

## **Appendix B – Schedule of Representations and Responses to The Burroughs and Middlesex University Draft Supplementary Planning Document**

- 240 emailed and written responses
- 109 Questionnaires
- Petition with 650 signatures

Although there is no proposal in the SPD with regard to Hendon Library a petition with 1,392 signatories was submitted in relation to the consultation on the SPD.

All responses were carefully considered as many of the issues highlighted throughout the consultation process went beyond the remit of planning, and therefore the scope of this SPD. However, where feedback related to planning matters these have helped to shape revisions to the SPD. In summary these changes are :

- Amended and expanded vision and objectives to take account of a much broader set of benefits for the area beyond the focus on Middlesex University.
- References to prioritising the well-being of existing residents and secure new and enhanced community assets. Including where possible dual use facilities.
- A strengthened emphasis on the importance of historic character and archaeology and how this would be considered through any planning application process.
- Clarification on the principle that any redevelopment of car park sites within the area would need to be supported by sufficient evidence to justify reduction in car parking capacity.
- The SPD boundary has been amended to reflect concerns that it had been drawn inaccurately and needed to reflect property boundaries.
- Greater detail has been added to the description of the four identified Character Areas so as to guide new development appropriately.
- One of the original sites has been removed in response to the University stating it has no intention to develop its car park site on Greyhound Hill.

## Responses by General Issue

| General Issue              | Response   |
|----------------------------|--|
| University Expansion       | Buildings are being redeveloped across the area as the University is aiming to improve its teaching facilities and offer more students the opportunity to live near the campus. The University has stated it does not intend to increase the number of students enrolling into the Hendon campus.  |
| Community Cohesion         | The SPD encourages the formation of a residents' forum and for the University, students, Council and residents to work together to create a cohesive community.  |
| Community Resources        | Local Plan Policy requires that community resources must be re-provided at an equivalent quality and in a suitable location, so that redevelopment of sites do not result in the loss of community uses. The Council works with the NHS to ensure that there are adequate health services for an area.   |
| No Community Benefit       | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area. Each of the development principles will seek to ensure a balanced and integrated approach to the future development of the area. |
| Oppose Compulsory Purchase | If the Council are to consider CPO to assemble sites, the scheme will need to fit with the planning policy framework and deliver positive benefits to the area through a viable, fundable and deliverable proposal. This is not a tool for the university to acquire assets.   |
| Historical Value           | This part of Hendon has a heritage and history that provides a unique and distinctive character that must inform the any new development in the area.  |
| No Community Benefit       | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area. Each of the development principles will seek to ensure a balanced and integrated approach to the future development of the area. |
| Parking                    | Text amended to reflect that the Council acknowledges the importance of convenient parking for residents and businesses in the area.   |

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Consultation | Due to ongoing government restrictions it was necessary to consult on the SPD remotely, as has been the case for many other Councils throughout the pandemic. There has been positive feedback nationally that community involvement has increased as a result of the virtual consultation opportunities and this was also the case in Barnet as numbers participating across various consultation events has increased from previous face to face meetings. Responses have been accepted by email or post and through the questionnaire. |
|--------------|---|

### Responses by Specific Issues

| Comment   | Council Response   |
|---|--|
| Provision of conventional and affordable housing – The SPD clearly states in its aims that it is looking to explore opportunities for student and conventional housing. There is no mention in the document of provision of conventional housing and it concentrates solely on student accommodation. There is no mention anywhere in the SPD of provision of affordable housing to Barnet residents. Given the under provision of affordable housing in the past across Barnet and the continuation of this trend in 2019-2020 from a new build perspective, can you please explain this?  | More detail as to where conventional housing will be in will be available through the Hendon Hub project and at planning application stage   |
| To begin, why are the residential properties in my street included in the SPD boundary? These plans include evicting residents from 13-21 Prince of Wales Close in order to build student accommodation...it is highly suspicious that the rest of the street is included within the SPD boundary, leading residents to believe that in the near future the same fate will befall us, whether through tenancy eviction or Compulsory Purchase Orders. The boundary could stop by the PDSA. This is not to say that I agree to the plans for building student accommodation on the sites of the PDSA, or the Meritage centre-I do not, I object to them...these facilities are crucial to the community, as are the Library and Town Hall. | SPD Boundary was drawn using geographical markers such as roads and pathways and in some cases property boundaries. However this is not an indication of whether a property is to be redeveloped it is only to provide a geographical extent of the SPD. |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>I would specifically like to know whether residential homes that are on land owned by Barnet Council and managed by Barnet Homes, which lie within the SPD boundary, will be at risk of redevelopment IN THE FUTURE.</p>  | <p>SPD Boundary was drawn using geographical markers such as roads and pathways and in some cases property boundaries. However this is not an indication of whether a property is to be redeveloped it is only to provide a geographical extent of the SPD.</p> |
| <p>There are comments in the SPD on maintaining character. These are residential family streets and houses. The university has stretched broadly already with their developments to date. The construction of any commercial sized blocks will harm the aesthetic. When we walk along Egerton Gardens with our daughter we pass the churches on the corner and face the town hall. It is a beautiful sight. Please take my comments into consideration as well as my fellow residents.</p>                                 | <p>SPD is clear that in considering any new development proposal there needs to be a balance against recognising the importance of the established residential character and the historic significance of the area.</p>   |
| <p>I appeal to you, for the sake of our little heritage houses, please help us to get the proposed developments of the car parks on The Burroughs and Burroughs Gardens removed from the SPD. I'm sure there must be a way to improve the street scene and make them more attractive without building over them. Plant some trees? An attractive heritage style archway? With 6700 homes being built at Brent Cross, our little car parks offer such a small building opportunity, why do they want them??</p>             | <p>Text amended to reflect that the Council acknowledges the importance of convenient parking for residents and businesses in the area.</p>   |
| <p>There is much said in the SPD of benefits for residents and the local community, but when several people questioned what the benefits were there wasn't a detailed answer and all that was offered by planners was the vague possibility of access to some University facilities. This is something that has been asked about in the past and never occurred. Even if It is offered it is hardly a major benefit. Why isn't it clearly stated in the SPD exactly what the actual benefits to the community will be?</p> | <p>SPD encourages the University to provide residents with better access to their facilities. The Council will work with the University to ensure that residents are able to receive benefits to living close to the University.</p>                            |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>• The SPD is a collection of documents. What Barnet Council is now trying to do, is to put policy in place so that future applications can be policy compliant, however, the proposals go against current policy. • The current Local Plan Core Strategy (CS5) protects and enhances the Borough's suburbs and historic areas and the Plan's Development Management Policies are intended to protect Barnet's character and amenities (DM01), and preserve and enhances Barnet's heritage assets (DM06). What the Council is now proposing runs counter to those policies, above all the stipulation that any development here must be sympathetic and seek to preserve and enhance the overall character and heritage of this area. The proposed development would necessarily exacerbate footfall, reduce residential parking, and place a greater strain on local infrastructure. • In 2012, Barnet conducted a Character Appraisal and Management Proposals for Hendon - the Burroughs.</p> | <p>The Local Plan policies are the main policies that the SPD must adhere to. An SPD can only add detail to a policy it cannot introduce new policy or contradict Local Plan policy.</p>                  |
| <p>I trust the SPD will be returned to the drawing board and that the council will strongly consider the wisdom of handing swathes of land with cultural significance to a private institution to the detriment of the local community.</p>  | <p>It is important that a planning framework is in place to ensure that the quality and character of the area is enhanced when proposals come forward.</p>  |
| <p>However, the document being broad and general itself, does not mention any of the issues which are of the essential importance to the local residents and general public. Even the three supporting appendices do not address in the plain language the public concerns identified as early as March 2020 as stated in the Consultation Statement. It has been very much evident that the same concerns together with compulsory purchases and financing of the development have been prevailing also throughout the six weeks statutory public consultation period. The concrete, clear and substantiated answers have not been provided during Q&amp;A sessions.</p>  | <p>The SPD is a planning document seeking planning solutions to the issues that have been highlighted in the area. Many of these issues are within the scope of agencies outside the planning system.</p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>In addition to the above concerns, I would like to comment on the following issues which I hope will be addressed before the adoption of this SPD as these will have direct impact not only on the local residents, but also on the local conservation areas and the heritage: 1.1.7 It is not clear how the boundary of the SPD Frame Work area was identified and established for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o It excludes an integral part of conservation area from the Character Area 3 around and including St Marys Church which in turn is designated as the focus for one of the key views. Although the church and the church yard are in the third-party ownership, the SPD boundary follows for some strange reason the footpath through the church yard/cemetery. . Does that mean that half of the churchyard boundary wall may get funds to be repaired?</li> <li>o It excludes the Farm House and its yards. The whole Farm House plot is already leased to MU and represents very important link to the Sunny Hill Park as the green corridor described in the Landscaping Assessment.</li> <li>o It excludes short dead end of Wroughton Terrace where it meets Church Road, and where the entrance to West View alleyway is. . This currently very dilapidated and neglected stretch of the road is very much used by both local residents and students as the alternative pedestrian route to Hendon Central tube station.</li> <li>o It would be beneficial to clarify if the wider areas beyond the current Frame Work boundary would receive qualitative benefits through the planning contribution i.e. resurfacing of the Church Road will not stop at the corner with Sunny Gardens Road or the pavement will be fixed and cleared of the visual clutter on the opposite side of the Church Road from the Character Area 4.</li> </ul> | <p>SPD Boundary was drawn using geographical markers such as roads and pathways and in some cases property boundaries. However this is not an indication of whether a property is to be redeveloped it is only to provide a geographical extent of the SPD.</p> <p>Improvements can be made to the wider area of Hendon. These could be delivered from planning contributions made by developers across the area.</p> |
| <p>As the role of this Draft SPD is to ensure the planning and design parameters for such a large investment within the area are clearly established, it is questionable how the principles for the above mentioned allocation of various uses were determined. If the final SPD is to truly contain information of this nature, before a master plan of the area has been done and approved, the following comments should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Opportunity site B belongs to the sensitive conservation area within the quiet northern part of the SPD boundary.</li> <li>o The Greyhound Pub, St Marys Church, the Farm House, Old vicarage and ex- Checkers Pub now mix use development together with the Alms houses at the end of Church End represent the oldest part of Hendon.</li> <li>o The opportunity site B is situated on the outside of the gentle curve of the Church End on the top of the Greyhound Hill surrounded by listed buildings and the historic graveyard on its northern side.</li> <li>o Given the sensitivity of the area, there is a consensus among the local residents that opportunity site B should be allocated for the theatre which could be the best use of the site for the following reasons: . It provides opportunity for outstanding architectural design which would be suitable within the historic context. Strategically set back from the road curve, it would create</li> </ul>  | <p>The SPD as a high level planning framework shows a good understanding of local character that further masterplanning will provide more detail on.</p>  |

open space and mirror the large space in front of the old vicarage on the other side of Church End. It will provide a link along the Southern wall of the church /graveyard to St Marys School rear entrance. It should elevate Church Terrace from an unpleasant access route to Sunny Hill park to a pleasant walk between the theatre, the school and church yard. It would have controlled number of people at any time. Some of the theatre visitors could support the last old pub in the area thus enhancing the opportunity for business and securing its longevity.

. The newly created open space with public benches will be one of the most pleasant spaces for local gathering of all ages. The whole area would acquire civic status and it would be alternative to the more formal the Burroughs. The northern gate of the MU fence should be widened to allow student to access this now civic area as well as Green Route access towards the park. The reasons why the opportunity site B should not contain student accommodation for 300 units are as follows: The area around the church is very quiet and it attracts local residents and park visitors. Some out of 300 students or other individuals during the time when students do not occupy them could exhibit antisocial behaviour. The church/graveyard is very fragile environment without artificial lighting where occasionally and specially recently senseless vandalism is committed on historic gravestones. There has been strong activity of drug dealing in the currently abandoned areas of opportunity sites B and C and that should not be encouraged by bringing the large number of young people to the area where school children are already exposed to this activity. Potential for the littering of the secluded area where there is not much of pedestrian traffic. The area is currently avoided by the local residents because of its remoteness and it will be even more avoided if there is nothing else apart from student accommodation. This site should not contain 4 residential units as it is not appropriate for residential use due to its remoteness out of the main pedestrian routes. Opportunity site C should contain reprovision of residential units and community uses. Residential seams most appropriate use as the site is surrounded by the same and it would be continuation of the same use instead of the carpark. A feasibility study should be carried out to determine what level and which kind of community use the site could accommodate. The whole of the student accommodation, 800 units together with the underground parking and ground floor retail units should be located to the opportunity area E. The opportunity for the high-level architectural design in accordance to the design guidelines and planning requirements would complete urban regeneration of this main civic area. o Opportunity sites F and G should be also considered for infill buildings for either residential or part of MU general requirements.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>4.4 The north-eastern gate of the MU fence next to the entrance to Hendon Scouts should be widened to allow student and general public to access Green Route towards Church terrace park entry.</p>   | <p>This is a detailed matter to be addressed through a planning application.</p>   |
| <p>4.5 By creating the new theatre next to the school, the church, the pub and various community activities as well as the park, the inclusion of the community will be much greater as the building will be used by both the community and MU as well as the visitors outside the area.</p>   | <p>Further work would need to be undertaken by the University to determine if this is the most suitable site for a theatre given the design, historic, and environmental constraints</p>   |
| <p>4.5.9 Planning obligations must be enforced for the duration of the lease.</p>  | <p>The SPD cannot enforce this as planning obligations are subject to negotiation.</p>   |
| <p>Apart from the obvious small economic contribution which increased number of residing students will provide together with some employment opportunities within the new developments, it is not clear what other benefits the rest of this Hendon area may receive. The proposed development and face lifting of the area within the SPD boundary should happened regardless of complex leasing and financial arrangements between LBB and MU. The local residents would expect provision of parking, enhanced security, landscaping, resurfacing, community library and community activity places and everything that is mentioned within the SPD as a norm rather than the reward for surrendering public buildings to the private ownership. At the same time, it is hard to see how the nearby Brent Street town centre will be enhanced and develop any time soon as it is not destined for regeneration within LBB Local Plan Core Strategy DPD. 4.6 Being the one of the main thoroughfares in the area and given the physical limitations of the A504 it will be very difficult to see mayor reductions in vehicular traffic, or significant improvements for cyclist and pedestrians.</p> | <p>The economic potential of new investment and the benefits it can provide for the area including the two nearby town centres is highlighted in the SPD. The SPD is responding to the opportunities for growth and investment in the area. Without these opportunities there is no S106 or CIL to deliver enhancements such as public realm or road improvements. Town centres are playing a key role in attracting investment through housing led mixed use development.</p> |



|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Junction of A405 and Church Road can be improved by a small extension and the offset of the road curve, impinging on the MU and LBB's land on either side of Church End. Moving the road half meter away from Alms houses would create also wider pavement in front of them which would be welcomed improvement. With the clever traffic engineering even small widening of the pavement in certain places would enhance walking experiences.</p>   | <p>This comment has been shared with Highways for their consideration.</p>  |
| <p>Probably the most useful information for a lay person was the document titled Executive Summery . Public Paper which was available for download, but was later removed and is not accessible any more. In the absence of information like a master plan or feasibility study, the designation of uses without substantial justification is the most worrying aspect of this draft SPD. LBB should indeed review planning policies related to private HMO within the wider Hendon area as the proposed development of the student accommodation and PATAL scoring should not be driving principles for determination of planning application of this kind. The evolution of the area is inevitable when there is a large institution like MU who is driving it, but the process will have to be transparent and open for public debate at every step. It would be better to get the opportunities right now rather than later in the planning process when it becomes much costlier for everyone involved.</p> | <p>The SPD is a high level planning document.</p> <p>The Council's more rigorous policy approach on HMOs is set out within the Local Plan Reg 19.</p>   |
| <p>The intention of the SPD is to support the University in it's aim to consolidate it's campus in Hendon. At no point has the University attempted to engage with the local community, with which it is becoming an increasingly large part. The basis for the SPD emanates from two lines in the draft Local Plan. Unfortunately this wasn't picked up by those effected. Not surprisingly when its two lines within a three hundred page document.</p>  | <p>The SPD supplements policy in the Local Plan 2012 and the London Plan 2021. The SPD highlights that communication between University and the residential community is essential to community cohesion.</p> |
| <p>I am writing to you to raise my objection to the proposed developments as set out in the Local Plan and the Burroughs and Middlesex University Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), both of which are under consultation. I am particularly concerned about the plans for the Burroughs Gardens Car Park and Burroughs Car Park.</p>  | <p>Any proposals that come forward for the redevelopment of car parks will require very careful consideration of the impacts caused by the loss of parking spaces.</p>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>I welcome the good intentions stated in the SPD. The document says all the right things in quoting the relevant policies and principles, it is hard to know without the details if the policies and principles will be upheld. What safeguards will ensure that they are followed?<br/> e.g. 4.5.2. the intention to reduce conversion of family homes into HMOs<br/> 4.5.3 the expectation that the University will establish a community liaison group.<br/> 4.5.4/4.5.5 the University giving back to the community through access to resources and meeting rooms, evening/ weekend lectures/workshops and open days, fulfilling a much-needed civic role - there has never been anywhere else for cultural and creative art activities. I note the role the University has fulfilled as the venue for Holocaust Memorial Day. This event, Good Friday walk of faith and Remembrance Sunday are the main visible local events. Wouldn't it be great if there could be a summer festival on the Paddock again, as I understand there used to be?</p> | <p>There is an expectation through the delivery of this SPD and eventually through the implementation of Local Plan policies that there is greater community cohesion in the area. This includes relationships with the University as well as the management of HMOs. We hope that such events can be re-established.</p> |
| <p>6.1.4 'High quality public realm improvements are secured through new investment and delivered throughout the SPD area' - where will this new investment likely come from and what risks might come from that?</p>   | <p>Public realm improvements could include footpath widening, replacement of park benches, and planting.</p>  |
| <p>Furthermore, the data gathered within the SPD around transport was gathered in October 2020 when not all of the student body returned to campus and other patterns of behaviour were also disrupted (e.g. the government encouraging work from home, reducing commuter traffic). How can accurate future projection be made when the data collected was not representative of "normal times".</p>  | <p>The Transport Study was completed in October 2020 however the initial high level parking surveys were undertaken in October 2018 so were not impacted by the pandemic.</p>   |
| <p>Provision of conventional and affordable housing – The SPD clearly states in its aims that it is looking to explore opportunities for student and conventional housing. There is no mention in the document of provision of conventional housing and it concentrates solely on student accommodation. There is no mention anywhere in the SPD of provision of affordable housing to Barnet residents. Given the under provision of affordable housing in the past and the continuation of this trend in 2019-2020 from a new build perspective, can you please explain this?</p>   | <p>More detail as to where conventional housing will be in will be available through the Hendon Hub project and at planning application stage</p>   |

The SPD as presented uses pre-COVID assumptions and does not factor in that the pandemic is changing how we work and live. Likewise, university education will change and therefore there is no justification for more students being accommodated in the area.

It is currently difficult to determine the long term impacts of the pandemic on work and learning patterns for the Borough. Many of the University's courses benefit from in person teaching rather than online.

|   |                                       |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p>The draft vision for the planning framework is supposed to: - enhance The Burroughs as a place, fostering the creation of a diverse and inclusive community, where residents, students and academics live successfully and thrive together; - ensure the continuing success of Middlesex University as a tertiary institution by creating the space that enhances educational outcomes and brings forward innovation; - facilitate future development that builds on the rich architectural history of Hendon; and - make The Burroughs an inspiring civic and learning centre. Further, the draft SPD sets out the following development principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Design Conservation and Public Realm Principles</li><li>- Greening Principles</li><li>- Community Cohesion Principles</li><li>- Transport and Movement Principles</li></ul> <p>Main Concern / Objection = Bias towards Middlesex University and its prospective students</p> <p>Unfortunately, irrespective of the merit of sound “development principles” (considered in the abstract), the draft vision here is patently biased towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the (understandably) ambitious Hendon Campus development aspirations of Middlesex University; and</li><li>- the unjustifiable benefit / convenience of the University and its prospective students to:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o occupy the majority / all of the most attractive, historic civic buildings in the Burroughs, e.g. the Hendon Library, and elsewhere in Hendon to the detriment of existing and future generations of local residents; and</li><li>o be accommodated in Halls right beside / extremely proximate to the main University buildings.</li></ul></li></ul> | <p>Vision and objectives amended.</p> |
|---|---------------------------------------|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>The associated SurveyMonkey questionnaire invites respondents to state opinions on the draft SPD, based on a range from “Strongly agree” to “Strongly disagree”, yet the structure of the questionnaire and its questions are flawed in failing to enable respondents to distinguish sufficiently between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- support for the laudable “principles” espoused; and</li> <li>- the framework’s patent bias towards Middlesex University and its neglect of the interests of residents.</li> </ul> <p>I "support" the principles. I do not, however, support the framework proposed. I “Strongly disagree” with it, because of its:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- bias towards Middlesex University’s expansion plans and Campus vision; and</li> <li>- blindness to / neglect of the interests of Hendon and Barnet London Borough residents.</li> </ul> <p>The SPD should clearly recognise and reflect the fact that Middlesex University’s understandable Campus development aspirations in Hendon (since leaving Trent Park) must not take precedence over the needs and rights of Hendon and Barnet Borough residents. Hendon residents were here first and our interests must not be regarded as subsidiary to those of Middlesex University. Nature and scale of the changes proposed to achieve Middlesex University’s Campus expansion plans</p> | <p>The SPD provides a planning framework that sets the context for change delivered through a cohesive strategy. It will steer and enable the delivery of opportunities that provide for the changing needs of the area including the requirements of stakeholders such as Middlesex University. All of which needs to be balanced against recognising the importance of the established residential character and the historic significance of the area.</p> |
| <p>Fenella House and Ravensfield House – Fallacy that both are the same age and in need of urgent redevelopment In some of the planning discussions held in recent weeks and months, there has been a tendency to refer to Ravensfield House and Fenella House in the same breath, suggesting that they are both temporary dilapidated buildings which NEED demolition and redevelopment. Whereas it is true that Ravensfield House is of a temporary construction and would benefit from redevelopment / replacement, it is false to suggest that both buildings are the same age and in need of urgent redevelopment, just beside they are beside each other. As can easily be discerned, Fenella House was built fairly recently and is not in need of demolition, redevelopment.</p>  | <p>The SPD acknowledges that Fenella is the more recent development.</p>  |
| <p>I welcome the plans to improve the provision for walkers and cyclists as outlined in section 4.6, and the improvements to the public spaces by tree planting and green space improvements</p>  | <p>Support welcomed</p>   |

We note from the SPD and Appendix 1 (the Design Guide) that the University Car Park on Greyhound Hill – Opportunity site A, is earmarked for development. This land forms the boundary with Sunnyfields school. Whilst the Head Teacher has been reassured both verbally and in writing that 'there is to be no development on the Middlesex University car park', we remain concerned that SDP nevertheless makes clear reference to such possibilities. Any development of the car park would raise important issues that could negatively impact the school children such as:

- Safeguarding issues relating to overlooking the school playground
- Increased noise and disruption during any construction period that would effectively make it impossible to use the playground for play and sport
- Decreased sunlight to the wooded area and children's play area
- Disruption to the wooded area that borders the car park. This is recognised as of ecological importance in your environmental assessment.

This car park has been removed from the SPD and the emerging Local Plan (Reg 19).

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>We also have some more general concerns about the SPD such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overdevelopment of the area close to the school, with the risk of increased traffic and pollution particularly along Greyhound Hill which is already heavily polluted and is a main walking route for our children.</li> <li>• The impact of moving the library and possible degradation of its services. Our children predominantly suffer high levels of deprivation and access to a good library service is an essential part of achieving academic success. Our children are very conscious of their environment, both historically and environmentally. We study the history of the area and the children have done litter picking to improve the area. They have noticed an increase in the level of litter in recent years. We would be concerned that an increase in temporary residents would make this worse.</li> <li>• The Chair of Governor's 13-year old daughter was recently asked, while walking home one afternoon, if she wanted to buy cannabis. Whilst we are not against students, the reality is that drug dealers do move into areas with large numbers of young people. This is likely to get worse with the suggested development.</li> <li>• We have experienced some issues with the University over the shared use of the sports pitches on our land at the back of our school. We are concerned that this would become more of a source of dispute with 800 more students living in the area.</li> <li>• We would be very interested to know more about the benefits to local schools of this development.</li> </ul> | <p>The proposal to develop the University car park has been removed from the SPD and the Reg 19 Local Plan.</p> <p>There is no proposal in relation to Hendon Library in this SPD.</p> <p>The issue of anti social</p> |
| <p>Provision of conventional and affordable housing – The SPD clearly states in its aims that it is looking to explore opportunities for student and conventional housing. There is no mention in the document of provision of conventional housing and it concentrates solely on student accommodation. There is no mention anywhere in the SPD of provision of affordable housing to Barnet residents. Given the under provision of affordable housing in the past across Barnet and the continuation of this trend in 2019-2020 from a new build perspective, can you please explain this?</p>  | <p>More detail as to where conventional housing will be in will be available through the Hendon Hub project and at planning application stage</p>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>Provision of conventional and affordable housing – The SPD clearly states in its aims that it is looking to explore opportunities for student and conventional housing. There is no mention in the document of provision of conventional housing and it concentrates solely on student accommodation. There is no mention anywhere in the SPD of provision of affordable housing to Barnet residents. Given the under provision of affordable housing in the past across Barnet and the continuation of this trend in 2019-2020 from a new build perspective, can you please explain this?</p>   | <p>More detail as to where conventional housing will be in will be available through the Hendon Hub project and at planning application stage</p>   |
| <p>I refer to the six-week public consultation period (11 January to 22 February 2021). The consultation process was so imbalanced, biased and inequitable that it did not achieve the aims of a consultation i.e. obtaining wide-ranging and honest input from the local residents. This “Consultation” was so full of material, procedural and factual issues that it was at best a charade, merely advertising and sugar-coating Middlesex University’s plans or at worst, it was a tick-box exercise to fulfil a planning requirement, but with a foregone conclusion. It certainly was not what a sensible and serious consultation should look like for what is an enormously important issue. During the first consultation on Teams, the planning authorities allowed the consultees to voice their views. It was clear that the planning team was taken aback by the intensity of the disapproval the proposal created. Instead of continuing the path of open dialogue which is the hallmark of a good consultation and an open democratic process, this was prevented in consultation number two and three, where there was an inability for residents to speak. During consultation two questions had to be typed into a question box only visible to each consultee. A moderator considered the question before making it visible to other participants. There were many people who complained their questions were not shown and not answered, certain people had not a single question shown and answered. This is an absurd way to hold a consultation. Why present at all if the authorities do not want to hear the questions from the consultees and answer them? The third consultation was even worse with questions having to be e-mailed in prior to the time making a critical dialogue impossible. This was a shameful procedure and an utterly undemocratic conduct of a key element of a consultation. In addition, in the third consultation, to all attendees’ utter surprise, Ms. Ngaire Thomson informed us that she had conducted the traffic, safety &amp; security and ecological impact survey during lockdown. A time when the university was closed and most of its students were not at the university. In short, at the time Ms. Thomson conducted her assessment it was impossible to encounter the actual circumstances and issues the residents habitually encounter during Middlesex University term-time. If further expansion and densification continues as proposed, local residents will suffer all the negative effects to an even greater degree. Conducting the above surveys during such a non-representative time and presenting the findings as facts raises severe questions</p> | <p>The consultation was carried out in accordance with Government guidance on online consultation while COVID19 restrictions are in place. This is also reflected in the COVID19 Addendum to the Statement of Community Involvement. The SPD has generated a good response in terms of the number of representations. The online engagement events were held to publicise, inform and clarify as well as explain how to provide feedback on the draft SPD.</p> <p>The Transport Study was carried out by independent consultants. No additional surveys were carried out during lockdown.</p> |



|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>regarding Ms. Thomson's independence, judgement and competence to conduct such an important part of a planning exercise. It is incomprehensible that a member of the planning authorities would undertake such an important survey at a time (lockdown) which is totally unreflective of the reality and portray these results as factual findings. This is like measuring the air-quality at Heathrow airport at 3am during lockdown and then announcing that the airport causes neither noise nor air pollution and can therefore be expanded! This survey must be discarded as it cannot deliver anything else than utterly false results, totally inconsistent with reality. The survey must be rerun by a truly independent, competent individual at an appropriate time. This also raises an even bigger and more important question, why is the consultation for something so seismic taking place during lockdown when information is harder to share?</p> |  |
| <p>Provision of conventional and affordable housing – The SPD clearly states in its aims that it is looking to explore opportunities for student and conventional housing. There is no mention in the document of provision of conventional housing and it concentrates solely on student accommodation. There is no mention anywhere in the SPD of provision of affordable housing to Barnet residents. Given the under provision of affordable housing in the past across Barnet and the continuation of this trend in 2019-2020 from a new build perspective, can you please explain this?</p>   | <p>More detail as to where conventional housing will be delivered will form part of planning applications as part of the Hendon Hub project</p>  |
| <p>Provision of conventional and affordable housing – The SPD clearly states in its aims that it is looking to explore opportunities for student and conventional housing. There is no mention in the document of provision of conventional housing and it concentrates solely on student accommodation. There is no mention anywhere in the SPD of provision of affordable housing to Barnet residents. Given the under provision of affordable housing in the past and the continuation of this trend in 2019-2020 from a new build perspective, can you please explain this?</p>   | <p>More detail as to where conventional housing will be delivered will form part of planning applications as part of the Hendon Hub project.</p> |

Therefore, [...] first had line of sight to the SPD they were extremely shocked, disappointed, upset and saddened by the proposed boundaries. The proposed boundaries seem to take away a large portion of their garden which they rightfully own and purchased last year. I attach the following; 1. A map search snapshot taken from HM Land Registry showing the correct boundaries with the extended plots at the rear of 15 Egerton Gardens - these I believe were originally purchased from the council in 1999 by previous owners and now form part of the property for 15 Egerton Gardens. 2. Screenshot of a 3D map image of the 15 Egerton Gardens plot with its garden and how this correlates with neighbouring properties. They would effectively be left with an extremely short garden (possibly 3m in length as the house has already been fully extended fully to the rear - carried out by previous owners). In doing so this would deeply sadden my parents and have an extremely negative impact on their mental health given the importance of the garden to them and how it was such a crucial factor when deciding to buy the property. I really hope that it is a case that the boundary for the SPD was drawn incorrectly and therefore needs to be corrected.

The boundary has been amended.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1. The boundary to this plot is not correctly drawn on any SPD document issued in: Jan 2020, Sept 2020 and Jan 2021 (current consultation) a. As far as I am aware, Forward Planning has not formally acknowledged that there appears to be an error in the way that the SPD boundary border is drawn related to the land behind Ravensfield House. This error surprises me and also raises concerns whether there are similar errors in other parts of the SPD b. In short, the boundary as documented in the SPD appears to claim ownership of part of the existing gardens belonging to 13 &amp; 15 Egerton Gardens c. As proof of this error I have provided the attached zip file containing: i. Key pages from SPD documents showing the SPD boundary behind Ravensfield House ii. Pages extracted from formal LBB documents showing the correct boundary, plus Google each images 2. As far as I am aware, none of the SPD document makes reference to this unused land to the rear of Ravensfield House. a. As LBB is well aware, this unused land has been problematic for 30+ years. I am therefore surprised that the SPD makes no reference to this unused land b. The SPD appears to deliberately exclude 2 parcels of land as part of Site E (but these 2 parcels of land are still claimed within the boundary of the formal SPD. Why is this?</p> | <p>The boundary has been amended.</p>   |
| <p>In terms of point #1, I will be providing the owners of 13 &amp; 15 Egerton Gardens with a copy of this email so that they might raise their own objections to LBB claim ownership of half of their gardens as part of the SPD documentation. As previously stated, I am most surprised that this error has not already been picked up as part of the LBB internal planning review process. However, if there is a reason that the SPD boundary is drawn in this matter then LBB should address this matter urgently to avoid further escalation</p>  | <p>The boundary has been amended.</p>   |
| <p>The University already has 19,000 students. Before Covid, Hendon Brent Street area was frequently filled with students and surrounding roads filled with parked cars. The SPD makes no mention of what increases to student population are being planned.</p>   | <p>The University has stated that there is no increase to the number of students attending the university. The student units will be replacement units that are currently situated elsewhere in North London.</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>LB Barnet [as landowner] supports all 6 objectives subject to an amendment to Objective 4 which is discussed in paragraphs 5.3 to 5.5 of this report. A further objective should acknowledge the contribution that development can make to the public realm. This should include the enhancement and provision of new public spaces, the rationalisation of existing street 'clutter' and the redevelopment of existing 1960/70s constructed buildings. It is widely acknowledged that there are several outdated and incongruous buildings that detract from the built form and character of The Burroughs and Church End Conservation Areas</p>  | <p>Text amended</p>   |
| <p>The SPD must also make specific reference to supporting paragraph 13.7.1 of the adopted Core Strategy Policy 8 'Promoting a strong and prosperous Barnet'. LB Barnet (including London Borough of Enfield) and Middlesex University have for almost a decade been coordinating the release of Middlesex University sites for new housing development. The adopted Development Plan states that displaced Middlesex University teaching facilities will be relocated and consolidated within the main Middlesex University campus in Hendon:</p> <p>"Barnet aims to be recognised as the home of a leading university with an international reputation. Middlesex University is relocating its dispersed academic programmes from other sites to its main campus at Hendon. New state-of-the-art teaching, learning resource centre and research facilities are being developed alongside its existing buildings. Middlesex University has a vital role to play in providing higher educational opportunities at its Hendon Campus and in supporting local businesses through applied research and consultancy, including Knowledge Transfer Partnerships, and supporting small and medium enterprise start-ups and incubator units".</p> | <p>Text amended to acknowledge mention of University in the existing development plan for Barnet and the emerging Local Plan.</p> |

Supporting paragraph 10.5.3 to Policy DM03 'Specialist housing – Houses in Multiple Occupation, student accommodation and housing choice for older people' of the adopted Development Management Policies Document (2012) also makes reference to the consolidation and expansion of Middlesex University at the Hendon campus. The underlining rationale and the principle for the consolidation and expansion of Middlesex University in Hendon has been enshrined in adopted Local Plan policies CS8 'Promoting a strong and prosperous Barnet' and Policy DM03 'Specialist housing – Houses in Multiple Occupation, student accommodation and housing choice for older people' since 2012. For clarification purposes and for the avoidance of doubt this legacy should be acknowledged at the beginning of Chapter 3.4 of The Burroughs and Middlesex University Planning Framework Draft SPD.

The SPD is clear in how it supplements existing Local Plan policies including DM09 on Specialist Housing.

We agree that recognition should be given to Hendon's heritage assets and the contributions they make to the character of The Burroughs and Church End. In that regard, we suggest that the SPD makes clearer reference to adopted Policy CS5 'Heritage and Character' and Policy DM06 'Heritage and Conservation' [to be superseded by Draft Policy CDH08 'Barnet's Heritage' once the new Local Plan is adopted] and adopts the approach to the historic environment as set out in Chapter 16 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' of the NPPF (2019). As currently drafted the SPD proposes a decision making framework that is inconsistent with the above adopted Local Plan and national planning policies and the overarching statutory framework set out in the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (referred to as 'The Act'). The SPD is confusing in its objectives with regards to heritage assets and the approach to assessing applications within the SPD area. For example, Section 2.2 of the SPD states that a draft objective for the SPD is to 'enhance heritage assets alongside opportunities for high quality modern design'. The statutory duty in relation to conservation areas is set out at Section 72 of the Act ('preserve or enhance') and in relation to listed buildings at Sections 16 and 66 of the Act (which relate to 'preserving' the building's interest). 'Preserve' in these contexts means 'the avoidance of harm', and in such a case the statutory duty is met. Policy CS5 'Heritage and Character' refers to a requirement to 'protect and enhance' the Borough's heritage assets. Policy DM06 'Heritage and Conservation' also states that heritage assets will be protected in line with their significance and that development proposals must 'preserve or enhance' conservation areas. The draft SPD objective therefore goes beyond the duty placed on a decision maker by the Act and the development plan policies. The objective as drafted within the SPD conflicts with Sections 16, 66 and 77 of The Act and is contrary to the NPPF (2019) [page 74] as an SPDs is unable to propose new policies. To remedy this we suggest that the draft objective in 2.2 be amended to read 'to preserve or enhance heritage assets alongside opportunities for high quality modern design'.

Text amended in SPD

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>A fundamental tenet of both the NPPF (2019) and Policy DM06 (with the DPD cross-referencing the NPPF at Table 7.1) is the requirement for decision makers to consider 'how the benefits outweigh any harm caused to the heritage asset' (Part C of Policy DM06). This 'balancing provision' is not reflected in the draft SPD and should be included in the summary Paragraph 3.5.1 of the SPD to ensure compliance with the Development Plan and national policy.</p>                                       | <p>Text amended in SPD</p>                              |
| <p>In reference to the St Josephs Grove to Church End Character Area, page 21 of the SPD includes the following statement: "The area borders Conservation Areas to the north and south, new buildings should therefore be designed sensitively to ensure that the views of these are not negatively impacted." In relation to the St Josephs Grove to Church End Character Area and the East of Church Terrace Character Area we request that the word "negatively" is replaced by the word "unacceptably".</p> | <p>Negatively is the more appropriate planning term</p> |

The requirements of Policy DM06 (and the NPPF on which it is based) could be better reflected in Paragraph 4.2 of the SPD. We suggest the following wording is inserted in reference to the 'St Josephs Grove to Church End' Character Area: 'These buildings together with the public realm elements create a different ambience. Redevelopment opportunities in this section will need to acknowledge this established setting and sense of place. Maintaining and where possible enhancing the wider public realm and sense of space this area provides is also important. While large buildings would be in-keeping with the character, development proposals should consider the effect on the significance of the existing Statutory and Locally Listed buildings, that characterise The Burroughs and Church End/ Greyhound Hill in accordance with the approach set out in DM06. Particular attention should be given to the residential areas that are in the streets surrounding this section, ensuring impacts, such as, overshadowing and overlooking are designed-out and mitigated'. Similarly, with regards to the 'Church End to Greyhound Hill' Character Area: 'The redevelopment of opportunity sites leading to this vantage point should consider the effect of that development on the significance of the Church End Conservation Area and the settings of listed buildings in accordance with Policy DM06. Ideally the setbacks should be increased to create more public realm and allow for trees to frame the view where this preserves or enhances the heritage assets' significance'. Paragraph 4.3.5 should be similarly amended to ensure that it reflects the 'preserve or enhance' principles set out in statute and Policy DM06.

Text amended in part.



|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>The SPD is overly prescriptive in terms of the stated design approach. This will constrain innovation and creative approaches when bringing sites forward for redevelopment. For example, under the subheading 'character' on page 4 of the appendix, it states as a 'general rule' that new architecture must harmonise with the existing architecture [considering the close proximity of most sites to listed buildings and conservations areas]. Such a stipulation is overly blunt and does not have regard to the general approach set out in Policy DM06 [i.e. assessments should consider the degree to which proposed changes affect the significance of an asset] and fails to have regard to the contribution that different styles of architecture can make to the character of an area including conservation areas. To remedy this the following paragraph should be inserted within the SPD: Each site should be considered on a site by site basis, with regard to the general character of the area, and a specific assessment of the impact that a development may have on the significance of an asset. This is a nuanced approach, but one that we consider is not reflected generally in the SPD.</p> | <p>Amendments in part made to the Design Guide.</p>   |
| <p>Appendix 1 of the SPD contains a design guide for the SPD sites. We make a general observation that the plans which illustrate 'setbacks' are unclear in their meaning and are likely to be overly prescriptive. We recommend that setbacks are not illustrated on plans or other visual aids within the SPD or its supporting documents.</p>  | <p>The setbacks are to ensure that new developments do not dominate the streetscene and allow for the historic features to remain prominent</p>   |
| <p>Similar prescriptions are made throughout Appendix 1, such as the manner in which the Burroughs should be landscaped (page 8 of the Appendix). While we welcome the pursuit of high design quality within the public realm, the wording is overly strict and prescriptive and is therefore not supported.</p>  | <p>The SPD has been pitched correctly as a high level planning document. It is not overly prescriptive.</p>   |
| <p>The principles set out for Site B should identify clearly the detracting features within the conservation area, in particular the existing Meritage Centre. The redevelopment of the Meritage Centre provides an opportunity for enhancement of the Church End Conservation Area and the setting of several Grade II and II* listed buildings. To this end, the key views along Church End should clearly acknowledge the fact that the Meritage Centre blocks views of the southern aisle and eastern end of the Grade II* Listed Parish Church of St Mary. In this case views towards the north are obscured for pedestrians at the southern end of Church End. The visual obstruction [towards an important heritage asset] caused by the Meritage Centre should be highlighted and included as part of the baseline conditions in this part of the SPD Area. This is not reflected in the photograph on page 15 of Appendix</p>  | <p>While the Meritage Centre is not necessarily of great architectural value it does not necessarily follow that a new build would be an improvement. The SPD Design Guide sets out how the views along Church End should frame St Mary's</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>The guidance should provide reference to St Mary's Church and its setting by requiring development to consider the effect that development would have on its significance by virtue of the development in its setting. There are opportunities to enhance that significance (by removing detracting features). To do so should be the primary objective of the SPD. The proposed statement which reads 'redevelopment opportunities should respect the overall character within the area' (page 14 of the Appendix 1) are too general and will confuse readers and decision makers and should be removed.</p> | <p>The suggested setbacks for this site are very generous and ask only that the buildings are set back from the Church End frontage so as not to block the view of the Church.</p> |
| <p>We welcome the principles for Site E and similarly recognise that additional height could be achieved in this location. As above, the impact on nearby listed buildings should be considered in the framework as set out by Policy DM06 and the NPPF (2019). Imprecise requirements such as 'not to detract from the existing environment' or 'dominate or detract' from listed buildings' should be deleted.</p>   | <p>This is appropriate wording for a SPD</p>   |
| <p>The stipulation requiring existing building footprints and setbacks to be retained by new development is overly prescriptive and fails to consider the positive contributions that a well-designed larger building or series of buildings could have in this location. The reference to maintaining existing building footprints and setbacks should be deleted. Statements such as 'a setback here would have to occur...' (page 26 of the Appendix 1) should also be deleted.</p>   | <p>Text amended in part.</p>   |
| <p>In terms of Site F, overly prescriptive stipulations regarding the building line should be deleted, as there may be several alignment options for a site. In this case there are at least two possibilities i.e. an alignment with the Old Fire Station to the north or set back closer to the line established by the residential Georgian buildings to the south. What constitutes an appropriate setback cannot be predetermined in advance of the Council's receipt of a development proposal.</p>  | <p>The building line for site F allow the proposal to align with the Old Fire Station. This is not a requirement, buildings could be set further back.</p>                         |
| <p>We consider paragraph 4.3.3 too prescriptive in terms of the phasing of public realm investment. Paragraph 4.4 which requires retention of existing trees should be amended to include the text "where possible or practicable".</p>  | <p>Text amended</p>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>In reference to Chapter 4.5 (Paragraphs 4.5.6, 4.5.7, 4.5.9, 4.5.10 and 4.5.13) we in principle support requirement for an accompanying Draft Student Management Plan for student housing proposals and would accept a planning condition requiring full details of the final Student Management Plan to be approved by the Council before the development is occupied. We suggest that the required contents of the Draft Student Management Plan as listed in Paragraph 4.5.7 is divided between two separate documents, one document containing the commitments and obligations relating to the management of students within the accommodation and a second document relating to the environmental and landscape maintenance issues.</p> | <p>The detail of how the Student Management Plan is presented can be discussed at the planning application stage.</p>  |
| <p>In reference to Paragraphs 4.5.4 and 4.5.5 LB Barnet (as landowner) will wherever possible encourage access to the facilities for residents and community groups and commits to fostering a positive partnership between Middlesex University and other stakeholders.</p>  | <p>Comments welcome.</p>   |
| <p>In reference to Paragraph 4.5.14 it should be acknowledged that the consolidation of Middlesex University will bring short term economic benefits during the construction phase and longer terms economic benefits including increased student spend within the local economy. The requirement for additional academic and support staff will result in further local spend creating demand for local jobs within the immediate area.</p>  | <p>Amended in part. All development provides construction job this is not specific to the redevelopment of sites within the SPD.</p>   |
| <p>The requirement for student housing to be accredited under one of the codes listed in paragraph 4.5.8 is both onerous and unlawful. What may be included in a supplementary planning document is dictated by the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Regulations 5 and 6 prohibit a supplementary planning document from containing any statements regarding development management policies which are intended</p>   | <p>These requirements are viewed as best practice and should be seen as industry standard.</p>   |
| <p>to guide the determination of applications for planning permission. If the SPD includes policy statements such as that included in paragraph 4.5.8 then the document would be defined as a local plan and would be subject to the consultation requirements of Regulations 18 and 19 and Examination in Public.</p>  | <p>Text amended. This is related to the amenity of the area. Development Plan policies CS5 and DM01 refer among other things to the amenity and safety of the area surrounding developments. The SPD is ensuring that it is understood that Student Management Plans relate to</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | these matters. The Reg 19 Barnet Local Plan also addresses these matters.  |
| In reference to Chapter 5 nos. 21 -13 Church End (13-21 Prince of Wales Close) and the Fuller Street Car Park site should be included as both sites have the potential for redevelopment and will contribute to the overarching SPD objectives.  | The Fuller St Car Park is included as part of Site C. The Prince of Wales Close/Church End sites are not Local Plan sites. |
| In reference to Chapter 6.1 we support the master planned approach encouraged by the SPD and are committed to engaging with LBB Planning Department, residents and other stakeholders to ensure proposals meet the objectives set out within this SPD.<br>9.2 In reference to paragraph 6.4.4 we support the use of S106, S278 and CIL funds to help meet identified infrastructure requirements. There is also the potential for developers to deliver some or all infrastructure identified as part of proposals for development.  | Text amended.  |
| Figure 2, the map showing historic assets within the SPD area, indicates, correctly, that a large part of it is in an Area of Special Archaeological Significance (also called an Archaeological Priority Area). The draft SPD, however, does not draw out the implications of this, as it should.   | Text revised   |
| Appendix 1 to the draft states, correctly, that archaeological evidence of Roman and Anglo-Saxon habitation has been found in the area; indeed there has been a lot of evidence also from later periods. Excavations over the years, especially near St Mary's church and at the Burroughs car park, have revealed many remains of the old village of Hendon, going as far back as Saxon times.  | Support welcomed   |
| It is certain that construction work in those parts of the SPD area will reveal more important deposits, and likely that the same is true in other parts. The SPD must recognise this and make it clear that any development that may affect archaeological remains will need to demonstrate the likely impact upon the remains and the proposed mitigation to reduce that impact. This will probably mean that a condition is imposed on any planning application, requiring archaeological investigation before the development takes place. We ask for the draft SPD to be amended accordingly. | Text revised   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>The Key Opportunity Sites should not be included in the SPD. This premature until the new local plan is found sound. The inclusion of the sites goes well beyond the scope of what a non-development plan document can do in the absence of a corresponding adopted local plan. We agree that the sites do have development potential, but presently there is no evidence to show to what extent they can be. While the Regulation 18 Site Selection Background Paper is helpful, it does not show how heritage was factored in. We would expect this type of evidence to be compiled in support of the sites allocated in the local plan. Given that the local plan is in its early stages it may be the case that this evidence will be forthcoming. In addition, the SPD may require a SEA if it precedes the local plan. The sites could be added into the SPD as a revision after the plan has been adopted. Only sites that are already allocated under the adopted plan could be included.</p> | <p>The inclusion of these sites is indicative, providing guidance further to the identification of these sites within the Draft Local Plan. Heritage, context and environmental considerations are covered by the Draft Local Plan.</p> |
| <p>Overall heritage is generally well represented in the SPD. However, in some places the SPD suggests that it is compromising on heritage e.g. 1.1.8. We suspect this is not intentional, but it is important to ensure that the SPD conforms with the NPPF which requires great weight to be attached to the conservation of the historic environment.</p>   | <p>Text revised</p>   |
| <p>Often the guidance in the Design Code does not reflect the character assessment findings e.g. where sites are surrounded by low rise buildings the Design Code still allows for additional height without specifying any parameters. New development should be based on character, so it is not clear why additional heights are being promoted in areas with a consistent low-rise character e.g. The Meritage Centre.</p>   | <p>The Design Code has been revised and updated.</p>  |
| <p>More design direction should be provided. In many places the SPD only requires new development to respond sensitively to the historic environment, but it does not explain what this entails or how it will be judged. The SPD gives guidance on what is significant but does not follow this through to design directions e.g. more detailed design principles could include “in this area heights should be limited to ...”; “prevailing roof lines should not be interrupted” etc.</p>   | <p>This is a matter to be addressed when development proposals are clearer at application stage.</p>  |
| <p>In preparation of the forthcoming SPD, we encourage you to draw on the knowledge of local conservation officers, the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service, and local heritage groups.</p>   | <p>Separate GLAAS response received</p>   |
| <p>1.3.2 – the SPD is an important opportunity to ensure that the high-quality historic environment within the SPD area is conserved or enhanced. This should be recognised as a priority alongside the other points listed.</p>   | <p>Text amended</p>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>2.2 – amend wording of the fourth objective, at present it reads as if heritage is being compromised. The two different strands could be separated out into two standalone objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Conserve, and where appropriate, enhance the historic environment</li> <li>o Look for opportunities to deliver high quality contemporary design</li> </ul> <p>or the wording amended: Conserving and enhancing heritage assets, alongside and delivering opportunities for high quality contemporary modern design</p>                    | <p>Text amended</p>  |
| <p>It is important that the SPD does not promote a specific architectural style, especially as there is no evidence to suggest that modern architecture is the most appropriate style. In instead I advise the use of the term “contemporary” which is distinct from “modern”. Contemporary architecture is not limited to a single stylistic thread and simply means “of its time”. Whereas Modern embodies a specific set of ideals - an absence of ornament, structures of steel or concrete, large expanses of glass, minimal exterior expression, and open floor plans.</p> | <p>Text revised - "modern" has been replaced by "contemporary" when referring to architectural style</p>                           |
| <p>3.5.1 Heritage – we welcome this point, but if heritage is to be a primary factor in design (as required by the emerging London Plan), then this needs to come across more consistently throughout the document. Otherwise this objective will be undermined.</p>   | <p>The text now better reflects London Plan Policy.</p>  |
| <p>When discussing future landmark buildings, it will be important to identify existing landmarks to ensure they are not compromised. The area is relatively small so opportunities for landmarks will be limited. Too many landmarks stop such developments functioning effectively as landmarks. Ideally the Council should be the authority on where landmarks are located given that this is a strategic issue, and so it would be helpful if more direction on this was provided in the SPD.</p>  | <p>The importance of landmarks is reflected in the supporting Design Guide as well as Landscape and Arboricultural Assessment.</p> |
| <p>The SPD area is particularly sensitive to tall buildings, the visual intrusion of which would be harmful. It would be helpful if this was explicitly mentioned. For example, the Design Code highlights Site A as having most potential but is silent on what height parameters would be acceptable. The cumulative impacts of the sites need to be considered to avoid transforming the character of the area rather than working with it.</p>   | <p>This car park has now been removed from the SPD.</p>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Site B, The Meritage Centre – The Design Code suggests increased heights may be appropriate on this site. This site will be extremely sensitive to heights and we do not consider that it is appropriate for increased height beyond anything extremely modest, a single storey perhaps. There may be more scope to the rear of the site for slightly higher again as it is less sensitive. Testing is likely to be required for this site and more detail needed regarding parts of the site that are more sensitive to others. The Design Code states that new development should not be overbearing to or obscure St Mary’s Church, this is helpful, but the guidance should follow through to specify what this means in design terms i.e. this part of the site is therefore unsuitable for taller development that would compete with the dominance of the church.</p> | <p>Proposals that come forward will need to demonstrate how they have responded to the Design Guide.</p>                       |
| <p>We welcome the inclusion of low-rise high-density examples in the Design Code. However, this aspiration should come out more clearly with the SPD and Appendix 1.</p>  | <p>There is a clear link between the SPD and the supporting Design Guide.</p>  |
| <p>We welcome the list of locally listed buildings in Appendix 1.</p>   | <p>We welcome this support.</p>  |
| <p>New development should be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 20 of the Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), February 2019, states: “Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for... infrastructure for waste management, water supply, wastewater...”</p>   | <p>This is a strategic matter for the Reg 19 Local Plan.</p>   |
| <p>Paragraph 28 relates to non-strategic policies and states: “Non-strategic policies should be used by local planning authorities and communities to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development. This can include allocating sites, the provision of infrastructure...”</p>   | <p>The SPD does not set policy that is the remit of the Local Plan.</p>  |
| <p>Paragraph 26 of the revised NPPF goes on to state: “Effective and on-going joint working between strategic policy-making authorities and relevant bodies is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy. In particular, joint working should help to determine where additional infrastructure is necessary.”</p>   | <p>The Council has demonstrated such on-going working through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan published in February 2021.</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>The web based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) includes a section on 'water supply, wastewater and water quality' and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this section also sets out that: "Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development" (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 34-001-20140306).</p>   | <p>This is an issue to be addressed through the Local Plan</p> |
| <p>For information, the way water and wastewater infrastructure will be delivered has changed. From the 1st April 2018 all off site water and wastewater network reinforcement works necessary as a result of new development will be delivered by the relevant statutory undertaker. Local reinforcement works will be funded by the Infrastructure Charge which is a fixed charge for water and wastewater for each new property connected. Strategic water and wastewater infrastructure requirements will be funded through water companies' investment programmes which are based on a 5 year cycle known as the Asset Management Plan process. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example to understand, design, and deliver local network upgrades can take around 18 months and Sewage Treatment &amp; Water Treatment Works upgrades can take 3-5 years. Implementing new technologies and the construction of a major treatment works extension or new treatment works extension or new treatment works could take up to 10 years.</p> | <p>This is an issue to be addressed through the Local Plan</p> |



|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Thames Water have limited powers under the Water Industry Act 1991 to prevent connection to its network ahead of infrastructure upgrades. In some circumstances it may be necessary to phase development in order to avoid adverse amenity impacts for existing or future users such as internal and external sewer flooding, pollution of land, and water courses and / or issues with water supply in the form of no or low water pressure. To minimise the likelihood of requiring such conditions developers are advised to contact Thames Water as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme. Infrastructure Requirements</p> <p>In light of the changes which took effect in April 2018, and which are set out above, we would request that a paragraph is included in the Neighbourhood Plan which states: “Developers need to consider the net increase in water and waste water demand to serve their developments and also any impact the development may have off site further down the network, if no/low water pressure and internal/external sewage flooding of property is to be avoided. Thames Water encourages developers to use their free pre-planning service (<a href="https://www.thameswater.co.uk/preplanning">https://www.thameswater.co.uk/preplanning</a>). This service can tell developers at an early stage if there will be capacity in Thames water and/or wastewater networks to serve their development, or what they will do if there is not. The developer can then submit this communication as evidence to support a planning application and Thames can prepare to serve the new development at the point of need, helping avoid delays to housing delivery programmes.”</p> | <p>This is an issue to be addressed through planning applications.</p>   |
| <p>Our ‘Risk of Flooding from Surface Water’ maps show some low, medium and high risk, particularly along the roads/highways. Therefore you should consider opportunities to alleviate surface water flood risk as part of the guidance within this SPD. Evidence within Surface Water Management Plans/Local Flood Risk Management Strategies may highlight critical drainage areas within this area or highlight opportunities to retrofit sustainable drainage measures. The West London SFRA (2018) may also provide useful guidance which should be referenced in this SPD, particularly regarding surface water risk.</p>  | <p>Text amended in SPD to remind developers to meet Local and London Plan policies in regard to surface water.</p> |
| <p>Thames Water may also be able to provide a view as to the general condition of the underlying drainage system and whether future upgrades may be required to ensure there is sufficient infrastructure capacity for the conveyance of surface water and waste water.</p>  | <p>This is a detailed issue to be addressed through planning applications.</p>                                     |
| <p>I am very grateful for your inclusion of multiple community safety and crime prevention methods, primarily included within section’s 3.5, 4.3.7, 4.3.8, 4.3.9. This is very welcome and one which I believe will be of great benefit to the local community and the borough as a whole.</p>   | <p>Support welcomed</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>The benefits of Secured by Design, supported by independent academic research, has consistently proven that SBD housing developments experience up to 87% less burglary, 25% less vehicle crime and 25% less criminal damage. It has also had a significant impact on anti-social behaviour (SBD - Homes 2019 guide).</p>   | <p>Support welcomed</p>  |
| <p>We note reference within the document to providing access to footpaths and cycle access within the area. We would wish to highlight the opportunities for recreation and leisure provided by Brent Reservoir which is within walking and cycling distance of the SPD area and the potential benefits of this to the health and wellbeing of residents.</p>  | <p>Having attractive and accessible destinations to visit such as Brent Reservoir will encourage more walking and cycling.</p>                         |
| <p>We would ask that consideration is given to opportunities to provide appropriate signage to and enhanced walking and cycle links to the reservoir as part of any future infrastructure provision associated with development in the area covered by this SPD.</p>   | <p>SPD reflects the importance of wayfinding to increasing the accessibility of the area in a sustainable way.</p>                                     |
| <p>Chapter Five identifies nine key opportunity sites which are also identified in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) Schedule of Site Proposals (Nos 34 to 42). The draft framework does not refer to the housing capacity or proposed uses, but the draft Local Plan identifies that the sites have the potential to deliver 358 new homes in total. Therefore, an additional objective could seek to ensure that the impact of growth is managed and supported by additional social infrastructure, where needed, and that development promotes physical and mental health and wellbeing. Health and wellbeing is strongly influenced by the environment in which people live and that planning policies and decisions can contribute to the prevention of ill-health and encourage healthy lifestyles.</p> | <p>To promote healthy living and wellbeing is a key objective in the emerging Local Plan and an expectation of all new development in the Borough.</p> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>The draft framework identifies key policy considerations which will impact on health and wellbeing, including sustainable transport and 'healthy streets', community safety, green infrastructure and design of buildings and spaces. To tackle these issues in a holistic way, we suggest that a health impact assessment is submitted with large development proposals to ensure that measures are introduced to mitigate the negative impacts of development and maximise health benefits. It could also consider the longer-term health and wellbeing implications of Covid-19 as noted in paragraph 1.1.4 in terms of travel, changing working and learning patterns and the design of buildings and spaces. We note that the draft Local Plan Policy CHW 02 'Promoting health and wellbeing' supports the use of health impact assessment for larger developments.</p>   | <p>Comment welcomed. It is difficult to predict the long term implications for travel and working and learning patterns resulting from Covid-19.</p> |
| <p>We welcome the statement in paragraph 4.5.18 regarding the need for the Council and the NHS to assess the need for health services in the area as development comes forward. These includes the impact of new housing and student accommodation. We note paragraphs 6.1.4 and 6.4.2 and would welcome the opportunity to identify future health infrastructure requirements arising from single developments or cumulatively and the need for developer contributions.</p>   | <p>Comment welcomed</p>  |
| <p>Although figure 2 shows the Area of Archaeological Significance, it should also be mentioned in paragraph 1.1.8. The description of the Area of Archaeological Significance is as follows:<br/>     "There are more Roman finds in Hendon than any other period. There is a collection of Roman pottery, broken cinerary urns, mortaria water bottles, bricks, millstones, suggesting a villa was located at Hendon Grove. There is a lack of evidence in the Hendon area after the withdrawal of the political and military support of Rome in the mid 5th century, until the Norman invasion in the 11th century. However, it is likely that the main arterial routes continued in use. This is evident by the Saxon names. Hendon means 'high hill', Heah (high) dun (hill), probably only used for name making and seldom used after 800 AD. It was then called Hendun in 959 AD, Handone (which is mentioned in the Domesday Book, 1086 AD) and Hendone in 1199 AD. Hendon was first mentioned in a charter (972-8 AD), by which time a settlement had developed at Church End. The charter also mentions land in the north of the parish called Lothesleage, but the name disappeared by the end of the middle ages. Much of the area was still wooded in the 14th century, therefore, supplied fuel-wood to London for a long period of time, until it was replaced by Newcastle coal in the 16th century. The area was used as hay farms instead. Large houses appeared from the 17th century, for rich families to escape the polluted city. However, Hendon didn't really expand until the 19th century, when its industry started to develop, including the construction of several factories in the 1880s. This APA consists of four sections:</p> | <p>SPD and Design Guide revised.</p>   |

|  |               |
|--|---------------|
| <p>A) The Burroughs (western area): There is no real evidence of pre-Roman settlement in this area, but there is prehistoric evidence of a few flint flakes next to St Mary's Church. The parish church of St Mary's is possibly Saxon. A priest was mentioned in the Domesday Book in 1086 AD, which shows evidence for there being a church here and was possibly the first settlement of Hendon. There is a 12th century Norman chancel beneath the wall of the nave to confirm its early medieval existence. Roman pottery was also discovered near the church, including a flagon neck with a moulded face on it, plus coarse red wares and grey wares (3rd/4th century). There is also evidence of 400grams of 8th/9th century coarse tempered ware in a ditch adjacent to St Mary's. Other archaeological evidence includes Roman pottery, Saxon pottery sherds, medieval pottery, a rare double-headed spiral pin and medieval coins. There were also some 14th century burials located outside the cemetery. The Burroughs was called the 'Burrows' from 1316 AD until the 19th century, named after the local rabbit warrens. The settlement consisted of isolated farms and hamlets until the 19th century, but there was also two large houses built, including Ravensfield House (18th century). There is also evidence of a Tudor pub built here."</p> |               |
| <p>More should be mentioned about the heritage of the individual character areas:<br/> Character Area 1 has the potential for a Roman Villa to be located within the vicinity.<br/> Additionally, the Burroughs was the location of a Medieval settlement.<br/> Character Areas 3 and 4 – there is a high concentration of evidence of Roman activity in the area, and it is likely that St Mary's Church is Saxon in date. It is believed that the settlement developed around the church during the Saxon and medieval periods.</p>  | Text Amended. |
| <p>Any applications within the Area of Archaeological Significance should be supported by an archaeological desk based assessment. Within Character Areas 1, 3 and 4 this may also need to be supplemented by an archaeological evaluation. Consultation with the GLAAS should sought as part of any pre-application discussions.</p>  | Text Amended. |

### Questionnaire and Petition issues

| Key Issues   | Council Response  |
|--|---|
| <p>Don't see need for SPD as university could continue to operate independently.</p> | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university.</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Growing numbers of students and accommodation is putting pressure on the area. There is need for SPD to be more specific in the provision/delivery of infrastructure to meet community needs.</p> | <p>A phasing strategy and master planning will provide more specific details on proposals coming forward; however, the SPD does state the requirements and expectation for a range of physical, social and environmental infrastructure.</p>   |
| <p>It doesn't address issues between students and residents.</p>   | <p>The SPD advocates a community liaison group to follow up on specific issues between the established community and students including some of those that may be outside the remit of this SPD.</p>   |
| <p>Disagree with CPO and university ability to gain more assets with no benefit to the community.</p>  | <p>If the Council are to consider CPO to assemble sites, the scheme will need to fit with the planning policy framework and deliver positive benefits to the area through a viable, fundable and deliverable proposal. This is not a tool for the university to acquire assets.</p>  |
| <p>SPD does not consider needs of the residents and is focused on the university, risking the future of the local community and existing identity.</p>   | <p>The SPD aims to maximise and guide the wider benefits of having a educational institution like the University located in the area. To be a successful place the SPD promotes greater awareness and integration with the wider local community and local character when considering any future development proposals.</p>  |
| <p>It feels that the proposals will overrun and take over what is a lovely residential neighbourhood</p>   | <p>One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area. The university and Council own a substantial amount of land and the SPD's role is to guide development within a planning and design framework that will bring the widest community benefits overall.</p> |
| <p>Disagree with proposed quiet cycle routes outlined in Figure 6 (transport measures)</p>   | <p>The transport study has taken existing conditions and policy context as well as the Healthy Streets Approach into account, as outlined in Appendix 3. The proposed measures and initiatives are consistent with those identified within the Barnet Long-Term Transport Strategy.</p>  |
| <p>Support for the consideration for residents and sense of community that exists, with hope that the positive elements of the area will be retained</p>   | <p>The Council welcome the support and recognise the important heritage and architectural history of the area.</p>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Unclear on what is meant by integration of university with residential community and also skills retention as there are so many international students.</p> | <p>By integration, the SPD will facilitate the opportunity for the university and local community to work together to create a shared future for the area to enhance and grow. With better integration and provision of space for start-ups, entrepreneurial ventures, incubator units etc. graduates will be more inclined to stay in the area and build on this foundation. Also, with the provision of a variety of services, leisure and retail that students can enjoy locally, they are more likely to settle in the area longer term, rather than just travelling in for university attendance and leaving again.</p> |
| <p>Strongly disagree with the vision - no specific comment</p>   | <p>The vision has been revised</p>   |
| <p>Focus of SPD is on university not residents - will be detrimental to them.</p>  | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area.</p>   |
| <p>The vision and objectives are focused on the university not residents, with the intention of making a 'university town' without consultation.</p>           | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area. The SPD was available for comment through public consultation from 11 January to 22 February 2021. Due to Covid restrictions consultation events were held virtually and documents were available for comment online.</p>               |
| <p>Lack of evidence on how retention of skills in the area will be achieved or if there has been any pattern of this in the past.</p>                          | <p>There are a range of local initiatives to support the retention of skills and university graduates to the area. By providing space for students to develop and use their skills with start-ups, entrepreneurial ventures, incubator units etc. graduates will be more inclined to stay in the area and build on this foundation. Also, with the provision of a variety of services, leisure and retail that students can avail of living in the area, they are more likely to settle in the area longer term, rather than just travelling in for university attendance and leaving again.</p>                             |
| <p>Additional funds needed to deal with antisocial behaviour, litter and supporting services (due to increase in population and activity).</p>                 | <p>The SPD requires appropriate infrastructure to come forward to accommodate new development with funding that will use S106, S278 and CIL as well as pooled developer contributions to meet requirements. New student housing will also require a Student Management Plan to act as a code of conduct, to include management of antisocial behaviour and disciplinary procedures.</p>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Who will fund the proposals? If Barnet Council are funding this, what other more needed/essential services are going to lose out?</p>                                   | <p>The SPD requires appropriate infrastructure to come forward to accommodate new development with funding that will use S106, S278 and CIL as well as, pooled developer contributions to meet requirements, which are all associated to the development in the area and will not have impact on spending elsewhere in the Borough.</p>   |
| <p>Focus of SPD is bias towards university not local residents and don't support framework overall; however, agree with the principles addressed.</p>                      | <p>The Council welcome the support for the principles. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development. It also aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community, which may seem that there is focus on the university, but it is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university.</p>  |
| <p>Focus of SPD is on university with no benefit to local residents. Public assets should be redeveloped for residents' benefit.</p>                                       | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community, which may seem that there is focus on the university, but it is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. The SPD also directs the reprovision of any community facilities that may be displaced and/or lost as part of the redevelopment</p>   |
| <p>Do not agree with CPOs being used to benefit the university (at the cost of people's homes).</p>  | <p>If the Council are to consider CPO to assemble sites, the scheme will need to fit with the planning policy framework and deliver positive benefits to the area through a viable, fundable and deliverable proposal. This is not a tool for the university to acquire assets.</p>   |
| <p>Data/evidence obtained during lockdown is not an accurate reflection. The consultation process due to Covid restrictions also didn't give proper chance to comment.</p> | <p>Work on the SPD and evidence gathering has been ongoing since 2018. The SPD was available for comment through public consultation from 11 January to 22 February 2021. Due to Covid restrictions consultation events were held virtually and documents were available for comment online.</p>  |
| <p>Proposed development focuses on university not community and will be detrimental to the neighbourhood, heritage, local business and facilities.</p>                     | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area. Each of the development principles will seek to ensure a balanced and integrated approach to the future development of the area.</p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Although Hendon served well by public transport into London, this is not the case for access across Borough so there is a need for car use and therefore car parking. The car parks are used by residents and support local business.</p> | <p>The Transport Study provides further detail on the underpinning objectives, which are also supported by overarching policy for London and the Borough, including endorsement of active travel and the healthy streets approach, improvements in orbital travel links and improving safety and traffic management on roads. Other parking management issues for residents will include potential implementation of CPZs.</p>  |
| <p>Consultation process didn't offer much opportunity for questions/proper engagement and only open to those with digital access.</p>  | <p>Due to ongoing government restrictions it was necessary to consult on the SPD remotely, as has been the case for many other Councils throughout the pandemic. There has been positive feedback nationally that community involvement has increased as a result of the virtual consultation opportunities and this was also the case in Barnet as numbers participating across various consultation events has increased from previous face to face meetings. Responses were also accepted by email or post as an alternative to the questionnaire.</p> |
| <p>Proposals are contrary to Core Strategy and DM policies as they do not protect heritage, character or amenities.</p>  | <p>The SPD has been produced in conformity with existing policy, including the Core Strategy and London Plan, as well as the emerging draft local Plan, which can also have weight in the determination of planning applications.</p>   |
| <p>Development and additional student accommodation will put excessive pressure on infrastructure to the detriment of residents.</p>   | <p>The SPD requires appropriate infrastructure to come forward to accommodate new development with funding that will use S106, S278 and CIL as well as pooled developer contributions to meet requirements. The Council will also use planning obligations to secure Student Management Plans for all student housing developments.</p>   |
| <p>Car parking is needed as on-street parking is insufficient and dangerous. Parking areas could be greened and include electric charging points.</p>  | <p>Implementation of controlled parking zones (CPZs) is being explored to help address issues for residents with inappropriate use of existing spaces. The Transport Study outlines further details on SPD measures, which includes an increase in the number of electric vehicle charging points in line with London plan Standards. Section 4.4 on Greening Principles outlines a range of ways to make the area greener and provide biodiversity net gain.</p>   |



|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Consultation process during pandemic didn't offer much opportunity for questions/proper engagement. University and Council failed to consult residents.</p>   | <p>Due to ongoing government restrictions it was necessary to consult on the SPD remotely, as has been the case for many other Councils throughout the pandemic. There has been positive feedback nationally that community involvement has increased as a result of the virtual consultation opportunities and this was also the case in Barnet as numbers participating across various consultation events has increased from previous face to face meetings. Responses were also accepted by email or post as an alternative to the questionnaire.</p> |
| <p>Vision is deeply flawed</p>   | <p>Vision has been revised</p>  |
| <p>Residents and students have not lived successfully over many years and the proposals will create further problems for residents and does not provide for needs of local community (all about university).</p> | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area.</p>  |
| <p>The vision will further the ongoing deterioration of the area, removing character and aesthetic value of the area.</p>  | <p>The SPD has acknowledges the important heritage and rich architectural history of Hendon, which is underpinned by Appendix 1 Design Guide.</p>   |
| <p>Proposals are focused on university and Hendon will become a university campus (with all that entails)</p>  | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area.</p>  |
| <p>Strongly oppose it will permanently change the area</p>   | <p>Whilst there will be some change in the area, one of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area.</p>   |
| <p>Proposals don't consider residents and shouldn't provide any further student accommodation.</p>   | <p>The planning system cannot restrict proposals student accommodation, particularly where there is identified need. The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. Proposals for student accommodation seek to alleviate pressures for Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and free up family homes.</p>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| University and students don't form part of Hendon community and there has been lack of engagement on proposals that don't reflect residents' needs.                  | The Community Cohesion Principles within the SPD set out the framework to create greater integration between the students and local area. The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just to the benefit of the university..               |
| Loss of historic assets like town hall and library isn't acceptable, as proposals focus on university not residents  | The SPD acknowledges the important heritage and rich architectural history of the area, which is underpinned by Appendix 1 Design Guide.  |
| More GPs, underground car parks, better internet and electricity capacity needed to account for proposals.   | The SPD requires appropriate infrastructure to come forward to accommodate new development, which will be assessed based on proposals and early engagement, as outlined in section 6.4 Infrastructure and Funding.  |
| Strongly oppose the loss of the library as a public community space that will be very much needed after pandemic.  | The library is not a specific proposal in the SPD   |
| Proposals will change the area from residential neighbourhood to university campus with extra burden on infrastructure and services (to the detriment of residents). | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area. |
| Places needs of university ahead of needs of the residents (has also submitted email response).  | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university.  |
| No benefit to residents and risks heritage loss  | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. The SPD also acknowledges the important heritage and rich architectural history of the area, which is underpinned by Appendix 1 Design Guide.                              |
| Affordable housing and heritage protection for residents should be the priority not student accommodation  | Proposals for student accommodation seek to alleviate pressures for Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and free up family homes. The SPD also acknowledges the important heritage and rich architectural history of the area, which is underpinned by Appendix 1 Design Guide.  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Disagree with CPOs and lack of engagement opportunity of virtual consultation.</p>                                    | <p>If the Council are to consider the use of CPO to assemble sites, the scheme will need to fit with the planning policy framework and deliver sustainable wellbeing to the area through a viable, fundable and deliverable proposal. Due to COVID restrictions it was necessary to hold a virtual consultation, in line with government guidance. The consultation period has also provided opportunity to provide comments on the SPD.</p> |
| <p>The vision is focused on university and not residents and will be detrimental to local area.</p>                      | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area.</p>   |
| <p>Prioritises university not residents and the community are going to lose it's assets and heritage as a result.</p>    | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. The SPD also acknowledges the important heritage and rich architectural history of the area, which is underpinned by Appendix 1 Design Guide.</p>  |
| <p>Don't support CPO and would rather see University build on the car park they have in Greyhound Hill</p>               | <p>If the Council are to consider the use of CPO to assemble sites, the scheme will need to fit with the planning policy framework and deliver sustainable wellbeing to the area through a viable, fundable and deliverable proposal. Site 37 (A) at Greyhound Hill has been identified for potential development within the SPD area.</p>   |
| <p>Don't see benefit for residents and will only create more problems with traffic, anti-social behaviour and litter</p> | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. New student housing will also require a Student Management Plan to act as a code of conduct, to include management of antisocial behaviour and disciplinary procedures.</p>  |
| <p>Proposals are a betrayal of local area and community</p>  | <p>The SPD provides a way for better communication and understanding between the University and local residents</p>  |
| <p>Although the vision sounds worthy, there isn't enough detail on delivery to believe this can happen.</p>              | <p>The vision sets the overarching ambition for the SPD, with further detail on specific elements and delivery outlined in the following chapters and appendices.</p>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Focused on the university, there is great danger that the character of the area will be lost to commercial interest and overdevelopment (noted by the scale of proposals outlined).</p>  | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. The SPD also acknowledges the important heritage and rich architectural history of the area, which is underpinned by Appendix 1 Design Guide. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area.</p> |
| <p>Sceptical that the proposed new development will be sympathetic to heritage assets or will benefit the community</p>   | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. The SPD also acknowledges the important heritage and rich architectural history of the area, which is underpinned by Appendix 1 Design Guide.</p>  |
| <p>There hasn't been any integration of university with community and don't see how this SPD will change that to address anti-social behaviour, litter and loss of family homes for HMOs</p>  | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. New student housing will also require a Student Management Plan to act as a code of conduct, to include management of antisocial behaviour and disciplinary procedures.</p>  |
| <p>Environmental and ecological value of the area should be considered a main aim of the vision to maximise natural capital and its benefits. Stag beetles, hedgehogs and bats some of the species in the area that should be considered.</p> | <p>Section 4.4 on Greening Principles considers ways to enhance the natural environment in the SPD area to improve biodiversity net gain and the urban greening factor.</p>  |
| <p>Scale of proposals not suitable for the area, particularly for traffic, parking and overall character</p>  | <p>The Council is committed to the delivery of sustainable and active travel, with student accommodation proposals to endorse car-free development. The SPD also acknowledges the important heritage and rich architectural history of the area, which is underpinned by Appendix 1 Design Guide.</p>  |
| <p>The area is already overcrowded with students and antisocial behaviour</p>   | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. New student housing will also require a Student Management Plan to act as a code of conduct, to include management of antisocial behaviour and disciplinary procedures.</p>   |
| <p>Does not benefit the residents, only the university</p>  | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university</p>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Loss of historic character is a concern   | The SPD has acknowledges the important heritage and rich architectural history of the area, which is underpinned by Appendix 1 Design Guide.   |
| Doesn't consider needs of residents and also doesn't offer solutions to the many issues in the area                                   | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university  |
| Housing for first time buyers and young families instead of student accommodation would be more likely to retain students in the area | Proposals for student accommodation seek to alleviate pressures for Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and free up residential property for families.  |
| Loss of community assets is to the benefit of the university not residents or history of the area                                     | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. The SPD also acknowledges the important heritage and rich architectural history of the area, which is underpinned by Appendix 1 Design Guide. |
| The proposals do not reflect the vision and do not meet the needs of residents  | The SPD has been prepared in collaboration with key stakeholders and engagement with the community to reflect the needs of the community. The overarching development principles aim to shape the future development of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area.                |
| Existing residential area/use should be protected under current planning policies   | The SPD builds upon existing policy and the preparation of this document has been aligned to the emerging Local Plan, including the key opportunity sites. Once adopted the SPD will be a material consideration in determining future planning applications; however, current planning policies will also apply in accordance with this document.   |
| Existing residential area/use should be protected under current planning policies   | The SPD builds upon existing policy and the preparation of this document has been aligned to the emerging Local Plan, including the key opportunity sites. Once adopted the SPD will be a material consideration in determining future planning applications; however, current planning policies will also apply in accordance with this document.   |
| Loss of community assets is to the benefit of the university not residents or history of the area                                     | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. The SPD also acknowledges the important heritage and rich architectural history of the area, which is underpinned by Appendix 1 Design Guide. |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Already overcrowded and congested without these excessive proposals, bringing further problems for residents and antisocial behaviour    | New student housing will also require a Student Management Plan to act as a code of conduct, to include management of antisocial behaviour and disciplinary procedures. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area.  |
| No benefit to residents who will lose assets, amenity value and historic character of the area for disproportionate university expansion | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. The SPD also acknowledges the important heritage and rich architectural history of the area, which is underpinned by Appendix 1 Design Guide.  |
| Overdevelopment that does not benefit residents, only the university   | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university.  |
| Loss of community assets is to the benefit of the university not residents   | Section 6.4 of the SPD outlines the requirement to re-provision any community facilities that may be displaced and/or lost as part of the redevelopment.  |
| Rebalance the location of student housing across the sites - larger student population at the Meritage centre and fewer on Ravenshurst   | The Design Guide provides further detail on the design parameters within the SPD area and will support the SPD in terms of future decision making on planning applications for student housing coming forward.  |
| Community cohesion detail is woolly. Should focus on university providing public spaces and assets - a good example of such is the gym   | Section 4.5 on Community Cohesion outlines the principles expected to be delivered from proposed development in the SPD area. The Council will work with Middlesex University to explore best use of university resources for local groups as well as opening up specific lectures and workshops that could benefit the community. Dual access for facilities is also to be considered for spaces that could be opened to the public so the Council are fully supportive of this. |
| Visual images of what proposed area might look like could help community acceptance  | Although the design principles and additional design guide (Appendix 1) outline the framework of what is expected, detailed plans will be submitted for planning permission that must adhere to the adopted SPD guidance.   |
| Parking is already an issue, with residents parking occupied by students   | Parking is an area that has been identified as an issue in Section 4.6 that requires further investigation, which will include potential implementation of controlled parking zones (CPZs) in the area. Future student accommodation will also be accompanied by travel plans to promote active travel and reduction of car use, whilst Barnet also work to promote active and sustainable travel within the Brough utilising Transport for London's Healthy Streets approach.    |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Local residents are as important as transient students  | We acknowledge the importance of the residents in the area and one of the key objectives of the SPD is to facilitate greater integration within the community. The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, enhancing the area through collaboration, not just to benefit the university or students.  |
| Lacks detail, such as where relocation of library or other important buildings will be  | Detail for this is provided as part of the Hendon Hub consultation.  |
| The area is already overcrowded with students, antisocial behaviour is an issue, green spaces busy and littered to the detriment of local residents' quality of life. Although the vision sounds promising, very sceptical of actual delivery | The SPD acknowledges the issues highlighted and one of the key purposes of producing this document was to ensure delivery of the vision and objectives as set out. The Council and University are therefore committed to delivery, working with the community and developers to successfully achieve this.   |
| Personal safety is an issue and should be covered by community cohesion principal so would like confirmation of this?   | One of the key policy requirements outlined in Section 3.5 is community safety. Secured by Design Principles will also prioritise safety in new development and public realm improvements as referred to in Section 4.3. New student housing will also require a Student Management Plan to act as a code of conduct, to include management of antisocial behaviour and disciplinary procedures; therefore safety is an issue that is covered in various ways throughout the SPD including community cohesion. |
| Prioritises university not residents. No integration to date so fail to see how that will change.   | One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, recognising that there could be improvements in the level of engagement between the university and community, this documents sets the parameters for doing so successfully in the future. The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community.   |
| Need for resident car parking   | Parking is an area that has been identified as an issue in Section 4.6 that requires further investigation, which will include potential implementation of controlled parking zones (CPZs) in the area. Future student accommodation will also be accompanied by travel plans to promote active travel and reduction of car use, whilst Barnet also work to promote active and sustainable travel within the Brough utilising Transport for London's Healthy Streets approach.                                 |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Need for resident car parking   | Parking is an area that has been identified as an issue in Section 4.6 that requires further investigation, which will include potential implementation of controlled parking zones (CPZs) in the area. Future student accommodation will also be accompanied by travel plans to promote active travel and reduction of car use, whilst Barnet also work to promote active and sustainable travel within the Borough utilising Transport for London's Healthy Streets approach. |
| Prioritises university not residents.   | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university.  |
| Should recognise that the University will be occupying space in the West Stand at The Saracens Coptal Stadium once built, which requires better cycling and walking access. | The SPD has noted the importance of improving linkages with Coptall and Sunny Hill, which extends beyond the SPD area.  |
| Prioritises university not residents, who are losing community assets. Strongly disagree with CPOs.   | If the Council are to consider the use of CPO to assemble sites, the scheme will need to fit with the planning policy framework and deliver sustainable wellbeing to the area through a viable, fundable and deliverable proposal. This is not a tool for the university to acquire assets.   |
| Focused on the university, to the loss of the community as there is a need for affordable family housing for residents to remain in the area.                               | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. Proposals for student accommodation seek to alleviate pressures for Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and free up family homes.   |
| Resources and funding should be directed towards residents needs not the university, who should provide their own parking etc.  | The SPD aims to maximise and guide the wider benefits of having a educational institution like the University located in the area. To be a successful place the SPD promotes greater awareness and integration with the wider local community and local character when considering any future development proposals.  |
| Focused on university expansion and will just exacerbate existing problems such as traffic, parking, litter, noise etc.   | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage issues.  |



|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>Very concerning proposals for a community that is already experiencing issues with overpopulation including antisocial behaviour, traffic/lack of parking, loss of character and green space.</p>  | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. The SPD also acknowledges the important heritage and rich architectural history of the area, which is underpinned by Appendix 1 Design Guide. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage issues.</p> |
| <p>It is not clear which design has been chosen for each of the 4 Character areas. Needs to be easier to understand.</p>  | <p>Further detail on design and character areas can be found in Appendix 1 Design Guide. The SPD has provided a summary of each of the character areas and key aspects that new development should consider.</p>  |
| <p>This is about needs of university not community or residents (who will pay for it) and needs independent review.</p>   | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, The SPD requires appropriate infrastructure to come forward to accommodate new development with funding that will use S106, S278 and CIL as well as pooled developer contributions to meet requirements.</p>   |
| <p>Plans include loss of private garden to the rear of private property, which is not acceptable</p>  | <p>The proposed site (E) development does not extend beyond the existing boundary and therefore the garden to the rear of the property will not be included. Detailed site maps can also be referred to in the Reg 18 draft Local Plan. The rear garden is included in the SPD area, denoted by the outer red line but not the development site.</p>  |
| <p>To be onboard with this massive development, residents deserve to understand exactly how the university and Barnet Council will address important issues such as crime, drugs, overcrowded streets, already-strained infrastructure etc.</p> | <p>The SPD outlines a number of initiatives and requirements from proposed redevelopment, including Student Management Plans with new accommodation to act as a code of conduct, managing antisocial behaviour and disciplinary procedures. Safety has also been addressed within the Design and Community Cohesion Principles. The SPD requires appropriate infrastructure to come forward to accommodate new development with funding that will use S106, S278 and CIL as well as pooled developer contributions to meet requirements.</p>                  |
| <p>Car parking and antisocial behaviour already a problem attributed to university students, which the proposals will add to.</p>   | <p>Parking is an area that has been identified as an issue in Section 4.6 that requires further investigation, which will include potential implementation of controlled parking zones (CPZs) in the area. The SPD outlines a number of initiatives and requirements from proposed redevelopment, including Student Management Plans with new accommodation to act as a code of conduct, managing antisocial behaviour and disciplinary procedures.</p>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Car parking should be kept to benefit residents  | Parking is an area that has been identified as an issue in Section 4.6 that requires further investigation, which will include potential implementation of controlled parking zones (CPZs) in the area. Future student accommodation will also be accompanied by travel plans to promote active travel and reduction of car use, whilst Barnet also work to promote active and sustainable travel within the Brough utilising Transport for London's Healthy Streets approach. |
| Focused on university expansion and will just exacerbate existing problems such as traffic, parking, litter, noise etc. with students not contributing to local economy or community cohesion. | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage issues.   |
| This could provide a good opportunity to green the area and improve dilapidated and listed buildings but how will it be funded.  | The SPD requires appropriate infrastructure to come forward to accommodate new development with funding that will use S106, S278 and CIL as well as pooled developer contributions to meet requirements. Section 6.4 outlines the type of provision that will benefit the residents, including reprovision of any community facilities, public realm, green space and tree planting.   |
| Like the idea of safer walkways & management plans for students as well as integration of university with town.  | The Council welcomes this support.   |
| Impact on community is of concern  | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage issues.   |
| Sceptical of translation of plans into reality   | One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage issues. Planning applications coming forward will need to adhere to the SPD once it has been adopted.  |
| Focused on university expansion and will just exacerbate existing problems such as traffic, parking and GP capacity, with student retention to the area highly unlikely.                       | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage issues.   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Little attention paid to the environment or ecology</p>   | <p>Section 4.4 on Greening Principles considers ways to enhance the natural environment in the SPD area to improve biodiversity net gain and the urban greening factor. Section 6.4 on provision of infrastructure also includes how development principles will be supported with tree planting, public realm and green space improvements.</p>   |
| <p>Proposals are mainly to the benefit of the university not residents and will add to issues with antisocial behaviour and need for additional policing of the area.</p>  | <p>The SPD outlines a number of initiatives and requirements from proposed redevelopment, including Student Management Plans with new accommodation to act as a code of conduct, managing antisocial behaviour and disciplinary procedures. Safety has also been addressed within the Design and Community Cohesion Principles.</p>  |
| <p>Good to see the university being proposed as an asset to community. Pedestrian access is also welcomed and would like to see more eg. Watford Way and Quadrant Close with more tree planting and greenery</p> | <p>The Council welcome this support.</p>   |
| <p>Reinstate Church Farm House Museum and allow the University to build another facility for its present use</p>   | <p>There is no plan to re-open Church Farm Museum in this SPD</p>  |
| <p>Loss of parking is detrimental to residents and local business</p>  | <p>Parking is an area that has been identified as an issue in Section 4.6 that requires further investigation, which will include potential implementation of controlled parking zones (CPZs) in the area. Future student accommodation will also be accompanied by travel plans to promote active travel and reduction of car use, whilst Barnet also work to promote active and sustainable travel within the Brough utilising Transport for London's Healthy Streets approach.</p>                                    |
| <p>Objectives and proposals don't align</p>  | <p>The overarching objectives for the framework have been thoughtfully prepared and set out to underpin the development proposals.</p>   |
| <p>Not good for the area or residents. Should provide more buses.</p>  | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. Appendix 3 Transport Study considers bus provision and use, with suggested improvements including bus speeds and reliability. The Transport Study has taken existing conditions and policy context as well as the Healthy Streets Approach into account, and proposed measures and initiatives are consistent with those identified within the draft Barnet Long-Term Transport Strategy.</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Inappropriate development for a residential area  | One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. Proposals for student accommodation also seek to reduce Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and free up family homes.  |
| Area is already overpopulated and this will only add to problems of parking, traffic, antisocial behaviour, litter and crime. | One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. Student Management Plans will be required with new accommodation to act as a code of conduct, managing antisocial behaviour and disciplinary procedures. Safety has also been addressed within the Design and Community Cohesion Principles.  |
| Proposals will help the area, which is in need of regeneration but heritage should be protected, such a Meritage centre.      | The Council welcome this support and recognise the architectural and heritage value of the area. The Hendon Conservation Area Character Appraisal acknowledges the Meritage Centre as a possible future site for redevelopment and proposals will need to respect neighbouring heritage assets and local distinctiveness. Existing community use will be relocated/reprovided.  |
| Public transport and traffic calming along A1 is needed   | Much of the A1 is outside the SPD boundary; however, the Appendix 3 Transport Study highlights the importance of transforming the Burroughs into a multi-modal corridor to encourage active travel and less car use. This is also consistent with the Healthy Streets Approach and the draft Barnet Long-Term Transport Strategy.   |
| Good idea in general but strongly oppose any tall buildings/tower blocks as have been built in other parts of the Borough.    | The Council welcome this support. Appendix A Design Guide provides details on the assessment of heritage and suitable design principles, which underpin the key proposals in the SPD outlining suitable height and design within each of the character areas.   |
| Prioritises university not residents and seems unrealistic that it will encourage retention of students to the area.          | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. By providing space for students to develop and use their skills with start-ups, entrepreneurial ventures, incubator units etc. graduates will be more inclined to stay in the area and build on this foundation. Also, with the provision of a variety of services, leisure and retail that students can avail of living in the area, they are more likely to settle in the area longer term, rather than just travelling in for university attendance and leaving again. |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>Proposals are to the benefit of the university not residents and will add to issues with parking, antisocial behaviour and litter.</p> | <p>One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. Student Management Plans will be required with new accommodation to act as a code of conduct, managing antisocial behaviour and disciplinary procedures. Safety has also been addressed within the Design and Community Cohesion Principles.</p>                                   |
| <p>Objectives, principles and character areas lack substance and detail and fail to consider environmental impact</p>                     | <p>The detail in the SPD is underpinned by supporting evidence and analysis in the Appendices, which consider landscape, character and design in more detail. Environmental impact is an important consideration, reflected across all of the development principles and the objectives will be updated to capture this commitment.</p>   |
| <p>Lacks sufficient cycling provision - safe cycle routes is the issue not the hills</p>  | <p>Improving pedestrian and cycle connections is a key objective identified within the Transport Study that has been recognised in the SPD, together with the challenges of providing cycling lanes due to narrow pavements and lines of sight (to provide for cyclists and pedestrians).</p>   |
| <p>Increasing hall spaces for students frees up local property for residents and brings trade to local shops, which is a good thing.</p>  | <p>The Council welcome this support.</p>  |
| <p>It is overdevelopment of the area and loss of important community assets, such as the library</p>                                      | <p>One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area. Section 6.4 of the SPD requires the re-provision of any community assets that may be displaced and/or lost as part of the redevelopment.</p>  |
| <p>Prioritises university growth to the detriment of the residents, who will lose community assets and green space.</p>                   | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development and manage any associated issues. Section 6.4 of the SPD requires the re-provision of any community assets that may be displaced and/or lost as part of the redevelopment in addition to tree planting and improvements to public realm and green space.</p> |
| <p>This is about the university not what residents need</p>   | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development and manage any associated issues for residents (and community as a whole).</p>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Needs to be scaled down as the proposals are too dense and represent overdevelopment of the area.  | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development and manage any associated issues.   |
| More trees and accessible active travel routes to benefit residents not just university  | The Appendix 3 Transport Study highlights provides further detail on the importance of transforming the Burroughs into a multi-modal corridor to encourage active travel and less car use. This is also consistent with the Healthy Streets Approach and the draft Barnet Long-Term Transport Strategy.   |
| Concerned about impact on private property by the development at Fuller Street Car Park as details aren't clear throughout SPD   | Further detail is provided in Appendix 1 The Design Guide, which refers to the proximity of the site to Hendon - Church End Conservation Area and St Mary's Churchyard/Cemetery and therefore future development should not have negative impact on these assets.   |
| Proposal seems to be entirely to the benefit of the university and to the detriment of the local residents, environment and historic character.  | The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It also acknowledges the important heritage and rich architectural history of Hendon as well as the existing landscape, which is underpinned by Appendix 1 Design Guide and Appendix 2 Landscape and Arboricultural Assessment. |
| Objectives should include retaining the intended use of civic buildings, ensuring that any charitable organisation that is CPO'd is provided accommodation within Middlesex campus   | Section 6.4 of the SPD requires the re-provision of any community assets that may be displaced and/or lost as part of the redevelopment in addition to tree planting and improvements to public realm and green space.  |
| Heights listed as 4 storeys in the appendix are incorrect for site e (they are between 0 and 2)  | The heights maps have been removed from the documents   |
| Lack of consultation between university and residents  | The SPD consultation was conducted in accordance with requirements. The SPD was available for comment through public consultation from 11 January to 22 February 2021. Due to Covid restrictions consultation events were held virtually and documents were available for comment online.   |
| Recognise the improvement to buildings in the area but residents are losing access to valuable community assets, such as Town Hall, Church Farm Museum and the top floor of Hendon library (which is likely to be entire premises) | Section 6.4 of the SPD requires the re-provision of any community assets that may be displaced and/or lost as part of the redevelopment.  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Proposed development will put extra strain on infrastructure and parking, loss of heritage value as well as increasing antisocial behaviour</p>  | <p>The SPD requires appropriate infrastructure to come forward to accommodate new development with funding that will use S106, S278 and CIL as well as pooled developer contributions to meet requirements. Section 6.4 outlines the type of provision that will benefit the residents, including re-provision of any community facilities, public realm, green space and tree planting. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. Student Management Plans will be required with new accommodations to act as a code of conduct, managing antisocial behaviour and disciplinary procedures. Safety has also been addressed within the Design and Community Cohesion Principles.</p> |
| <p>Financial viability should be demonstrated clearly as local residents/taxpayers will be responsible given university and council debt - for proposals that do not reflect residents' needs</p> | <p>As noted above the proposals will use developer contributions for supporting infrastructure and will not be funded by residents council tax.</p>  |
| <p>Proposals will damage character of the area and accommodation unnecessary as students could live in Brent Cross.</p>   | <p>One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, underpinned by a Design Guide (Appendix 1), which acknowledges the existing character of the area. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. Proposals for student accommodations also seek to reduce Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and free up family homes.</p>   |
| <p>Proposals will change character of the area to university campus</p>   | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area.</p>   |
| <p>Will overcrowd and change character of the area to a university campus</p>   | <p>The SPD aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development that is more likely to be detrimental to the area.</p>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Object to loss of assets such as town hall as the proposals focus on university not residents  | Section 6.4 of the SPD requires the re-provision of any community assets that may be displaced and/or lost as part of the redevelopment. The Council will work with Middlesex University to explore best use of university resources for local groups as well as opening up specific lectures and workshops that could benefit the community. Dual access for facilities is also to be considered for spaces that could be opened to the public so the Council are fully supportive of this.  |
| Need for further consultation  | The SPD consultation was conducted in accordance with requirements. The SPD was available for comment through public consultation from 11 January to 22 February 2021. Due to Covid restrictions consultation events were held virtually and documents were available for comment online.   |
| Loss of residential character of the area is a worry, with associated loss of community assets, pressure on parking, transient students. | Section 6.4 of the SPD requires the re-provision of any community assets that may be displaced and/or lost as part of the redevelopment. The Council will work with Middlesex University to explore best use of university resources for local groups as well as opening up specific lectures and workshops that could benefit the community. By working together one of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, underpinned by a Design Guide (Appendix 1), which acknowledges the existing character of the area. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. Proposals for student accommodations also seek to reduce Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and free up family homes. |
| Proposals will lose character of the area  | One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, underpinned by a Design Guide (Appendix 1), which acknowledges the existing character of the area. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents.   |
| Doesn't consider residents - just for commercial gain  | One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area to avoid piecemeal development. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. It is also aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider community.  |



|   |   |
|---|---|
| Needs of residents neglected  | One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area to avoid piecemeal development. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. It is also aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider community.  |
| Lack of consultation  | The SPD consultation was conducted in accordance with requirements. The SPD was available for comment through public consultation from 11 January to 22 February 2021. Due to Covid restrictions consultation events were held virtually and documents were available for comment online.   |
| University already has detrimental impact on the area, without additional development proposals         | One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area to avoid piecemeal development. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. It is also aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider community.  |
| University already has detrimental impact on the area, without additional development proposals         | One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area to avoid piecemeal development. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. It is also aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider community.  |
| Lack of consultation on a proposal that will add to issues that university students are already causing | The SPD consultation was conducted in accordance with requirements. The SPD was available for comment through public consultation from 11 January to 22 February 2021. Due to Covid restrictions consultation events were held virtually and documents were available for comment online. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. |
| Will permanently change the character of the area   | One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, underpinned by a Design Guide (Appendix 1), which acknowledges the existing character of the area. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents.   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Lack of consultation. Scale of redevelopment is excessive              | The SPD consultation was conducted in accordance with requirements. The SPD was available for comment through public consultation from 11 January to 22 February 2021. Due to Covid restrictions consultation events were held virtually and documents were available for comment online. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area in a planned way, to avoid piecemeal development. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. It is also aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider community. |
| Will permanently change the character of the area                      | One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, underpinned by a Design Guide (Appendix 1), which acknowledges the existing character of the area. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents.  |
| Loss of community assets to university and community don't have access | Section 6.4 of the SPD requires the re-provision of any community assets that may be displaced and/or lost as part of the redevelopment. The Council will work with Middlesex University to explore best use of university resources for local groups as well as opening up specific lectures and workshops that could benefit the community.  |
| Needs to be proportionate to existing character                        | One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, underpinned by a Design Guide (Appendix 1), which acknowledges the existing character of the area. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents.  |
| Lack of consultation   | The SPD consultation was conducted in accordance with requirements. The SPD was available for comment through public consultation from 11 January to 22 February 2021. Due to Covid restrictions consultation events were held virtually and documents were available for comment online.  |
| Lack of consultation and character of the area                         | The SPD consultation was conducted in accordance with requirements. The SPD was available for comment through public consultation from 11 January to 22 February 2021. Due to Covid restrictions consultation events were held virtually and documents were available for comment online. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, underpinned by a Design Guide (Appendix 1), which acknowledges the existing character of the area. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents.                                  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Loss of residential character of the area, shouldn't be how council tax is spent</p>                | <p>One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, underpinned by a Design Guide (Appendix 1), which acknowledges the existing character of the area. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. The SPD requires appropriate infrastructure to come forward to accommodate new development with funding that will use S106, S278 and CIL as well as pooled developer contributions to meet requirements. Section 6.4 outlines the type of provision that will benefit the residents, including re-provision of any community facilities, public realm, green space and tree planting</p> |
| <p>Lack of engagement and transparency</p>   | <p>The SPD consultation was conducted in accordance with requirements. The SPD was available for comment through public consultation from 11 January to 22 February 2021. Due to Covid restrictions consultation events were held virtually and documents were available for comment online.</p>  |
| <p>Lack of consultation. Proposals are about university needs not residents</p>                        | <p>The SPD consultation was conducted in accordance with requirements. The SPD was available for comment through public consultation from 11 January to 22 February 2021. Due to Covid restrictions consultation events were held virtually and documents were available for comment online. One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area to avoid piecemeal development. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. It is also aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider community.</p>   |
| <p>Overdevelopment that does not benefit residents, only the university</p>                            | <p>One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area, underpinned by a Design Guide (Appendix 1), which acknowledges the existing character of the area. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents.</p>  |
| <p>University already has detrimental impact on the area, without additional development proposals</p> | <p>One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area in a planned way to avoid piecemeal development. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. It is also aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider community.</p>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Overdevelopment that does not benefit residents, only the university</p>  | <p>One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area in a planned way to avoid piecemeal development. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. It is also aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider community.</p>  |
| <p>Worried about development and increased numbers of students</p>   | <p>One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area in a planned way to avoid piecemeal development. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. It is also aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider community.</p>  |
| <p>Area is already overdeveloped</p>   | <p>One of the key purposes of the SPD is to shape the future of the area in a planned way to avoid piecemeal development. The SPD also seeks to ensure all supporting measures are put in place to alleviate development pressures and manage potential issues for residents. It is also aims to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider community.</p>  |
| <p>There hasn't been any integration of university with community and don't see how this SPD will change that to address anti-social behaviour</p> | <p>The SPD aims to add more formal processes and requirements to maximise the benefits of the university to the wider area, whilst integrating with the local community. It is about enhancing the area through collaboration, not just the university. New student housing will also require a Student Management Plan to act as a code of conduct, to include management of antisocial behaviour and disciplinary procedures.</p> |