

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

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO FURTHER PROPOSED CHANGES
Thursday 8 March 2012**

Name	Organisation	Comments
Charlotte Goodrum Daniel Watney	Comer Homes	See attachment no. 1
Mr Philip Murphy Quod Planning	Brent Cross Cricklewood Development Partners	See attachment no. 2
Mr Justin Mills Contour Planning	Bestway Holdings Ltd	See attachment no. 3
Mr David Hammond	Natural England	See attachment no. 4
Graham Saunders	English Heritage	We have no further comments to make, except that we would suggest that Policy CS5 key target monitoring indicator should be amended to say the following: No increase, <u>but a reduction</u> in number of heritage assets on the heritage assets at risk register.
Amy Douglas Drivers Jonas Deloitte	Bride Hall	See attachment no. 5
Hannah Pearce Rapleys	HI (Brent Cross) Ltd	See attachment no. 6
Victoria Bullock	A2 Dominion	See attachment no. 7

Barton Willmore		
Anna Rogers	Savills	See attachment no. 9
Andy Karski Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design Ltd	Middlesex University	<p>We have examined the proposed further amendments that could affect the University, and confirm that the University does not consider that any of them raise matters that affect the soundness of the policies in the documents.</p> <p>The University is pleased that the Council now proposes to add the wording “..or as agreed in a Travel Plan” to the reference to cycle parking standards in paragraph 18.8.6 of the Development Management Policies DPD. This overcomes the University’s previous objection to the requirement for compliance with higher education cycle parking standards in the London Plan on the grounds that these are wholly inappropriate for the Middlesex University campus in Hendon and not supported by evidence.</p> <p>The University appreciates and welcomes the positive way in which its concerns have been heeded by the Council throughout the policy preparation process. Please would you convey the University’s support for the proposed changes to the Inspector, Mr. Maher.</p>
Navin Shah AM	London Assembly Member for Brent and Harrow	<p>I would like you to take the following comments below into account in respect to the proposed further changes to the core strategy and development management policies:</p> <p>I always suspected that the Brent Cross development was a pie in the sky. Recent news reports suggest that original plans, for which outline permission was granted, have collapsed.</p> <p>It is unclear at this stage what would be the future of this scheme but I understand that there are moves to plan massive new retail development, without any housing and other critical ‘mixed-use’ elements, to which I am totally opposed.</p> <p>Any such fundamental change in the development brief or phasing to the</p>

		<p>original approved plan would require new planning application. Given the shambolic consultation in the past I demand that local residents in areas such as Dollis Hill in Brent are fully consulted to make them aware of the implications of the new scheme including any plans involving waste recycling project. I remain extremely concerned about any massive increase in any future redevelopment of the existing shopping centre on the grounds of increased congestion from increased traffic, destruction of small shops in local high streets and regeneration projects in the adjacent boroughs.</p>
David Hersh	Chairman of London Jewish Girls High	<p>I am writing in regard to the consultations to the above.</p> <p>Our school (London Jewish Girls High) recently attempted to purchase a site owned by Barnet council for the purposes of education, sports and communal use. This land was communal open space, but the council seem to have gone out of their way to make sure not to sell the site to us, preferring instead to sell to a commercial developer.</p> <p>I was just wondering how that fits in with all the proclamations made in the Development management policies of the council, who seem to be acting against their own policies, as set out in their core strategy plans, which states: Chapter 9: Providing quality homes and housing choice in Barnet (CS E19) states: We also seek to retain community and education uses as set out in Policy DM 13 – Community and Education Uses as such infrastructure supports the Borough as it grows.</p> <p>http://www.barnet.gov.uk/development-management-policies-preferred-approach-sept.-2010.pdf paragraphs 12 & 14 also seem to profess support of these policies, which Barnet don't seem to</p>

		actually wish to implement.
Mr C Malyali Briarfield Avenue	Resident	Could you please ask the Inspector to accept the wishes of the local community and reinstate the original PLAN Map 11 as prepared by independent consultants Arup and originally accepted by both the council and all those people who participated in the independent audit of open space and recreational space in Barnet. The plan is on page 59 and needs to be replaced with the original which was circulated to all participants included in the original draft but then removed by the council a number of months later without consultation.
Gloria Abramoff Briarfield Avenue	Resident	I would just like to comment on pre-publication stage of Map 11 in the Core Strategy. I am resident of Briarfield Avenue and would like to comment as follows: 1. The pre-publication stage plan is compliant with PPG 17. 2. The pre-publication stage plan supports and illustrates the policy; the current version doesn't. 3. The pre-publication stage plan will fit with the Site Allocations DPD; the current version won't.
C. Pagonis Biarfield Avenue	Resident	I would like to reiterate my previous objections to the core strategy amendments particularly as to how they relate to the green space bounded by the houses on Dudley Road, Briarfield Avenue, Tangle Tree Close and Rosemary Avenue. This particular site has been the subject of two recent planning appeals, both found that the land in question constituted green open space. Hence I would like to see a return to the pre-publication stage Map 11, in the Core Strategy as this version is based on an independent and credible evidence base and supports CS7. Additionally, Map11 in the core strategy at the pre-publication stage,

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complies with PPG17 2. Supports and illustrates the policy, the current version does not. 3. Fits with the Site Allocations DPD, the current version will not.
Mrs Suzanne Fitzgerald	Resident	<p>I would like to comment on the local development plan.</p> <p>It seems that the Map 11 has been changed at the very last minute. It now looks like Barnet Council have removed <u>all</u> private sports and leisure facilities and greenspaces from the map. Also excluded from Map 11 is the piece of greenspace (the Greensquare) at the rear of my house 61 Briarfield Avenue. This is despite 2 Planning Appeals being upheld having been fought by Barnet Council on the grounds that this piece of land is used for amenity and should be preserved in its own right.</p> <p>I am concerned about the changes to Map 11 and I find it very, very suspicious that when we (the Greensquare Residents' Association) protested about being removed unfairly from the pre-publication version of the map; Barnet, rather than putting us back on, LB Barnet took every sports ground and greenspace in the borough off it. Please look at all the dark green that has been lost from this plan compared to the original map which showed all of this land.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that Capita is in the short list of two to win the £250 million Regulatory Contract for LB Barnet. This would mean that Capita would employ all the Planning Officers in the Borough. Capita have been involved in the disputes about the Greensquare as they own Andrew Martin Associates who are the Planning Consultants who have acted, for the past 5 years, for Higgins PLC who bought the land speculatively in three separate lots.</p> <p>I would like my comments to be passed on to the Inspector, Vincent Maher.</p> <p>I would like a return to the prepublication version version of Map 11 because that version is based on an independent and credible evidence base and supports CS7.</p> <p>My son is a keen junior cricketer and I am also dismayed to see that the</p>

		Finchley Cricket Club in our road has been removed from its designation also.
Julia Hines	Green Square Residents Association	<p>I would just like to restate the view of Greensquare Residents Association that Map 11 should revert to the pre-publication stage version.</p> <p>1. The pre-publication stage version of Map 11 is in line with PPG17 and based on a sound evidence base. Neither of the other two versions meet this criteria, as it is clear that Greensquare field and other pieces of land have been omitted; 2. The pre-publication stage version of Map 11 supports and describes policy CS7, which later versions of the Map do not. This will create confusion and unfairness. A similar issue arose in the current UDP and was criticised by the planning Inspector Dr Andrew Pykett on those grounds in the course of a planning appeal; 3. The pre-publication version of Map 11 will be in line with the forthcoming Site Allocations DPD. Later versions will not; 4. Land on the pre-publication version of Map 11 can form the basis of a list of land of community value, including as it does, sports and recreational grounds under s.88/89 Localism Act 2011. Later versions of Map 11 may conflict with this.</p>
Peter Pickering	Finchley Society	<p>CORE STRATEGY</p> <p>CS PEA 1/d. I still prefer the less definite 'is due to be' to 'will be replaced'. In any case before the finalisation of this Core Strategy the NPPF will very probably have appeared, with what changes from the draft we do not know. So the Core Strategy will be out of date before it is born.</p> <p>CS PEA 3/a. I would prefer 'The Bill was enacted in November 2011' Shorter, and removing the odd implication that Royal Assent and enactment are different things.</p> <p>Adden 1. I am not sure that this précis of a complex piece of legislation, regulations under which have yet to appear, is quite accurate, and I am sure that it will soon become out of date, as there comes to be actual experience of neighbourhood planning. Perhaps something more tentative</p>

		<p>would be better. In any case, I see no difference between the old and the new wording in the first sub-paragraph.</p> <p>EMC LBB 4 'its' NOT 'it's'</p> <p>CS PEA 1/t In the West Hendon paragraph 'underway' should be 'under way' as in the Graham Park paragraph.</p> <p>CS PEA 1/y The word 'utilise' is too weak. Change to 'follow'.</p> <p>CS PEA1/al Why 'taller buildings' here, when the phrase is 'tall buildings' elsewhere. Remove a distinction without a difference.</p> <p>CS E27 'outside', not 'outside of'</p> <p>Adden 82. Since the document asserts frequently that all PPSs will vanish very soon, it is wrong to introduce a new specific reference to provisions of PPS4. Much better to set out what Barnet's requirements will be, as in the current version.</p> <p>Adden 141 Only last week (28/2/12) we were told that melting Arctic ice will lead to more severe winter cold episodes.</p> <p>DMPD</p> <p>PSA10 'Because of' was all right. 'Due to' is wrong - correctly 'owing to'.</p> <p>PSA 48 It is hard to disentangle the drafting here, but the second word should surely be 'developments', parallel with 'those' nine words later.</p> <p>PSA 51 Is there a confusion between Environmental Impact Assessments and Health Impact Assessments? It would help users of the DMPD to be told what sort of projects require such assessments - 'certain' is very vague.</p> <p>PSA 86 Including 'preserve' in the first sentence is welcomed - but the wording should surely be 'preserve or enhance', without the 's's'. The requirement on the applicant to show how the proposals relate to surrounding areas, and comply with conservation area character appraisals is a good one, and should be reinstated.</p> <p>PSA 88 It would increase clarity if 'for demolition' were retained after 'Proposals'</p> <p>DMP PEA 2/ss The second sentence would be less confusing if it began 'Rather than identify'; the text as it is suggests that retail units do the</p>
--	--	--

		<p>identifying. 'shops' is actually preferable to the abstract 'retail uses'. PSA 162 'and employment use' in 'Once this can be satisfied then partial loss for residential and employment use may be permitted.' is not understood - surely business use is employment use. But the whole sentence has perhaps been deleted. PSA170 'complement', not 'compliment'. DMP PEA 2/bbb Decide in this whole section whether 'Blue Ribbon Network' should have capitals or not. PSA 200 Delete the oddly chatty 'our'. PSA 203 Should it be 'Transport for London' threshold, as in PSA 195? DMP E24 A comma after CPZ in ii would clarify the sentence.</p>
Peter Pickering	<p>Finchley Society Also see attachment no. 8</p>	<p>DMP E4 and DMP E5 Residential Conversions 1. <u>Finchley Society Representation</u>: The Council has produced no evidence to show that the fundamental change it is proposing at the very last stage in the procedure is sound, as it was duty bound to do. In the document 'Further Proposed Changes to Barnet's Development Management Policies' the Council offers no justification beyond the jejune "Revision following EIP hearing session Infrastructure, Implementation and Monitoring." The original text has been in the DMPD since it first appeared eighteen months ago, and has been generally accepted by the community, and thus satisfies paragraph 2.8 of the Planning Inspectorate's soundness guide, (which says that there must be evidence of participation of the local community). We invite the Inspector therefore to recommend against this new wording. On the other hand, in our view the existing wording of paragraph 2.81 is justified, effective and consistent with current National Planning Policy and is therefore sound. The proposed changes are however neither justified, nor effective in delivering the <u>locally determined</u> "Three Strands Approach" policy that underpins the Core Strategy, nor do they make any difference regarding the implementation of national planning policy. They are not therefore sound. From a purely drafting perspective, the replacement of the last two</p>

		<p>sentences of 2.8.1 by the proposed paragraph 2.8.1a is an improvement as it brings more clarity to the wording and provides links to the other relevant policies.</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.8.1 and 2.8.1a would then read: -</p> <p>"The conversion of existing dwellings into flats can have a cumulative effect that is damaging to the quality of the environment and detracts from the character of established residential areas. Conversions may be appropriate in certain types of property or street but can harm the character of areas by changing the nature of a neighbourhood through more activity. This intensification of use can often involve more people movements, increased car movements and parking stress, more rubbish to be collected and more deliveries.</p> <p>"Flat conversions must therefore be situated in appropriate locations characterised by housing that has already undergone significant conversions or redevelopment to flatted accommodation. Conversions in roads characterised by unconverted houses will not normally be appropriate.</p> <p>"Where conversions are acceptable any external alterations should seek to minimise their impact on the external appearance of the property and local character. Conversions must also be able to satisfactorily address all other relevant policies in the DPD including the need to consider the dwelling size priorities set out in DM08 and the approach to parking management set out in DM17. Further guidance on conversions will be in the Residential Design Guidance SPD."</p> <p><u>2. Reasons:</u></p> <p>The Council's "Three Strands Approach" policy was approved by Cabinet in November 2004 and has been taken forward through the Local Development Framework.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Paragraph 2.2.1 states that the "Three Strands Approach" policy provides the spatial vision that underpins the Core Strategy and Local Development Framework and that Strand 2 is</p>
--	--	---

		<p>"Enhancement and protection of Barnet's suburbs town centres and historic areas".</p> <p>The Adopted UDP saved Policy H23 and paragraphs 8.3.3.20 and 8.3.3.21 recognise that conversions would not normally be appropriate in roads characterised by houses in single family occupation and that the cumulative effect of conversions in these roads is that they can damage the quality of the environment and be detrimental to the character of established residential areas. Character is more than just the physical character of a road, as has been recognised in a very recent appeal decision (paragraphs 4 and 5 of Appeal Decision APP/N5090/A/11/2162026, attached)</p> <p>Policy H23 has been carried forward into the Development Management Policies DPD and enhanced in accordance with the locally determined "Three Strands Approach" policy. We believe that DMP paragraphs 2.8.1 and 2.8.1a as set out above correctly address the need to retain family houses as identified by DMP Policy DM08 and contribute to the enhancement and protection of the borough's suburbs within the Three Strands Approach, which is consistent with the localism agenda and the wishes of local residents. It should be noted that significant portions of suburban Barnet, made up of roads characterised by houses in single family occupation, are located immediately adjacent to town centres and other areas that would be considered "highly accessible", yet the 'Three Strands Approach' policy safeguards these.</p> <p>There are, of course, in the borough of Barnet roads characterised by houses that have undergone significant conversions or redevelopment to flatted accommodation. There the principle of further conversions would be acceptable as they would not detract from Strand 2 of the policy. Often these roads contain the "very large houses" and the unoccupied ones both referred to in Councillor Tierney's evidence and in the Labour Party's submissions in advance of the EiP Hearing Sessions (Day 1 Matter 2). Conversions of houses in these roads and of the "very large houses" can be accommodated within the existing policy wording without the need for the proposed further changes. Some roads contain distinct character</p>
--	--	--

		<p>areas with part comprising houses in single family occupation and part "very large houses" some of which have been converted into flats or replaced by more modern flatted development (an example is Woodside Park Road in North Finchley running from the High Road down to Woodside Park Station where further applications to convert houses into flats would not be objectionable on character grounds alone); the existing policy wording can accommodate these.</p>
Peter Pickering	Finchley Society	<p>DMP E23 and DMP E24 Travel Impact and Parking Standards</p> <p>1. <u>Finchley Society Representation:</u></p> <p>We consider that the wording of Policy DM17g as proposed in DMP E23 and DMP E24 is not sound because it is not justified and not effective in responding to current National Planning Policy and the London Plan 2011.</p> <p>We consider that it would be sound if the wording of Policy DM17g2 were to read:</p> <p>"Development may be acceptable with limited or no parking provision, subject to the applicant entering into a legal agreement to restrict future occupiers from obtaining on street parking permits in existing Controlled Parking Zones and in Controlled Parking Zones that may be introduced in the future."</p> <p>(Incidentally, to achieve coherent sense, a semi-colon would be required between the words "CPZ" and "where" in line 1 of the Council's latest wording of Policy DM17g2ii.)</p> <p>2. <u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>The proposed further change of Policy DM17g1 by the addition of the word "maximum" and the latest version of the wording of Policy DM17g2 would intensify the displacement of parking provision away from off-street/on-site parking provision in developments to on-street public highway parking.</p>

		<p>The Transport for London representatives at the Examination in Public confirmed that the London Plan Policy 6.1 and Table 6.2 parking standards for residential development increased the pressures on on-street parking space and the amount of on-street parking. The addition of the word "maximum" in the proposed change to Policy DM17g1 will exacerbate the situation in the Borough of Barnet, which has lower Public Transport Accessibility levels (PTALs) and, according to the London Mayor's Transport Strategy, is more reliant on car use than many other London Boroughs.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the wording of Policy DM17g2 clarify that its application is dependent on filling up available on-street parking capacity before controls would be imposed and then only in Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs). The assessment of the need for any controls would be dependent on surveys whose reliability can often be questioned.</p> <p>A policy of allowing overspill parking from developments to fill up available on-street parking before any development management/control is exercised, would be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety and the free flow of traffic apart from the effect on the street scene and the amenity of existing residents. Such a policy does not appear to support Paragraph 34 of Planning Policy Statement 1 that states:</p> <p>"Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take opportunities available to for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions should not be accepted".</p> <p>Further, this policy would be likely to increase the pressure for more or extended Controlled Parking Zones (which may reduce the available on street parking spaces by as much as a third), and so produce further parking displacement.</p> <p>Within existing CPZs, in many roads there are already more parking permits issued than spaces available, let alone additional potential take up from existing residents and the ability for residents on the edge of the zone to use their permits to park close to shopping and other amenities.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>The policy seems likely lead to an increase in "parking space rage" and complaints to Councillors if residents find that they have to keep driving round the block to find an available parking space. If the response were to ration the supply of parking permits by increasing their cost, that would be to the detriment of less well off residents and particularly those living in streets where there is no off street parking.</p> <p>To put the parking pressures into context, we refer to the following statistics:</p> <p>Existing Housing Stock = 133,000 (Core Strategy Submission Stage paragraph 4.7.3)</p> <p>80% of residents live in households with a motor vehicle (Core Strategy Submission Stage para 14.2.3)</p> <p>73% of households have access to a car (Core Strategy Submission Stage para 4.9.1)</p> <p>28,000+ new homes proposed in Core Strategy Table 2 as revised – a 21% increase on 133,000.</p> <p>3. <u>Conclusion:</u></p> <p>The further proposed changes under reference DMP E23 and DMP E24 are not sound and should not be adopted. We urge the Inspector to amend Policy DM17g2 by the substitution of the wording suggested in Section 1 above, which would make the policy sound.</p>
Rahul Mody	Resident	<p>I live on Fursby Avenue near to West Finchley Tube station.</p> <p>I am writing in relation to the proposed change to the Local Development Framework in relation to abandoning the Council's current principle of resisting the conversion of houses into flats in residential areas and moving to a position that, even in areas of houses such applications will not be resisted provided the "appearance" of the flatted development is of</p>

		<p>a house.</p> <p>I have significant concerns in this regard in relation to the area I live in. The area of West Finchley, because of the proximity of the tube station will be a desirable area for flatted development at the cost of the much needed family homes. The area of West Finchley is characterised by 1920/30s houses of 3/4 bedroom family homes. However, we are currently seeing a rise in applications for significantly larger extensions. A concern is whether such houses will be retained as family homes once they are extended.</p> <p>The proposed change is likely to affect the following adversely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking situation, which is already a significant problem in this area - Provision of schooling - Over congestion significantly affecting the landscape of the area <p>I would be grateful if you can please take the above into consideration. Many thanks.</p>
Lesley Ludlow	Resident	<p>I write regarding the proposal to remove the following paragraph from the local development framework:</p> <p>"Flat conversions must therefore be situated in appropriate locations characterised by housing that has already undergone significant conversions or redevelopment to flatted accommodation. Conversions in roads characterised by unconverted houses will not normally be appropriate. Where conversions are acceptable any external alternations should seek to minimise their impact on the external appearance of the house and local character. Further guidance on conversions will be set out in the Residential Design Guidance SPD."</p>

		<p>There is a need for family houses in the West Finchley ward. If you take family homes out of this area you are in danger of increasing journey to school times for children, taking away the opportunity to walk to school and adding to traffic congestion in the area. I am against the proposal to make this change.</p>
Doug Killen	Resident	<p>I am very concerned about the proposed change to the Development Management Policies (DMP E4, paragraph 2.8.1).</p> <p>In particular I feel it is very important to keep the following existing wording:</p> <p>Flat conversions must therefore be situated in appropriate locations characterised by housing that has already undergone significant conversions or redevelopment to flatted accommodation. Conversions in roads characterised by unconverted houses will not normally be appropriate. Where conversions are acceptable any external alternations should seek to minimise their impact on the external appearance of the house and local character.</p> <p>Many of the roads around West Finchley are characterised by pre-1914 and pre-1930s 3-4 bedroom family houses. It is vital that any new conversions in this area maintain the external appearance of the house and local character. Furthermore, it is not appropriate to allow flat conversions in roads that are characterised by unconverted houses as this would radically change the family-friendly suburban character of the area. It would also put excessive pressure on parking and exacerbate the already acute shortage of quality family housing in Barnet.</p>
M. Ree and M. Emori	Residents	<p>As responsible home owners living in West Finchley my partner and I urge you to resist the removal of the following paragraph from the current</p>

		<p>policy.</p> <p>"Flat conversions must therefore be situated in appropriate locations characterised by housing that has already undergone significant conversions or redevelopment to flatted accommodation. Conversions in roads characterised by unconverted houses will not normally be appropriate. Where conversions are acceptable any external alternations should seek to minimise their impact on the external appearance of the house and local character. Further guidance on conversions will be set out in the Residential Design Guidance SPD."</p> <p>The good standards that currently exist in this community would needlessly be put at risk were this to take place.</p>
Loveday Langton	Resident	<p>I am writing to voice my very strong opposition to the proposal to allow more family homes to be converted into flats in West Finchley. I am shocked and appalled by this scheme, which will have nothing but negative consequences for our community and the quality of life for residents of West Finchley.</p> <p>We should be striving to preserve the family-oriented nature of West Finchley and its historic housing and built landscape. We should be striving to reduce, rather than increase, the burden on our roads, public transport, parking, schools and all other local services, which are already stretched to the limit and will not cope with the introduction of multiple additional households as family homes become flats.</p> <p>I have lived in Finchley all my life and am now raising my young family here and I absolutely do not want the nature of Finchley to change in this way. I cannot think of a single reason why this would be considered, as the only benefit will be to development companies who only care about</p>

		<p>profit, not about the community, the people and the way of life in Finchley. This scheme would damage our neighbourhood and is completely unacceptable.</p> <p>I find it extraordinary that Barnet Council claims to be "Putting the Community First" and then outlines a scheme that puts the community last and profit-making developers first.</p>
Kieran Kettleton	Chair - West Finchley Residents' Association	<p>On behalf of the West Finchley Residents Association (with some 200 members), I write in response to the Council's proposed changes to the DMPD regarding the conversion of houses to flats. The removal of the following paragraph is of particular concern:</p> <p><i>"Flat conversions must therefore be situated in appropriate locations characterised by housing that has already undergone significant conversions or redevelopment to flatted accommodation. Conversions in roads characterised by unconverted houses will not normally be appropriate. Where conversions are acceptable any external alternations should seek to minimise their impact on the external appearance of the house and local character. Further guidance on conversions will be set out in the Residential Design Guidance SPD." (Page 3)</i></p> <p>Local residents are concerned that the integrity of those areas in the borough characterised by 1920/30s single family homes (usually 3/4 bedrooms) will be destroyed by this very significant change to policy.</p> <p>The West Finchley Residents' Association strongly urge the Council to maintain its current principle of resisting the conversion of houses into flats in residential areas. To allow applications where the "appearance" of the flatted development is of a house where there is no definition of what will constitute "appearance", will give the presumption to developers. It will destroy the integrity of</p>

		<p>streets characterised by single family homes with gardens and will further reduce the much-needed stock of family homes in the Borough thereby re-engineering the population away from family residences.</p> <p>The concern of the WFRA is that our area of West Finchley, because of the proximity of the tube station will be a desirable area for flatted development at the cost of much needed family homes. Our area of West Finchley is characterised by 1920/30s houses of 3/4 bedroom family homes. However, we are currently seeing a rise in applications for significantly larger extensions and a concern is that developers will use this change in policy to seek to convert such extended houses to flats.</p>
Dr Suzanne King and Mr Richard Bartholomew	Residents	<p>We object to the changes to:</p> <p>DMP E4 10 2.8.1 (supersedes PSA 23)</p> <p>The conversion of existing dwellings into flats can have a cumulative effect that is damaging to the quality of the environment and detracts from the character of established residential areas. Conversions may be appropriate in certain types of property or street but particularly where they are highly accessible. However even in such locations they can harm the character of areas by changing external appearance the nature of a neighbourhood and increasing activity. Such activity this intensification of use can often involve more people movements, increased car movements and parking stress, more rubbish to be collected and more</p>

		<p>deliveries.</p> <p>Flat conversions must therefore be situated in appropriate locations characterised by housing that has already undergone significant conversions or redevelopment to flatted accommodation. Conversions in roads characterised by unconverted houses will not normally be appropriate. Where conversions are acceptable any external alternations should seek to minimise their impact on the external appearance of the house and local character. Further guidance on conversions will be set out in the Residential Design Guidance SPD.</p> <p>There is continual demolition of family housing in the area and its replacement with flats. This trend seems likely to result in a significant shortage of family housing at a time when the birth rate is at the highest for many years, generating a demand for family housing. The result could be families living in overcrowded accommodation which can lead to poor educational achievement and blighted lives.</p> <p>I hope you will reconsider.</p>
Alan and Jennifer Douglas	Residents	<p>We wish to object to the proposal to alter the LDF in regard to developments of flats.</p> <p>The area of West Finchley in which we live is predominantly single family 3 or 4 bedroom semi-detached houses. There is no precedent for conversion to flats.</p> <p>There is a high demand for small family houses in this area due to the proximity of Moss Hall School - not for flats.</p> <p>Any conversions would entail grossly extending the current houses and completely destroy the character of the area.</p>

		<p>It would entail the streets becoming terraces and not semi detached housing.</p> <p>Conversions would also increase car parking - which is already a problem due to the proximity of West Finchley station.</p> <p>This proposal is detrimental to the quality of life in West Finchley.</p>
Liz Wilby	Resident	<p>I thought I would drop a quick note from my husband and myself to say that we disagree with the proposals to remove the paragraph that restricts development of houses to flats.</p> <p>We feel this could spoil what is at present a lovely area and our street particularly would lose some of its community spirit.</p>
Salim Sabri	Resident	<p>It is of great concern that if the following paragraph is removed that much needed family homes will be converted into flats, especially in areas close to tube stations. I live in such an area and in addition the size of some of the houses attracts unnecessary advances from developers.</p> <p>Page: 3 of January 2012 document Prefix: DMP E4 Policy/paragraph: 2.8.1 (supersedes PSA 23)</p> <p>Flat conversions must therefore be situated in appropriate locations characterised by housing that has already undergone significant conversions or redevelopment to flattened accommodation. Conversions in roads characterised by unconverted houses will not normally be appropriate. Where conversions are acceptable any external alternations should seek to minimise their impact on the external appearance of the house and local character. Further guidance on conversions will be set out in the Residential Design Guidance SPD.</p>

		I urge the Council to leave this paragraph in the policies and protect the character of the borough.
Vivienne Igel	Resident	<p>I am writing to object in general to the proposals to relax planning policy around the conversion of family houses to flats. I live in West Finchley, an area of few flat conversions which as a result retains much more of a community atmosphere, not to mention homes with front & back gardens which encourage wildlife.</p> <p>I am deeply concerned at the removal of the current restrictions on page 3 of the proposal (DMP E4). As the council are already aware it has been an enormous struggle for local residents to maintain the character of this area both socially & aesthetically against developers wanting to turn family homes into flats.</p> <p>I strongly urge the council to resist relaxing policy on conversions & in fact would request that the council tightens current policy in order to maintain its commitment to listening to the views of local residents rather than developers.</p>
Alex Igel	Resident	<p>I write to object in the strongest possible way to the following paragraph being REMOVED from the current council policy document.</p> <p><i>"Flat conversions must therefore be situated in appropriate locations characterised by housing that has already undergone significant conversions or redevelopment to flattened accommodation. Conversions in roads characterised by unconverted houses will not normally be appropriate. Where conversions are acceptable any external alterations should seek to minimise their impact on the external appearance of the house and local character. Further guidance on conversions will be set out in the Residential Design Guidance SPD."</i></p> <p>I understand that The Council is proposing to make significant changes</p>

		<p>to this Local Development Framework. One particular proposal which could affect our area of West Finchley is to abandon the Council's current principle of resisting the conversion of houses into flats in residential areas and move to a position that, even in areas of houses such applications will not be resisted provided the "appearance" of the flatted development is of a house.</p> <p>My concern is that West Finchley, because of the proximity of the tube station will be a desirable area for flatted development at the cost of the much needed family homes.</p> <p>West Finchley is characterised by 1920/30s houses of 3/4 bedroom family homes. However, we are currently seeing a rise in applications for significantly larger extensions. A concern is whether such houses will be retained as family homes once they are extended.</p> <p>It could and should be argued, that West Finchley is an area of significant Architectural Interest and if you and your colleagues have and wish to promote a sense of aesthetics, West Finchley should be made a preservation area like Hampstead Garden Suburb and not fall prey to these would be "Johnny Come Lately" Property Developers out to make a quick buck. I am certain that if you and your colleagues at the council faced similar threats you too would be objecting vociferously.</p>
Richard Westgate	Resident	<p>I write regarding the proposed change to the Local Development Framework making it easier for developers to convert properties in the area to flats (DMP E4, Page 10 of the Sept 2011 document, para 2.8.1). The proposed removal of the following paragraph,</p> <p>'Flat conversions must therefore be situated in appropriate locations characterised by housing that has already undergone significant conversions or redevelopment to flatted accommodation. Conversions in roads characterised by unconverted houses will not normally be appropriate. Where conversions are acceptable any external alterations should seek to minimise their impact on the external appearance of the house and local character. Further guidance on conversions will be set out</p>

		<p>in the Residential Design Guidance SPD.'</p> <p>would appear to abandon the Council's current principle of resisting the conversion of houses to flats in residential areas.</p> <p>The existing policies have failed to prevent the approval of the development of certain properties despite local opposition. I believe that the Appeal system already favours the developers and that any move to weaken the controls in the initial considerations is ill-conceived.</p> <p>I was born in West Finchley over 50 years ago and the area has always been predominantly of family homes. I moved back to the area nearly 5 years ago since when I have noticed a marked increase in traffic and parking difficulties. I would therefore oppose a change which would inevitably lead to a further loss of family residences and increased traffic.</p>
--	--	--