

**POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, 20 July 2021**

**ITEM 5 – PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

**Note**

At the meeting a total of 30 minutes is available for public questions and comments. The questioner may ask one supplementary question at the meeting which will be answered without discussion. The supplementary question must be relevant to the original question put to the Chairman.

| <b>Agenda Item No</b>                                     | <b>Question</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
|---|---|--|
| Item 8 – Proposed Hendon Redevelopment Full Business Case | Sharon Rind<br><br>The flats on the corner of Prince of Wales Close and Church End, 13-21 Prince of Wales Close, are, I believe, part of the Meritage Centre redevelopment plans. There has been talk of re-providing parking spaces from the Fuller Street car park, but no mention of the 7 parking spaces that are to be removed, 5 within the site directly opposite the front doors of these flats, and 2 on Prince of Wales Close. Where are these parking spaces going to be re-provided as they are desperately needed by the residents of Prince of Wales Close? | Until this year these spaces were for the sole benefit of 13-21 Church End but are now included as part of the resident permit scheme, on a trial basis. Given the recent change in the status of these spaces, we are looking to re-provide these 5 spaces elsewhere.<br><br>The other 2 spaces that are currently available for the use of the residents of Prince of Wales Close will remain unchanged. |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Item 8 – Proposed Hendon Redevelopment Full Business Case</p>  | <p>Gerrard Roots</p> <p>This is a dreadful proposal, concocted in secrecy in 2019, and finally presented for public consultation during the chaos of the pandemic. The plan would ruin the two 'Heritage Conservation Areas' in Hendon. It would remove essential services to residents, and replace them with vast new Middlesex University buildings - including student halls of residence which are unlikely now ever to be used. The sole beneficiaries will be the big builders/developers. The plan is so awful that even some LB Barnet Conservative councillors (backed up by Hendon's Tory MP) have broken ranks to oppose it. (Those councillors already appear to have been punished for their decency.)</p> <p>I wish to know if the rest of Barnet's Tory councillors regard themselves as representatives of their residents or simply as the servants of powerful developers?</p> | <p>Councillors will balance the needs of local residents and stakeholders and the wider public/borough interest.</p>  |
| <p>Item 14 – Motion to Exclude the Press and Public and Item 15 – Proposed Hendon Hub Full Business Case (Exempt)</p> | <p>Tony Mason</p> <p>Does every Councillor confirm (by raising of hand at the meeting, or by any other form of acknowledgement) that they have reviewed, and accept as true, the information contained in the “Public Interest Test” (PIT) document generated by Barnet?</p> <p><b>Note:</b> The PIT is needed to lawfully invoke Item #15 as an exempt item.</p>   | <p>The Public Interest Test has been published.</p> <p>Under the Local Government Act 1972 the committee can lawfully go into exempt session if they consider necessary.</p> <p>As these questions are responded to by the Committee Chairman, the Chairman cannot answer on behalf of individual committee members as to whether they have reviewed a document. However, this does not prevent residents contacting committee members directly to seek confirmation.</p> |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Item 14 – Motion to Exclude the Press and Public and Item 15 – Proposed Hendon Hub Full Business Case (Exempt)</p> | <p>Tony Mason</p> <p>I have submitted a new EIR request to Barnet for any information withheld under Agenda item #15. Does every P&amp;RC Councillor confirm they understand by deliberately voting to exempt #15 they may trigger Information Commissioner to investigate if there was a breach of EIR Reg 19?</p> <p><b>Note:</b> A deliberate breach of EIR Reg. 19 may occur as the individual Councillor is deliberately attempting to “block” access to a “<i>record held by the public authority, with the intention of preventing the disclosure by that authority of all, or any part, of the information</i>”</p> <p>See:<br/> <a href="https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2004/3391/regulation/19/made">https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2004/3391/regulation/19/made</a></p> | <p>Under the Local Government Act 1972 the Council is entitled to have exempt reports and if required go into exempt session to discuss these report, although this is not always required. Members of the public are entitled to request information contained in these documents under the Freedom of Information Act or Environmental Information Regulations. All such requests are dealt with within the Council’s processes which include an initial assessment. If residents are not satisfied, they may ask for an internal review and after this stage they may appeal to the Information Commissioners Office. This is a lawful process.</p> <p>As these questions are responded to by the Committee Chairman, the Chairman cannot answer on behalf of individual committee members as to whether they have reviewed a document. However, this does not prevent residents contacting committee members directly to seek confirmation.</p> |
|---|--|---|

| Agenda Item No   | Public Comment  |
|--|---|
| Item 8 – Proposed Hendon Redevelopment Full Business Case                      | <p>John Doherty</p> <p>The Fenella / Ravensfield site has been highly-misleadingly described in supporting documentation as at present containing structures 4-7 storeys high, when in fact they are 2-3 storeys high. The Community fails to understand why such a patently disproportionate and inappropriate development proposal (for c. 1,000 new student and other accommodation units is being driven by Councillors, despite the lack of any support from residents; indeed in the face of unprecedented opposition from residents, who are rightly extremely concerned about the inevitable adverse effects on our Community and our Heritage (all wondering why the Councillors supporting the proposals are ignoring those legitimate concerns). Councillors need to listen to the residents and address their concerns.</p> |
| Item 8 – Proposed Hendon Redevelopment Full Business Case                      | <p>Professor Brad Blitz</p> <p>The Hendon Hub team challenge my criticism that their report is factually inaccurate. They claim Historic England's comments relate only to the SPD. Historic England condemned the proposed height of buildings in the SPD, but these plans are duplicated in the Hendon Hub boards. From the perspective of heritage, the distinction between SPD and Hendon Hub is arbitrary, but it's typical of the bait and switch approach employed by Barnet. Unsympathetic overdevelopment is unsympathetic overdevelopment; the proposals, including those on the Hendon Hub site, in the SPD, and the revised Local Plan, are all contrary to Historic England's guidance.</p>  |
| Item 8 – Proposed Hendon Redevelopment Full Business Case                      | <p>Gideon Glass</p> <p>Middlesex University accepts that it is primarily a commuter university with a high proportion of students living at home. The reports pack acknowledges that there will be changes in demand for higher education with Brexit / Covid 19 and that Middlesex intend on moving towards a blended physical / digital learning offering. The pack also states that Middlesex will continue to focus on vocational courses (e.g. nursing) which will drive demand for additional accommodation. Are councillors aware of the proportion of vocational students who currently reside in halls or are these students primarily commuters with no requirement for housing?</p>  |
| Item 9 – The Boroughs and Middlesex University Supplementary Planning Document | <p>Hayley Blitz</p> <p><i>'Hendon possesses advantages superior to almost any place in the vicinity of London; it has an excellent neighbourhood for those desirous of society... persons may here enjoy all those comforts and advantages generally only to be found at a much greater distance from the metropolis; but without being overwhelmed with adjoining buildings as usual with most places in the neighbourhood or within any moderate distance of town'</i> <b>The Times August 1819 - STILL TRUE.</b> These plans amount to the wholesale VANDALIZATION of historic Hendon. They have been repeatedly rejected by the community. There are better ways which must be explored.</p>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Item 9 – The<br>Boroughs and<br>Middlesex University<br>Supplementary<br>Planning Document | Professor Brad Blitz<br><br>I previously reported to councillors on this committee, that residents were denied effective consultation on the SPD, and that our data rights were breached. We also know the act of withholding information, including the business case, was deliberate, and as the ICO has indicated, unlawful. Documents published in 2019, but released under FOI last month, record LBB's intentions to deceive residents. They demonstrate that this matter was pre-decided. Councillor Thomas' emails to residents provide further evidence that he never intended to engage in sincere consultation, and that the redevelopment plans for the Boroughs and Church End, have been unlawfully pre-determined. |
|--|---|