any properties required could be purchased directly through negotiation with owners.

## 5 CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

- 5.1 The London Borough of Barnet is preparing proposals to redevelop several sites in and around The Burroughs in Hendon as part of the Hendon Hub project. This will integrate academic and civic spaces along The Burroughs, working in partnership with Middlesex University and other key stakeholders to create a place that everyone can be proud of, and which will deliver significant new investment.
- 5.2 Hendon Hub comprises a mixed-use development opportunity in Hendon's The Burroughs, providing services to the community and Middlesex University. There are three core sites to the scheme: Ravensfield, Fenella and Car Park (RFC); Building 9 (including the Town Hall, Town Hall Annex, and Hendon Library), and the Meritage Centre (MC) site. Other satellite sites are to be incorporated to house relocations and landscaping improvements.
- 5.3 There will be no loss in community facilities, with the following services to be relocated and be more accessible within as part of the development:
- Hendon Library to the RFC Site
  - Meridian from the MC Site to the RFC Site
  - African Cultural Association from the MC Site to the RFC Site
  - Citizen's Advice Bureau to RFC Site
- 5.4 This consultation began on 26 February 2021 and closed on 7 June 2021. During this time, the project team has sought to consult and engage with neighbours and local community groups prior to the finalisation of the project and the submission of planning applications. As well as meetings held with Council planning officers, extensive stakeholder and public consultation has been undertaken through several virtual and in-person consultation events, the use of a dedicated virtual consultation platform: [www.hendonhub.co.uk](http://www.hendonhub.co.uk), regular briefings for local councillors and other stakeholders, and meetings with members of the public. Printed copies and other alternative formats of the consultation materials were also made available on request.
- 5.5 People with an interest in the proposals have been able to provide their feedback in several different ways, including an online feedback form, through writing to or emailing the team, over the phone or directly at consultation events.



- 5.6 The project team has sought to respond to the feedback received from local residents, LBB planning officers, statutory planning consultees and others and has made numerous changes to the overall proposals as a result. These proposed changes are set out in Chapter 4, although they cannot be confirmed unless the Full Business Case has been approved by the Policy and Resources Committee. These are, however, the recommendations of the project team, who have sought to improve and refine the proposals in response to feedback provided during the consultation.
- 5.7 More information about how the proposals have been developed, refined and finalised through consultation with the public, council planning officers and others will be available in the documents that would be submitted as part of any future planning applications. This would include the Design and Access Statement and Planning Statement, as well as the Statement of Pre-application Consultation.
- 5.8 The project team will also continue to keep interested residents and stakeholders updated on the submission and progress of the application, all of which will be available on the [www.hendonhub.co.uk](http://www.hendonhub.co.uk) project website.
- 5.9 If planning applications were to be submitted, interested residents and stakeholders would have a further opportunity to provide comments and feedback through the Council's public access system as part of the statutory consultation that is undertaken on all applications.

**General Disclaimer**

This report has been prepared by GL Hearn Limited (GL Hearn) for the London Borough of Barnet (“the Client”) and is for the sole use and benefit of the Client in accordance with the agreement between the Client and GL Hearn under which GL Hearn’s services were performed. GL Hearn accepts no liability to any other party in respect of the contents of this report. This report is confidential and may not be disclosed by the Client or relied on by any other party without the express prior written consent of GL Hearn.

Whilst care has been taken in the construction of this report, the conclusions and recommendations which it contains are based upon information provided by third parties (“Third Party Information”). GL Hearn has for the purposes of this report relied upon and assumed that the Third Party Information is accurate and complete and has not independently verified such information for the purposes of this report. GL Hearn makes no representation, warranty or undertaking (express or implied) in the context of the Third Party Information and no responsibility is taken or accepted by GL Hearn for the adequacy, completeness or accuracy of the report in the context of the Third Party Information on which it is based.

## **Appendices**

- APPENDIX A:** FEBRUARY CONSULTATION LEAFLETS
- APPENDIX B:** SCOPE AREAS USED FOR LEAFLET MAILOUTS
- APPENDIX C:** MARCH CONSULTATION LEAFLETS
- APPENDIX D:** MAY CONSULTATION LEAFLETS
- APPENDIX E:** INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS
- APPENDIX F:** COUNCIL SOCIAL MEDIA POSTS
- APPENDIX G:** HENDON HUB WEBSITE
- APPENDIX H:** CONSULTATION BOARDS
- APPENDIX I:** MAY DROP-IN INVITATION
- APPENDIX J:** CO-DESIGN STREET SESSION LEAFLET
- APPENDIX K:** PROMOTION VIA FIRST TEAM
- APPENDIX L:** HENDON LIBRARY SURVEY
- APPENDIX M:** HENDON LIBRARY SURVEY ANALYSIS
- APPENDIX N:** CONSULTATION FEEDBACK FORM