

**LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET  
LDF CORE STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES DPDs  
EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC**

**FINCHLEY SOCIETY  
POSITION STATEMENT IN ADVANCE OF HEARING SESSION  
Submitted by Peter Pickering**

**MATTER 8 – Managing the Built and Natural Environment**

**Paragraph 1.**

The Finchley Society believes that character of North Finchley and Finchley Church End Town Centres has already been affected adversely by the mass and bulk of the existing tall and large buildings and that they do not relate well to the form, proportion and composition, scale and character of surrounding suburban style buildings and houses particularly at street level.

Strand 2 of the Council's Three Strands Approach Policy as stated in Paragraph 2.2.1 of the Core Strategy Submission Stage is "The enhancement and protection of Barnet's suburbs, town centres and historic areas".

The June 2006 "Town Centre Enhancement in North London" study commissioned by the London Development Agency and the Government Office for London included proposals for buildings of up to eight storeys high on the Lodge Lane Car Park and other intensified development in North Finchley. That study failed to receive the support of the Council's Cabinet on 26 February 2007 when it considered a motion referred from the previous Council meeting.

The Society was therefore surprised that the submission iteration of the Core Strategy includes proposals for Tall Buildings of 8 or more storeys to be located in North Finchley and Finchley Church End Town Centres (Core Strategy Submission Stage Policy CS5). These proposals were not in the previous version.

Policy 3.4 and Table 3.2 of the London Plan 2011 set out density standards for sustainable residential quality and Policy 8.2 Monitoring Key Performance Indicator 2 requires over 95% of development to comply with the housing density location and density matrix (Table 3.2).

The proposals for Tall Buildings in North Finchley and Finchley Church End Town Centres would we believe require densities that exceed the Table 3.2 standards and be inappropriate for these locations.

We have to date unsuccessfully sought statistics from the Greater London Authority on the monitoring of the 95% Indicator and hope that the Inspector will be able to obtain them as it appears that Barnet Council is seeking to take up a large portion of the 5% Londonwide figure in its regeneration and development areas detailed in Policy CS3, let alone the North Finchley and Finchley Church End Town Centres.

We urge the Inspector to:

- a) Delete the references to North Finchley and Finchley Church End Town Centres from Policy CS5, and
- b) Move the penultimate paragraph of Policy CS3 to the end of the shaded box so that Policy CS3 clearly states that town centre enhancement and infill housing development will also be required to be set within the context of the Table 3.2 density matrix in the London Plan 2011.

**Paragraph 2.**

The Finchley Society is reasonably content with policies CS5 and DM06 (as is the Hendon and District Archaeological Society, which commented at an earlier stage.) It is very important that the borough's heritage assets should be proactively managed (the recent closure of Church Farmhouse Museum was a regrettably failure to do this), but this must be achieved through the actions and decisions of the Council itself, and not through planning documents

**Paragraph 3.**

The Finchley Society believes that the London Plan 2011 Table 3.3 minimum residential floorspace standards and the Barnet adopted UDP minimum amenity space standards are an essential requirement, given the amount of development proposed for the Borough in the next few years and that there will be long term detrimental social implications if lesser standards are adopted.

These standards should be clearly set out in the Development Management Policies DPD so that they have the full planning weight afforded to documents that have been the subject of Examination in Public.

This would not be the case if they were relegated to a Supplementary Planning Document, which should more appropriately flesh out the DMP policies by providing more detail such as minimum bedroom sizes and directions on calculating Gross Internal Floor Area and the related minimum acceptable floor to ceiling heights.

**Paragraph 4.**

The Finchley Society believes that "Absolute Protection of the Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and other valued open space from inappropriate development", as described in paragraph 2.2.1 of the Core Strategy Submission Stage DPD, should mean just that and the Development Management Policies should not allow development in "very special circumstances" or "exceptional circumstances". We understand that there have been cases where the Council has sought to enhance the value of its estate at the expense of land designated as greenbelt or used as open space and further understand that in the case of a proposed development involving green belt land near to the junction of Brunswick Park Road and Osidge Lane the intervention of the London Mayor was a major factor in bringing the scheme to a halt.

**Paragraph 7.**

The Finchley Society does not believe that the Council's approach to the siting of advertisements and telecommunications is unduly restrictive. Indeed, since badly sited advertisements, mobile phone masts, and telecommunications cabinets can be unsightly and sometimes even dangerous, the Society might even welcome a more restrictive approach.

**Paragraph 8.**

The Finchley Society is very concerned about the detrimental effect on the suburban street scene of incremental and inappropriate conversion of front gardens to use for parking and the related loss of street trees and increased pressure on the availability of on-street parking caused by the provision of crossovers.