

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Forward Planning](#)
Subject: My representation in respect of the Draft Barnet Local Plan Main Modifications
Date: 18 June 2024 20:50:39

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

**** Warning External Email ****

Subject: Concerns Regarding the Edgware Policy in Barnet Local Plan Main Modifications

Representation from: Anuta Zack

Address: [REDACTED]

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Edgware Policy in the proposed Main Modifications to the Barnet Local Plan. I am an Edgware resident of long standing, I have raised my family in Edgware. Edgware is my home, it is the suburb I consciously chose to live in rather than an urban setting.

The local plan will change the nature, structure and functionality of Edgware. It will make my town generally inaccessible to me as a person who suffers from a chronic health condition. (Spare me the suggestion of Ballymore's representatives that I should get a blue badge when I pointed out the issue) Edgware only has the Broadwalk Shopping Centres car park to support its shops unlike other local towns that have more than one car park. Street parking is very scarce and once the proposed annexation of Station Road to be the transport hub the traffic will be at a standstill. There will be negligible parking to support a town and shopping centre that Barnet Council identified in 2013 as having a catchment area of 400,000. The car park is fully utilised the commuter car park regularly full and even mid week the shopping centre car park is very well utilised. The shopping centre is fully let and Station Road and High Street are also well let unlike many High Streets. Edgware is incredibly, still well served by banks. All this will not survive a minimum 10 year build for the ridiculous density and housing numbers with no supporting infrastructure and no support for the shops who need customers. There are near 3500 bus movements daily on Station Road many of which are taken off road into the bus station but will be moved on to Station Road immobilising the road. Topped with the only access to the building site being Station Road. So all the buses plus 2 building site access points and all the lorries a major development requires so thousands upon thousands. So basically Station Roads businesses will be decimated. Doubt the banks will stay so the town will be economically damaged for a decade at least and probably long beyond. I will shop

[REDACTED] Already the customers of the shops in Edgwarebury Lane struggle for parking. I regularly drive on if I can't park close enough. So a population increase of 50% in the ward where for months there has been sewage leaking on the pavement as Thames Water fails to sort out one problem in system that is failing throughout the town. If using the underground I am dropped off by car that won't be an option. I will be effectively excluded from my own town. TFL representatives told me that there were no plans to provide hop and drop facilities like other Barnet areas benefit from such as Hampstead Garden Suburb to compensate of

lack of parking. Personally it seems to be the plan will boost Brent Cross and the new development there at the expense of Edgware who will suffer huge commercial damage.

As a resident of Edgware, I understand the plan has been under development since 2020. However, I only recently became aware of its existence and its potential impact on our community. Like many I was shielding because of Covid and it seems to me that much more effort should have been made to engage the residents of Barnet and Edgware in particular whose towns fundamental structure will be so seriously impacted and whose lives will be changed. Whilst the letter of the law may have been followed the spirit of the law not so much.

Unfortunately, I haven't received any written communication from Barnet Council about the Local Plan, despite its significance for Edgware's future. Given the potential for significant change to Edgware's character and residents' quality of life, I believe wider notification would have been helpful. I was living in central Edgware at that time. Interestingly in contrast Harrow has tried to engage residents in their local draft plan which was advertised locally. Edgware is a town artificially divided and communication and collaboration should be priorities to ensure unity and not encourage division.

To say I found the volume and complexity of the Local Plan and the related documents overwhelming is a major understatement. I have had many people reach out to me asking for assistance to understand it, Professor, doctors, engineers, etc etc etc. Edgware and Barnet have many residents for whom English is their second language how they are supposed to absorb it and make informed comment when it is beyond most native speakers is beyond me. I asked Barnet for a glossary as it was obvious that planning meanings are different, none provided. The 42-day consultation period seems insufficient for anybody to comprehend the plan's details – especially for anyone with work or caring commitments, there are thousands of pages including supporting documents. I don't feel it's been made as accessible as it should. Best practice should engage and include the public for consultation for what after all is for them and to serve them.

I am deeply concerned about the impact of the Local Plan on Edgware and its residents, both present and future.

In light of these concerns, I would like to express my support for any representations made by Save Our Edgware and the Edgware Community Association. Please consider their submissions as reflecting my own concerns. Can I also add a few points listed below.

Please can you arrange for this letter to be considered as part of the Equality Impact Assessment?

Yours sincerely

Anuta Zack

MM6 3.1

PARAGRAPH 2

Object to the removal of the words “our main” which are factually accurate and fairly reflect the importance of all these towns to Barnet. The words “our main should be retained

There is also a suspicion on my part that suggesting other towns are not main unfairly and disproportionately amplifies Edgware’s position.

PARAGRAPH 2

“Outside these locations , growth has been supported in places with capacity for change and where local character and distinctiveness are recognized.”

This phrase is unclear to me and I would imagine the majority of Barnet residents. There are no definitions of capacity or distinctiveness. I have personally asked Barnet planning for a glossary to be provided as the specific meaning of words in a planning context are very important. They did not provide one. To me capacity can be construed in many ways as can distinctiveness. In fact in any area there undoubtedly could be an argument for the existence of both or not. This plan should be accessible to the average resident. It should be clearly comprehensible to all, it is after all meant to apply till 2036. Ambiguity is unhelpful. A clear phrase with clear definitions of what they mean should be provided.

“Active travel choices” must have some link to disability accessibility and for those with mobility limiting conditions. Active travel without caveats is agist and disadvantages those with chronic conditions impacting mobility and energy levels and sensory impairment. Green spaces have significant health benefits and need to be incorporated with active travel in a meaningful way. Active travel can not be used to actually limit the accessibility for large swathes of society.

PARAGRAPH 3p

And the addition of the benefit of good design should also include in keeping with the surrounding architecture particularly the heritage assets and historic environment.

PARAGRAPH 6

With the addition of “to” there should also be “ a FULL range of housing types” as it should be clear that all the communities needs be met.

MM7 3.2.2

1. “Respond” should be retained, the impact of COVID has actually not been fully understood and analyzed. When/if data becomes available the Council should respond.
2. “help” should be removed, it isn’t a defined or quantified term. The obligation is to deliver growth

9. ” social” should be retained. I requested the definitions to understand the distinction being made. I was told that words were interchangeable. If that is the case there is no need to change it. If as I

believe Social is a broader term that includes community but not vice versa then it is definitely best to retain it. Again I would reiterate that a clear glossary of terms would have been very helpful for Barnet Council to include.

12. “well designed, beautiful, and safe places” I support all of these things as long as they can be defined in some measure. Beautiful to the accounts department is not beautiful to the general population. All data suggests that architect’s definition of beauty and well designed does not correlate with the general population. Clear terms of reference need to be provided please. Please add “heritage environment appropriate” as well.

MM9 Policy BSS01

A c) please add EVEN to distribution which is obviously equitable and all research shows brings better outcomes. Please remove Major and District as again the need for equitability and better outcomes.

e) Add “continuing “ before viability. The option to lower viability should not be possible.

B keep ”seek to minimize the Borough’s contribution” remove “mitigate”. Minimise is much easier to define and understand than mitigate. Mitigate can be done in the Outer Hebrides. Minimize is local, quantifiable and relevant to all residents and users of the borough and its facilities. Mitigate has not been defined and should be defined by radius to the issue if it is not removed which I hope it is. Mitigation in an unimpacted area is not mitigation to most people in an impacted area.

C retain the text that has been removed and change identified to identifiable. In no way should identifying housing opportunities not be ongoing and involve more widespread smaller scale developments which have significantly better long term outcomes.

4.7.1 at the end of the first sentence add but this is increasing back to pre covid levels. Which is factually true as home working is actually now declining.

MM10

3.4.1

Restore the diagram and work in collaboration. Towns and communities should not be divided artificially by boundary lines. If you exclude a percentage of a town then exclude all data incorporated into its status that is on the other side of the boundary line. It is inappropriate to count what isn’t yours either work together or adjust all data . Edgware would certainly drop status with only Barnet boundaries.

M11

4.4.3 35,460 for a 15 year plan but it is only a 12 year plan at best. Should this not be adjusted? Or can clarity be given on what has already been included and achieved?

4.4.5 remove “and then exceed” in the first sentence. Either they will or they won’t it is unnecessary to put it in and could be an unnecessary pressure in future that may not work to the residents benefit.

4.8.2 Remove Edgware, Edgware should be treated equivalently to those towns removed. It is unfair to disproportionately target a town.

4.8.4 third sentence replace “beyond” with “whilst” .

4.8.6 sentence 3 keep “estimate” and reject “reflects”. It can only be an estimate factually.

Reject numbers for Edgware in table 5 and adjust to a suburban town calculation which would take the figures down substantially.

MM33 HOU01

Ac) after optimized add with “regard to the to the town setting and the overall community needs.” People and their towns matter.

MM51 CDH08

First paragraph please retain archaeological remains and locally listed buildings. Important and should not be omitted.