

From:



Subject:

Concerns Regarding the Edgware Policy GSS005 in Barnet Local Plan. Main Modifications

Date:

17 June 2024 21:27:23

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

**** Warning External Email ****

Dear Sir or Madam,

Our comments, concerns and objections on the revised **"POLICY BSS01 Spatial Strategy for Barnet"** are detailed below:

*Between ~~up to~~ 67,000 m2 and 106,000m2 of ~~additional~~ **new** office space in the rest of the Borough (with priority given to distribution across Barnet's Major and District town centres through applying the sequential test for main town centre uses), and including the provision of affordable workspace to meet Policy ECY02;*

I would question how Edgware can deliver the intended Housing growth outlined in policy **Policy GSS05** Edgware Growth Area in excess of 4,740 plus homes and still provide meaningful contribution to office space in line with strategic policy BSS01, so as the town is simply not a dormitory town, but has a range of employment opportunities (not overly dependent on replacement retail jobs from site allocations 27 and 28 - which are the allocations for Edgware Broadwalk and Bus garage).

I would be concerned with the word **"New"** instead of additional, as this potentially enables simply old jobs and employment floorspace to be replaced as opposed to meaningful gain in jobs, that are not overly concentrated to ensure a range of employment locations for employers and employees in highly sustainable locations near transport hubs and reduced need for excessive travel.

A range of employment opportunities would be more befitting of Edgware's designation as Major Town Centre and Growth area, as opposed current plans for high dependency on replacement retail jobs translocated from the existing Broadwalk shopping centre that is to be demolished.

Scope for Edgware to provide a range of job types and a robust and varied economy is further eroded by amendments to ECY01 and which has significantly weakened language around retention of employment uses "where possible to retain existing and encourage new office space". This language severely weakens the hand of decision makers on applications and has no teeth in terms of implementation. **"Where possible to"** should be removed from the policy.

Policy GSS01 Delivering Sustainable Growth

The wording of (f) makes no allowance for future growth of the transport hub at Edgware, simply maintenance of the status quo, the bus garage and train infrastructure need room

to grow to accommodate the planned level of growth for Edgware and surrounding area, once the primarily housing and retail development is undertaken there will be no ability to meet future needs Edgware or the borough to grow into the integrated transport hub referenced in Policy **GSS05** and meet the sustainable travel needs of the Edgware, Barnet, London and South Hertfordshire residents who rely on the transport facilities of Edgware and help avoid over reliance of private motor vehicle travel.

Policy GSS05 Edgware Growth Area

Paragraph A (a) is of deep concern and objected to as the proposed changes suggests even more growth is possible for Edgware through a design led approach, numerous residents, including myself believe there needs to be an infrastructure first approach in addition to high quality design (often subjective and at the whim of highly pressurised Planning officer) of any redevelopment in Edgware. The amount of growth planned for almost 12,000 new residents (based on the UK average 2.4 occupants per a dwelling) in what by necessity will be an incredibly dense arrangement whatever design and layout is settled upon, in a fringe of London suburban town seems highly inappropriate and not conducive to community cohesion or successful place making. 12,000 people is a new town within a town, provisional plans appear to make an uncharacteristic fortress of high rise towers and bulky buildings in the centre of Edgware with a foreboding and overbearing presence and not very welcoming environment to existing residents. The town cramming concept approach adopted by Barnet is not welcomed especially in areas so deficient of public open space and green infrastructure and a more even spread of development should be considered amongst the town centres across Barnet. Whilst intended enhancements to the silk stream are noted this is not sufficient to make good on existing deficiencies and proposed population growth. This is a walking route, there is no room for incidental play for typical activities such as informal football or cricket games amongst children. Whilst we are sure the local NHS integrated care board, education authority and highway authority are working closely with the Planning team, there is concern their modelling and implementation has not proven reliable in the past to with many in the area feeling the effects of lack of critical infrastructure to meet existing needs let alone accommodate the planned levels of growth.

Before any development proceeds the main junctions within Edgware need significant improvement as the town barely copes as is, the intended level growth and construction traffic for 10-15 years on the scale proposed and these slow moving arteries will completely seize and kill the town altogether and increase traffic emissions and reduce air quality whilst queuing traffic sits idle for hours (there's little mention of cycle or bus lane infrastructure) the end result may be a new town centre but will be sterile and soulless as the existing small town has become unviable in the interim trying to accommodate such level of growth over a generation. This phasing of critical road and transport infrastructure delivery first should be included in the policy.

Again it is noted the removal of office from the policy and no mention of light industrial/creative type uses which would diversify the economy of Edgware and reduce

travel demand on the road network and public transport. An overly dependent retail offering is not a robust enough economic model to ensure the long term vitality of Edgware and overly susceptible to the vulnerability seen in the bricks and mortar retail industry with the rise in online shopping.

Paragraph A (e) is too vague, "**pursue**" opportunity for jobs has very little effect for Development management officers tasked with implementing the policy and reliant on what is submitted in planning applications, the policy needs more teeth to compel delivery of employment opportunities.

Policy CDH04 Tall Buildings and Site Allocations 27 and 28

It is a major concern and objection that there is increased flexibility for increased heights of buildings proposed for Edgware above 14 storeys, this severely weakens the negotiating hand of planners and Development Management Committee members to rebut excessively tall buildings within Edgware and leaves it very open to interpretation, we have already had sight of the developers vision for 29 storey development which seems to mistake Edgware for Canary Wharf or Manhattan.

For the reasons outlined above We object to the proposed modifications to the local plan and seek amendments which prioritise fair and sound, social, economic and sustainable development, the current plan does not achieve this for Edgware or Barnet as a whole.

Yours sincerely

Gerard and Margaret Doyle

[Redacted signature block]

[Redacted signature block]