

Statement of reasons 1st March 2017

I am Jasmin Parsons of 62 Marsh Drive (West Hendon Estate) Hendon London NW9 7QF
I write this statement on behalf of myself the residents of West Hendon and Our West Hendon.
The London Borough of Barnet (West Hendon Regeneration Area) Compulsory Purchase Order No 2 & 2a 2016

Introduction

I write this on behalf of all the residents in the hope of not just stating factual evidence but also allowing the individual person/s and their issues/ fears and concerns to be heard, recognised and responded to. This statement to my knowledge covers many of the issues/ fears and concerns appertaining to the West Hendon community, Wild Life and Local Area. It covers their prior, current and future issues/ fears and concerns.

The first number represents the page. The second number represents the item/ issue. The third number or letter (if used) represents the sub or specific item/ issue.

1.1. The first initial scheme as far as I am aware was conceived in 1995 when the council had earmarked the area for regenerating, so the concept of regeneration was nothing, the only issue that the council had was that the community constantly rejected every scheme that was presented.

1.2. The Regeneration scheme that was finally accepted in 2002 after much heavy opposition (we opposed it because it was deeply flooded) because it was clearly and repeatedly stipulated that the regeneration was for the resident community.

Cllr Brian Salinger also clearly stated that the new West Hendon Estate would boast a new all-weather pitch¹ [West Hendon News October 2002](#), Cllr Brian Salinger also clearly stated (which also had some direct influence) that all homeowners that wanted to sell up and leave would be able to. Cllr Brian Salinger also promised that all council tenants would also be able to move or transfer if they chose to do so at any time during the regeneration project.

1.3. Cllr Brian Salinger made several sudden appearances constantly singing the praises of how wonderful this latest scheme was, we previously had had no contact with this Cllr since his last appearance in the 90's when the leaseholders had been forced to pay for Major Works which we now know that we should not have paid for or was already covered in our insurance or service charges.

1.4. At several of the meetings Cllr Brian Salinger gradually agreed to the promises that have become known as the pledge that was pushed by the residents and not presented by the council as this was the only way Cllr Brian Salinger and Tony Shoults, Chief Executive of Metropolitan Housing Trust could finally get some semblance of co-operation from the residents. Again this was only finally accepted by the packed community centre after Cllr Brian Salinger made it absolutely clear that the council would not be doing any upgrades to the estate. ([A.1 Letter to Andrew Dismore 04/10/2002](#)).

2.1. Cllr Brian Salinger soon returned to becoming the absent Cllr. once he had the alleged result that the council desired had been delivered. I challenged the way the vote was counted pointing out that representatives of metropolitan housing had been collecting voting slips from our estate residents which stopped it from being independent, Cllr Salinger never challenged me ([A.10 Petition speech on behalf of West Hendon Estate Resident and Sweets Way Evictions at full council at Hendon Town hall 2014](#)).

2.2. The vote was rushed and did not allow any time for residents to hold further meetings to discuss the Pledge or go into more details on why there could be no more upgrading of the estate. There was very little notice that was poorly advertised with real details.

Luckily for the residents they were still able to ensure all that had been agreed at the open meetings were enshrined in print with the explicit promise from both Cllr Brian Salinger and Tony Shoults, Chief Executive of Metropolitan Housing Trust that all that had been agreed would be included within the pledge as it would be legally binding document and would be binding throughout the entire regeneration project. ([A.2 Pledge 2002/2003](#)) or so we thought.

2.3. We were also given verbal contracts that stated quite clearly that all current residents would have a new home on the new estate, this we were given would include the very small number of non-secure tenants(6 – 8) that were currently on the estate at that time.

It was also made absolutely clear that every single council home would be replaced with another. It was also made absolutely clear that all homeowners would be able to afford to invest in another new home on the estate with the introduction of shared equity again demanded by the homeowners at the previous meetings held on the estate.

2.4. At no time was there a discussion or agreement to cut – off times or dates before during or after the alleged independent vote was taken.

2.5. It clearly states on page seven of the pledge;

Existing resident council tenants and owner occupiers on the estate will be offered a new home in the new West Hendon, (which we were allowed to assume that existing would still appertain to the non-secure tenants that became secure after their 1 or 2 year probation as was still happening elsewhere in the borough including other council estates).

2.6. When required to make this statement clear to the residents that questioned what the words actually meant that it meant Cllr Brian Salinger said and I quote **“existing means just that”**, **“all council residents living on the estate will be classed as existing”**, which was also confirmed by Tony Shoults, Chief Executive of Metropolitan Housing Trust at the same time.

2.7. As Tony Shoults, Chief Executive of Metropolitan Housing Trust was also fully behind this statement I would expect Metropolitan Housing Trust to honour his promise with their existing tenants currently housed on both the estate and Ramsey Close.

This **Lisp Promise** was made with the authorisation of both LBB and Metropolitan Housing Trust and should either be honoured or enforced.

3.1. There are many other statements that were made in the pledge all of which was specifically promised to benefit the residents of the estate, the local community as a whole, the wild life, the local ecosystem and the local and historic history of our home area would not only be secured, but would also greatly enhanced and would benefit.

3.2. Much has been referred to appertaining to meetings held between the RRG (Residents Regeneration Group (now the PB Partnership Board since the beginning of 2014).

I will cover them in brief as there was much going on in the early months/ years that seem to have been left out of the council's submission. All the partners have concentrated their case from late 2012, 2013 & 2014. As we stated earlier this latest conception evolved from 2002, the very latest and totally unwanted version is all that has been covered in any detail.

3.3. In 2002 Metropolitan Housing Trust were the partner chosen for the £275 million regeneration project by Barnet council's cabinet after accepting Cllr Brian Salinger's recommendation.

There were many claims on Metropolitans behalf including and crucially that they were and still maintain that they are a registered not-for-profit housing charity organisation (and now we see Metropolitan Housing Trust blatantly withholding Assured Tenancies to their tenants that are entitled to them in order to expel them from our estate in order to ensure that Barratts maximises their profit margin.

Cllr Brian Salinger also made excuses that the high rate of crime (that did not exist) would drop.

That the rat runs would also disappear (there weren't any they had already been removed).

That the high street was decimated by empty shops (two, and one of them was an ex Moons pub which is still to this day lying empty approx. 10 year).

Much of what Cllr Brian Salinger was claiming would happen with the regeneration project had already been accomplished between local council officers and residents (members of the York Park Leaseholders Association, I know because I was one of the members who used to meet with the council officers regularly on a monthly basis). In fact maintenance, repairs and improvements were on the increase abet slowly. ¹ [West Hendon News October 2002](#)

3.4. The original partners that were chosen from the only three other developers that were presented to the local populace, we chose another consortium that had offered to only partially regenerate and partially upgrade the estate which at that stage in the process the council had accepted was a reasonable alternative.

3.5. The original 2003 partnership that was allegedly chosen by the estate included Metropolitan Housing Trust and also teamed up with leading affordable housing provider Lovell and Bellhouse Joseph to form a consortium that produced a regeneration proposal for West Hendon. ([A.3RRG meeting 09/10/2003](#))

4.1. Neither the residents nor the RRG were told whatever happened to that consortium? Or why? Despite questions being raised no answers were ever given. The consortium obviously produced a viability study and building primary design agreement of which we would like both to be added to the Core Documentation.

4.2. The results of the alleged election were published giving all the answers given as to the reasons why people were for or against the regeneration project. We would like these to also be added to the Core Documentation.

4.3. There were also Frequently Asked Questions by Leaseholders & Freeholders Factsheets 1 – 5 that were published we would also like these added to the Core Documentation.

4.5. We would also like the letter sent by Andrew Dismore to Brian Reynolds Director of Social Affairs Deputy Chief Executive of Barnet council 4th October 2002 to be included into the Core Documentation.

4.6. Planning & Design meeting 7th October 2003 *Phasing & Programme* page 3 of 3, Bullet point 5. *Will the Lakeview Children & Family Centre be re-provided on the new estate?* Answer – Yes the current proposed location for the centre is on the new square.

4.7. Bullet point 7. *Will there be any building on the new park in the future?* Answer – No – there is no intention to build on the park in the future. In order for this to happen, London Borough of Barnet would have to give planning permission, it is extremely unlikely that any such planning permission would ever be given.

4.8. Tenure Mix

Bullet point 9. *Are you still intending to provide accommodation for sons and daughters along The Broadway?*

Answer – yes we are still planning provide a limited amount of accommodation for adult sons and daughters wishing to be re-housed separately under the terms of a policy under which LB Barnet will nominate individuals to Metropolitan. This has now been disposed of WHY?

4.9. June 2004 although the Metropolitan, Lovell & Bellhouse Joseph consortium were still busy convincing all the residents that although Barnet council had been agreeable to a part a refurbished and part regenerated estate Metropolitan had decided that only a complete regeneration of the West Hendon Estate was the only option open to everyone.

In fact this was not only untrue it was a deliberate misinformation to ensure that the regeneration was able to go ahead.

A fourth alternative had been put forward but not to the residents of West Hendon. It was 'The Case For The Fourth Option For Council Housing' A report by the House of Commons Council Housing Group that was accessible to the council but never got to be seen by the ordinary public until it was too late Appendix 1 (A4 The case for the Fourth Option for Council Housing).

5.1. 9th February 2005 a letter sent out by Metropolitan Housing Trust apologised for not having time to inform the RRG that they were in final negotiations with Barratt Homes to join the consortium.

5.2. 17th March 2005 RRG Meeting Notes. Page 2, Bullet point 3. *Members of the RRG would like to be kept informed and updated as appropriate and by the guidelines of the **Freedom of Information Act**.* Page 3.

There had been much concern over Barratt treatment of tenants when dealing with tenants choice, moving, etc. this concerned TV reports appertaining to 'The Builders from Hell' scheme in Cricklewood that had to be demolished and an incident in West Midlands reported on by Trevor MacDonald.

5.3. 2004 & 2005. Three questions were constantly raised;
1 the size of the properties which Shelia Morcombe confirmed on behalf of Metropolitan Housing Trust that existing Council tenants and owner occupiers will be offered a new home with the same size (useable floor space, number of bedrooms) as they now occupy or larger if need be.
2 [Summary of the outline planning application January 2005 Metropolitan](#)

5.4. **2** The density was a concern that was never overcome but merely marginalised.

5.5. **3** The communications between Metropolitan Housing Trust, Barnet council and the RRG were never totally open and honest.

5.6. 2006 Many decisions were taken by the partners (RRG residents representatives were not classified as partners at these closed meetings between Metropolitan Housing Trust Barratt & Homes & Barnet which included the final discussions and agreements on the PDA), this lack of communication and promised consultation issue was again raised by the RRG and yet again the RRG were assured that this would change as we progressed into 2007.
3 [West Hendon News issue 20 June 2007](#)

5.7. 2007 October Metropolitan Housing Trust informed the RRG that during the previous three months (without the RRG being aware) those re-negotiations had taken place that changed the PDA and that they would do a full consultation exercise with all the residents in January or February 2008 (yet another year of hidden meeting information and deliberate communication black-outs).
4 [West Hendon News Bulletin October 2007](#)

5.8. 17th January 2008. Phasing Consultation Presentation to the RRG had changed into information statements, that is to say that what was now being presented was not open to negotiation but had already been agreed without the residents knowledge this meant that no consultation had taken place, further more certain criteria had been slipped in without any ones prior knowledge or discussion and went un-noticed for quite a while as other issues suddenly took centre stage.

6.1. One was yet another change in Independent Tenant Adviser (ITA) the other was the sudden decision again without the resident section of the RRG knowledge was the introduction of Gas-Free units. When questioned by the Chair Ned Baker agreed that apart from the initial first phase all other phases would be put before the committee for discussion before any agreement to build more Gas-less units in all the future phases after phase one had been completed.

6.2. Yet again we were lied to, each following phase has already been designated as Gas-Free units while also forcing residents to tie themselves to a 25 year deal with EON (no get out clause) to supply all their hot water and heating, which in most cases is proving to be more expensive for the individual resident. It also takes away their basic right to choose whom they wish to use which is not what any of the residents agreed to. It also builds a monopoly for EON.

6.3. The council tenants that were still being kept in temporary council accommodation was also causing serious concern as this had been raised on previous occasions but was now a major factor as we had over 130 of such tenants slowly replacing secure tenancies. It wasn't the fact that Metropolitan Housing Trust and Barnet had already stated in writing that all 548 social homes would be secured for other social tenants Like – for – Like, it was also the fact that many of these tenants had been with us for a number of years and it was plain that they would be with us for many years to come, and all the residents wanted a permanent solution that was acceptable for all concerned.

6.4. 2009 Mike Freer Head of Barnet council promised that the council would make 115 temporary tenancies into secure tenancies. [A5.Cllr Mike Freer 2009 decision for West Hendon tenants](#)

6.5. 2010 from here on things started to pick unfortunately the communication issues did not improve. Since 2006 up now there had been less than 6 open meetings with the residents several years only had one open meeting to accompany this approx. 8 newsletters went out to the residents. It was no surprise that practically the whole estate had switched off to what was happening to their homes, their community, their environment, their lives, all about to be shattered.

6.6. During the following turbulent years the RRG was raising the issue of poor communications and lack of information, the RRG lost several key committee members due to the frustration felt and the futility of the meetings, much taking up with the continued requests for the same information that either arrived out of date or incomplete.

6.7. Council officers were also assigned to the magic roundabout; as soon as they started to raise concerns on the resident's behalf they were either moved elsewhere or left the council leaving us to start all over again. This was a constant.

7.1. ITA's were another issue as we went through several of them during the following few years again this caused us all sorts of problems which was not unsuited to Metropolitan Housing Trust, Barnet & Barratt.

7.2. 2012 Brought in the new order of the Partnership Board (PB) talks with Barnet Councils ultimate aim of transferring the RRG into the PB, this eventually took over two years to complete as there was much that we were against, unlike the other regeneration estates we refused to allow control of the committee to fall into the hands of the council as this would have been a conflict of interests. [A6. Localism Act 2011/ 2012](#)

7.3. Yet again another new council officer was deposited onto the RRG committee his number one aim was convert the RRG into the PB mirroring all the other regeneration estates with a Tory Cllr as chair (who would be making housing policy behind closed doors) holding the casting vote and removing the residents right to elect their representatives at an open meeting, but instead having their representatives chosen for them by the committee run by Barnet council.

The residents fought tooth and nail to oppose what would effectively be a closed shop. This unfortunately came at a cost which was that much of the committee time was taken up with fighting for independence allowing the business section to exclude much of the information that should have gone past our eyes.

7.4. 2014 The RRG finally accepted the transition into becoming the PB at the AGM. But Barnet council was forced to concede to majority of the resident's terms which did not mirror the other regeneration estates. We would still elect all resident representatives at annual elections and not be selected in closed meetings as wanted by Barnet council.

Both Chair and Vice Chair would be members that lived or worked in the local community. One Cllr would be chosen by the residents at annual elections only. That way we could ensure our independence from Barnet council Cllr's. The one stipulation that was forced upon the RRG by council officer was that the resident section of the PB would be the only committee that would not be allowed to nominate, second or vote for a fellow committee member (this included the other PB in Barnet and all the council committees), this was deemed by the council as unethical as the resident section had to be beyond reproach (uncorrupted).

7.5. And so to 2014. Still we have the decade old argument of poor or non-communication, the RRG was elected to represent the residents on the West Hendon Estate (much publicised and promoted by the PB. Yet still they constantly put hurdles in our way. Barnet Homes (also a member of the PB, but was hardly ever present at the RRG meetings) are constantly moving tenants elsewhere on the estate or away from the estate without the knowledge of the residents section of the PB (RPB) knowing that this makes it impossible for proper representation to take place.

It was agreed by all the residents at the time of signing their objection to the CPO that unless they requested to me in writing for me to no longer represent them and their objection I would continue to do so. I will exercise that for all the residents that do not wish to appear in person or wish to speak at the Public Inquiry. All names have already been presented.

8.1. The most recent complaint by all the council tenants in temporary council accommodation as classified by Barnet council is the fact that many have been here for many years and have had no reassessments done since their initial arrival, some will have been here more than 20 years but still have no housing security or been denied housing security since they day they were allocated the property.

8.2. Many have since integrated into our community with everyone under the illusion that many had already been changed into secure tenancies only to suddenly be rudely awakened with the uncaring reality of the previous and present Barnet council actual housing policy, others who have since been forced to move away miss the community companionship that they shared on our estate. (A7 Temporary tenants meeting 12/11/2014)

8.3. Franklin House was turned into holding building with many vulnerable people deliberately being placed there with the specific intention of relocating them as far from the London Borough of Barnet as possible. This would have happened quite easily had it not been for the fact that many of the new tenants filled the void that the previous secure tenants were leaving behind and continued to keep alive our community spirit.

8.4. Even worse is the bullying and threatening behaviour being dished out to the secure council tenants, the un-secured council tenants and Metropolitan tenants.

8.5. Secure council tenants have been coerced or scared into taking unacceptable properties built or currently being built on Metropolitan Housing Trust's traffic island (what used to be Perryfield Way car park).

They have the right to turn down the property if they do not feel it meets their personal requirements the tenant has the right to choose where they wish to move to on the estate as per the pledge. Still officers representing both Metropolitan Housing Trust and Barnet Homes have and is still trying various tactics including telling the council tenants that they can discharge them from their duty-of-care if they do not take up the property that is being forced upon them.

This is has been stressful for the tenants and these are just the tenants that I am aware of.

8.6. Properties are not as per agreement in various aspects; I refer to the pledge and the core documents.

8.7. Many of the council tenants that have been placed in what has been classified as temporary council accommodation were informed by the council officers that they would only be staying for a short period (two to three years was the usual time scale given).

They would then be moved to another secure tenancy elsewhere. This has not happened and with the new proposals that Barnet council wish to introduce in April 2015 will not happen. (A7 Temporary tenants meeting 12/11/2014)

8.8. The fact remains that from a handful of such tenants in 2002 we had at one point 250 such tenants, 90% of which arrived on the estate before the Localism Act 2011/ 2012 meaning that most should be made secure council tenants not flexi private tenants.

9.1. The fact that the regeneration broke down for more than 5 years technically and morally made all the properties on the West Hendon Estate secure accommodation which should not have continued as temporary accommodation unless another motive/ issue had become the deciding factor.

9.2. The fact that Barnet council at first tried to wash their hands of the council tenants in the temporary council accommodation and were only forced to acknowledge them because of the continued pressure by the local residents and the RRG shows what they intended to do and would be doing now if the RRG had not been successful in representing them.

9.3. Many tenants although council tenants for many years have been subjected to being forced to move from one regeneration estate to another at their own cost by Barnet council in a deliberate attempt to keep them isolated, confused and powerless. Not only has this been costly in a financial way to the tenant/s involved, which Barnet council are legally obliged to cover every single move which the council decided not to, the council were also legally obliged to cover the cost of the tenants postal and telephone changes of address which they have not done, but still do not intend to do.

9.4. The stress that this is causing the individuals is criminal it is destroying family life, insuring little or no cohesion, constantly jeopardising jobs, forcing longer hours and journey times and costs on the very people that can least afford it.

9.5. It is also condemning these tenants to permanent insecurity and ensuring family breakups as the kids get older and lose their rights to a secure home and no lasting community.

9.6. The council tenants that have been moved to other accommodation (some have been pleased to move, others not so pleased), at least several that we know of has cost them. All have had to down size meaning that they cannot take all their furniture with them some have lost as much as a third plus many kids toys that have either been binned or given away.

9.7. Some have had the extra cost of buying new furniture carpets, curtains, etc. there has been no re-imburements.

9.8. The extremely short unrealistic time tables that have been used standard two days. One tenant had to move on the same day that she viewed the property or lose it. All were told that if they did not take whatever property was offered them would have made themselves homeless which had the obvious effect of frightening them into taking whatever was offered without question, as many had siblings to look out for, all are now struggling to make ends meet and many are now claiming housing benefit which they were not claiming before they moved.

9.9. Tenants have also been forced to move into properties that are unfit for use and spent over £4,000.00 on materials alone which like other tenants has pushed them into debts as a result of the direct action taken by Barnet Homes that could and should have been avoided.

10.1. Barnet Homes has used dirty underhanded tactics to ensure that they were able to secure as many properties as possible even at the extent of deliberately telling tenants that they were not entitled to be re-housed when they were entitled to be re-housed as clarified by solicitors when these tenants attended Willesden County court in mid to late November 2014.

10.2. Barnet Homes sent out approx. 60 notices to quit to all council tenants in temporary accommodation, the information that was on the letters was completely confusing and was totally confusing and frightening to many of the residents many of whom were vulnerable tenants with special needs. This situation got worse as it continued despite repeated requests made by the RPB to use a different tactic to help the tenants rather than frighten them.

10.3. Court dates were set for Monday 17th and Tuesday 18th November between 3:00 and 4:00pm, & Monday 24th and Tuesday 25th, six to be processed within each half hour (five minutes per case).

10.4. Barnet Homes with Mr Joseph Cookie being the main culprit deliberately advised the tenants not to go to court advising them that it was just a formality and that there was no need for them to attend. Many of them heeded that advice and have now all been served with notices to quit.

The complaints that were raised were as far as residents are aware never investigated or even spoken to Mr Joseph Cookie about ([A.11 Letter of complaint to Barnet Homes 2014](#)).

The tenants that heeded the advice of Our West Hendon did attend Willesden County court and all received legal advice for the first time, all had their cases adjourned until after Christmas to allow them to put together a proper defence which only Our West Hendon has been helping them with, and now with some help from several solicitors, with no help or guidance from Barnet council or Barnet Homes.

10.5. The council are not the only ones guilty of this tactic Metropolitan Housing Trust have also used on an elderly disabled lady advising her also that there was no need for her to attend Willesden County court, now she too is petrified of every knock on the door or letter through the post box ordering her to vacate her home.

10.6. The new build that will be owned and serviced by Metropolitan Housing Trust/ Barratt Homes is only going to be leased by Barnet Homes. No one will answer the question (which was asked of Ned Baker Metropolitan Housing Trust that was held at the exhibition held in the community centre in Marsh Drive). If the lease was terminated by Barnet or Metropolitan what would happen to the secure tenants and their tenancies?

This question still remains unanswered. We would like this question to finally be answered at the Public Inquiry as it seems to have been forgotten again.

10.7. There are countless other stories concerning the above. But we still have yet to cover the Freeholders and the Leaseholders.

11.1. The freeholders own their own houses and exist in what can only best be described as a Hamlet. They do not have to pay service charges yet will not only be expected to landed with service charges for a property they do not want, they will no longer own their property out right and will have to permission from Metropolitan Housing Trust/ Barratt Homes as they will be the freeholder. They are right on the edge of the estate with their own back gardens; green playing field (what is left of York Memorial Park) at their back, empty space to one side of them plenty of open space at their front and was only attached to Marriotts Close Maisonettes by one ramp way which has now gone. The freeholders have the right to protect their property from being forcibly taken from them and replaced with another tower block?

11.2. The leaseholders face a various expensive problems in the fact that the council has not adhered to either our pledge or their PDA. They deliberately under-priced the properties by a contemptuous amount that ensured that no leaseholder would be able to reach the 50% equity (other regeneration estates in Barnet only have reach 40% bench mark all except West Hendon being disadvantaged yet again by the very Cllrs that state they were doing this in our best interests West Hendon has still not been brought in line with the other regeneration estates.

11.3. The fact that this has carried on for so long and will continue should allow all other leaseholders to take up the equity scheme if they so wish. This needs to be changed accordingly.

11.4. Metropolitan Housing Trust slipped in the 10% disturbance fee as part of the payment in 2008 and did not actually bring it to the table at RRG meeting until the earliest 2010 this is also only applied to West Hendon. This needs to be changed accordingly.

11.5. The running costs of the new build are nearly treble the current costs of our present homes, although both our pledge and their PDA clearly state that these will be subsidised as with the secure council tenants. Once the subsidies start to reduce homeowners will find it increasingly harder to stay and will be compelled to sell.

11.6. The New Works that took place on the West Hendon Estate is still being billed to the existing leaseholders, some have already paid some or all due to threats of court action being taken against them. All sorts of weird and wonderful excuses are being made by Barnet council in their effort to make leaseholders to not only cover the cost of the entire works, but also to pay for works that do not need to be done, work that we do not want doing, work that is covered by our insurance and work that is covered by our service charges. (A8. New Work Cost power point presentation Chris Delaney).

11.7. Barnet Homes and the HSG (Homeowners Support Group, sub group of the PB) have been holding various meetings to try and resolve this very expensive issue. But Cllr Tom Davey Head of Barnet Housing policy for the council decided otherwise. (A9. CRC meeting at Hendon Town Hall April 2014. A10 Letter of complaint to MP Matthew Offord 2014).

12.1 We also know that the council made the decision not to do any major repairs to the West Hendon Estate when they decided to progress with the original regeneration project.

12.2. We also know that Barnet council decided not to pursue the Electrical Company through the courts that was responsible for the electrical maintenance of this estate even though other councils have chosen to do so and have so far been settling out of court that suited the councils and their residents. Cllr Tom Davey promised to pursue this avenue at the CRC meeting held at Hendon Town Hall (A9. CRC meeting at Hendon Town Hall April 2014). But has since reneged on his word, instead has ensured that the leaseholders continue to pay for the councils dangerous decisions.

12.3. Cllr Tom Davey also agreed at the same meeting that if any evidence that was produced that showed that any work that did not need doing he would be investigated and would have it removed (as per above) This we have proved to Cllr Tom Davey who then made a personal decision to remove all the months of documented hard work that had been given to him done in our personal time and expense with no justification or reason ever given. And still we pay

12.4. The way the whole project has been handled has been appalling. Barnet Homes failed to give clear and precise details sending homeowners on fool's errands allowing them to be taken advantage of by unscrupulous tradesmen that were charging extortionate money for rewires that were not needed or work that did not need to be done.

12.5. The fact that much of the New Works has to be done because Barnet council/ Barnet Homes have not maintained the new equipment that leaseholders are still being forced to pay for (on the quite) which Barnet Homes had already agreed that they would organise payment between themselves (which they should have paid for in the first place) and Barratts. This irresponsible action has also placed many lives at risk over a number of years and is still doing so adds up to nothing short of CRIMINAL NEGLIGENCE.

12.6. The rights of residents has been completely removed by the council. There are residents that wish to stay that are in the first phases that are being forced to move away. There are residents that wish to move away for various reasons who have been forced to stay some for many years to come. This applies to both tenants and homeowners.

We respectfully ask the inspector to;

 Ask Barnet council & Cllr Brian Salinger and Metropolitan Housing Trust to live up to their original promise to replace every council home with another council home as per the lisp promise that was given to all the residents. 2.3.

 Ask Barnet council & Cllr Brian Salinger and Metropolitan Housing Trust to live up to their original promise to ensure that all homeowners would be able to afford another home as per the lisp promise that was given to all the residents. 2.3.

-  Ask Barnet council to remove the cut off dates or have them amended to reflect the excessively long time it has and will still take to complete the regeneration project. 2.4.
-  Ask Barnet council to live up to their promise of acknowledging that as per the pledge and Cllr Brian Salinger promise that all council tenants living on the estate will be classed as existing include the council tenants currently residing in temporary council accommodation. 2.6.
-  Ask Barnet council to produce written documentation explaining the reason/s why Lovell & Bellhouse Joseph was removed from the regeneration project. When, how and who chose Barratt Homes including their viability study. And why the RRG and the residents were not informed until after the deal was already in its closing stages. 4.1.
-  Ask the PB to start replacing the amenities that have been missing from the West Hendon community such as the Lakeview Children & Family Centre, the Working man's Social Club, and full access to our current community centre without payments or on nominal fees. The restoration of the local sailing and canoeing club by the bridge. 4.6.
-  Ask PB to hand back York Memorial Park in full to West Hendon community which was stolen from the community even when they stated that they would not take it. 4.7.
-  Ask Barnet council in partnership with the residents in the London Borough of Barnet to fully investigate the fourth option which had been put forward as a viable alternative. 4.8.
-  Ask PB to honestly take part in a full consultation process with the residents of the West Hendon estate and the wider community. 5.8.
-  Ask Barnet council and the PB to open and honest with all the panning details and stages which allow residents to have a genuine chance of influencing decision that will affect the rest of their lives. 5.7. & 5.8.
-  Ask PB to re-open negotiations about the utilities issue to avoid the real threat of residents going cold because of high and/ or multiple bills. 6.1. & 6.2.
-  Ask PB to honour their promise to ring-fence the 548 social homes (that were all council dwellings at the time) and ensure that all 548 social dwellings remain council dwellings and not private dwellings with council tenants on leases. 6.3.
-  Ask Barnet council to honour Mike Freer MP for Finchley promise that he made in 2009 when he was head of Barnet council to convert the 115 (130 at that time) into secure council tenants (pre Localism Act 2011/ 12). Due to the time that the regeneration project has already taken and the time that it will eventually take, make all the current council tenants on the estate and those that have already been moved and placed on flexi tenancies into secure council tenants as well. 6.4.

 Ask Metropolitan Housing Trust to remove their previously unknown clause of withholding Assured tenancies to all their tenants that are residing on estates that are being regenerated. 6.4. & 10.5.

 Ask Barnet council & Metropolitan Housing Trust to put in place an open and transparent process that stops tenants being forced to new property and/ or sign new tenancy agreements without being given real adequate time to have proper checks done, taking into account that many have no real knowledge of legal or council workings, and many have to have permission from work which is not always readily given. 9.3, 9.4 & 9.5.

 Ask Barnet council & Metropolitan Housing Trust to reimburse the tenants that have been forced to bear unreasonable costs and/ or have gone into debt due to the speed of the move and the restrictions that accompany that move. 9.6, 9.7, 9.8. & 9.9.

 Ask Barnet council to remove the New works costs from all the homeowners and reimburse all the homeowners that have already paid in full. 11.6, 11.7, 12.1, 12.2, 21.3 & 12.5. Appendix 2

 Ask Barnet council to reimburse all home owners their costs in full for any and all electrical works that they have been persuaded/ frightened into having done in their premises. 11.7, 12.1, 12.2, 21.3, 12.4 & 12.5

 Ask Barnet council & Metropolitan Housing Trust & Barratt Homes to work out a workable process during 2015 that will allow any and every resident regardless of status to either be able to leave the estate without burden if they chose to leave, to be able to stay on the estate without burden, or/ and to move around the estate without burden to ensure that they are able to choose throughout the regeneration project. 12.6.

New Work Cost for Electrical Riser Mains and Associated Works

By

Christopher Delaney on behalf of the Leaseholders

Appendix 2

The community and wider area

14.1. The community as a whole has suffered. I myself have lived in this area for over 50 years which is longer than any of the Cllrs who are currently making decisions from the comfort of their own secure homes, of which they have total control over the people whose lives they are affecting/ infecting trapped in at totally different situation for various reasons most not of their own choosing.

The council & Cllrs have had more than enough time (no skin is that thick) to realise the true feelings of the West Hendon Community, the damage they are causing, the stress that growing and the misery that the Cllrs have and are still intent on inflicting on our community.

15.1. Barnet council sold this regeneration project in 2002 on the sole basis (the one and only factor that counted) that the existing community would benefit yet here we are fifteen years later in 2017 with much of the original community either moved away or soldiering on and the same Barnet council ruling party that stuck to their original statement that this regeneration project is going to benefit the existing community, now changing their song to the same tune as the previous Public Inspector and Secretary of States tune because it means that they can excuse themselves from the devastation that they have caused and continue to cause.

15.2. With over a third of the existing community condemned to be moved away to who knows where, another third of what is left of our community condemned to be priced off our estate and probably priced well out of London. What happens to the rest is unclear. What is clear is that this project has not benefitted our community, for it to continue in its present form will not benefit the existing community and when it has finally been completed it will in no way benefit the meagre existing residents that survive the project.

15.3. PB reasons for deporting the tenants from this estate to anywhere else including other regeneration estates is to allow for more 'homes to be built' yet the PB are deporting social tenants that have already been living here for many years and the social homes that have been part of our community.

15.4. What is even more tragic is that Metropolitan Housing Trust (social landlords) who was taken onto provide social housing for social tenants are not just refusing to take on any of the existing council tenants in temporary accommodation because they intend to increase profits by allocating their social allocation to the alleged affordable market (average starting price £380,000.00), hardly affordable to tenants that can only just afford council rents. Metropolitan Housing Trust (social landlords) are even refusing to allow their own tenants to stay, they are also being deported by their own social landlords to allow them to sell their quota on the open market.

We respectfully ask the inspector to;

 Ask PB to sit down with the residents and formulate a project that ensures that the current existing community have the option to remain on the estate as secure tenants to give them their family and their neighbour's real stability and allow the community to flourish. 15.2. & 15.3.

 Ask Metropolitan Housing Trust (social landlords) review their current profit before people policy and change it to people before profit policy allowing their present social tenants to stay on the estate and change their continued short hold lease to an assured lease as previously promised. 15.2, 15.3 & 15.4.

15.5. As Barnet Cllrs continue to sell off and/ or give away public land, homes and buildings to the private sector without the recognition or permission of the majority of Barnet residents for

short term gain at a very, very long term cost to the same residents that are still unaware of what is going on. Not one single council home is being replaced. **Not A Single One.**

Page 16 of 21

Out of the thousands of units that are being built not a single unit will be a permanent council home; they will all be temporary private units.

We respectfully ask the inspector to;

 Ask PB to change the regeneration project to ensure that decent secure council housing is built to help the longevity of our current community. 15.5.

 Ask Barnet council to hold a full public meeting to discuss and gauge how the residents of Barnet actually feel about the Cllrs current policy and what changes could be implemented to best benefit the Barnet residents and their communities. 15.5.

16.1. The loss of York Memorial Park has been devastating especially when it comes to Remembrance Day and anniversaries, (A.12 Service of Remembrance February 2016 & 2017).

The city has their war memorials, the Cllrs have their war memorials, yet we are deprived of ours.

Just because our community chooses to remember their loved ones and others who lost their lives during the conflicts by walking through the park with its green grass, tall trees, birds singing, children playing sometimes blue sky sometimes not so blue instead of quietly standing in front of a plaque or statue we are penalised.

We should decide how we wish to remember what happened in our community not the Cllrs that never visit our estate.

16.2. York Memorial Park has many functions and is central to our community and is used by one and all without issues or problems.

16.3. Even the current coalition government agree that the park is the most important part of any estate as helps people with health and/ or disability problems, reduces crime, and reduces noise pollution, car fumes and light pollution (**government document**). It allows residents to enjoy the freedom of exercise either singular jogging or in groups playing rounder's or football on our long ago lost football pitch now deep within the bows of the 26 story high concrete sunblock.

16.4. Since the start of this glorious insipid not one single promise has been fulfilled but it has been twisted, yet at the same time we have one amenity after the other with no replacement even off the drawing board, they are going to take the cage away from us, the only amenity the residents have left is the original community centre and temporary community hub that was supposed to share with the Marquine now long gone and the community centre is not long for our community world either. And this we are supposed to put up for anything up to ten more years.

16.5. The way that York Memorial Park was laid out insured that a large buffer zone separated unwanted interest and/ or interference from unwanted visitors no matter what their age or interest. This has worked exceedingly well despite the excuses put forward by the PB that this

Page 17 of 21

allegedly needs replacing. What the PB plan will be detrimental to the Welsh Harp and all its wild life/ fowl and could prove devastating in the long term with all the extra noise and light pollution.

(A.17 "the estate we're in Tuesday 15th March 2016). <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b00t0ydd> which also brings into question the fact that the amount of corruption allegations that are appearing in the press about Barratts workers that have resigned, been arrested and charged, are helping police with their inquiries brings into question the sale of York Memorial Park for just £3 at cost yet Barratts are able to sell the land on in slices for £millions with no benefit to the local or wider community.

We respectfully ask the inspector to;

 Ask the council/ PB to immediately restore our green and open parkland that all the residents dearly miss and need back where it originally was or provide the equivalent play space elsewhere on our estate to allow our community full physical recreational activities. 16.2. & 16.3.

 Ask the council/ PB to restore our War Memorial Park either back where it was without losing one stinging single square inch or blade of grass. Or agreeing to place it where it was first promised in the pledge and succession of plans enhancing its full glory to again allow the residents to remember their loved ones in the way they used to before they were stopped because of the 26 story high concrete sun block. Ensuring that the usable green area that still has bodies beneath it remains undisturbed and given true tribute decided by the residents to the community that lost their lives on February 13th 1941 16.1 & 16.3.

 Ask the council to immediately allow resident community committee full access at free or fees that reflect the weekly/ monthly income. This will allow the residents to re-start the various community clubs that have gradually stopped because of (a) the continued exodus of existing residents and (b) the high prices being charged by Capita. 16.4.

 Ask the council/ PB to refrain from interfering with the Welsh Harp Boundaries and seek more qualified advice from the WHRCC on how to best approach this very delicate issue that is very close to the hearts of all those that live close by or visit the Welsh Harp. And contrary to what the PB would want anyone to believe many hundreds of thousands of people that visit the Welsh Harp year upon year have no trouble in finding it. 16.5.

Loss of Light/ Access, Compensation & Building works

17.1. Contrary to what has been stated by Barnet council the residents that live and will be living for many years to come have never had any talks about our right to light (RTL) or our right to access (RTA) which when raised was immediately dismissed with no further

discussion. We the residents in Marsh Drive have already noticed the difference in light that we now receive with just one tower, our natural sunlight will be even greater reduced as others go up. We the residents have also noted that we can only access what is left of York Memorial

Page 18 of 21

Park from two entrances either from Cool Oak Lane or from the side of no.1 Marriotts Close when we used to over a dozen ways of accessing a much larger York Memorial Park. This also makes it less safe for residents to walk along as there is now a regular crowding of youths that do not actually live on the estate but congregate at the steps of the new blocks causing much concern for residents living in the blocks.

18.1. Contrary to what Barnet council may have stated they and the PB in all the years since the project was first started there was never a mention of our RTL or our RTA until I spotted two sentences on a Barnet council e-mail when they were applying for the CPO. Since that time the council have done nothing to help inform us of our actual rights which we are entitled too instead they have continued to hide it from us.

18.2. The gospel according to the PB/ Barnet Homes is that no one is entitled to any form of compensation no matter what the conditions or what the builders/ workmen get up to or do. No matter what is raised the residents of the PB are told NO. I wonder which is harder to claim compensation than it is to win the lottery.

18.3. Residents have had to put up with incredible disruptions and disturbances, we have a lot of residents who work shifts or at night, some on zero hours, yet they are supposed to just put up & shut-up'. We have residents that have been living next to the actual works itself and had to put up with the constant vibrations, banging, drilling, shouting machine workings day in – day out – day after day – after day non-stop, some of these residents are confined to their maisonettes some even stuck in a bed. Not able to open the windows because of the noise, the dust, dirt. Not once did any member of the PB ask one single resident if there was anything they could do to alleviate the terrible conditions that they were suffering in their own home.

18.4. This also applied to the New Works that was carried out by Barnet Homes representatives appertaining to the electrical and associated works that included many aspects and also created even more issues/ problems including, rat runs, pigeon roosts, security issues maintenance problems. Also not actually knowing why instillations were in place and the massive Health, Safety and Welfare issue such as Asbestos, Legionella Disease and Carbon monoxide poisoning.

18.5. Safety issues were also of a concern concerning the building site that we residents are currently living on. The obvious issues such as the deliveries arriving early in the mornings, engines constantly running, were parking on the pavements obstructing wheelchairs, pushchairs, parents with small children, shopping people with disabilities. Sudden large deliveries. The obligatory white van that no one ever know anything about.

18.6. The fact that the council and should be regulating and ensuring continuity working between the utilities and the development works on and around the estate has not happened, this has already made a miserable existence almost intolerable.

It is the council that can give or withhold Wayleaves that give the right for any utility to work to start or continue. All the upgrading of electric, gas and water has been a direct result of the

Page 19 of 21

development, yet the council have allowed the utilities to work whenever and wherever they pleased 24/7 without any regard to issues, problems and hardships that the residents have and are still having to put up with, all of which can and should be avoided.

3 October 2016 London Borough of Barnet Labour Group

19.1 Silicosis is a long-term lung disease caused by inhaling large amounts of crystalline silica dust, usually over many years. Very fine dust created can easily be inhaled. Once inside the lungs, the dust particles are attacked by the immune system. This causes inflammation (swelling) and leads to gradual areas of hardened and scarred lung tissue (fibrosis). Lung tissue scarred in this way does not function properly

We have been asking for the dust mounds to be covered but were told that it was impossible by the operators used and accepted by Barratts without giving any actual evidence that this is so, even though I and other residents have witnessed other such mounds covered to protect what lay underneath. Also the fact that these dust mounds while they sit should be sprayed 24/7 to stop the dust from rising and circulating and contaminating the area, this has not been done since the contractors stopped crushing and left site.

19.2. Asbestosis is well known to all and we were given assurances we had nothing to fear from asbestos as they were to remove all the deadly material from site safely. Then we find out (not told) that it had been decided that because the asbestos based floor tiles (expensive, slow and very hard to remove without breaking) and the asbestos aertex painted ceilings (expensive, slow and not able to remove without breaking) were not being removed as with the asbestos panels and piping (cheap, quick and easy to remove building and site) but being crushed on site with the rest of the buildings. We were assured that the asbestos in each of the ceiling and floor based materials would only come to 0. Something and would be safe, but no one wanted to calculate putting approx. 100 contaminated buildings in the mix with an unknown quantity of asbestos contaminated fine dust that would and still is continuously flying around our estate 24/7, this is the same contractors that stated that it was not possible to cover the dust mounds that would protect us all that live and work in this area from contaminated dust particles.

We respectfully ask the inspector to;

 Ask the council/ PB to immediately recognise the fact that our rights to light and access to green and open parkland i.e. York Memorial Park has been diminished or denied and must compensate the residents accordingly. 17.1. & 18.1.

 Ask the council/ PB to immediately recognise the fact that our rights to light and access to green and open parkland i.e. York Memorial Park has been diminished or denied and must compensate the residents accordingly. 17.1. & 18.1.

Page 20 of 21

 Ask the council/ PB to immediately recognise the fact that our rights to compensation appertaining to long and continued building works and street works compensate the residents accordingly. 18.2. 18.3. & 18.4.

 Ask the council/ PB to immediately recognise the fact that the council has failed thus far in protecting the Health, Safety and Welfare of all the residents existing and new on the West Hendon Estate and the neighbouring area and must compensate the residents accordingly & make a start in doing the regulatory action that they are empowered to do. 18.4. 18.5. 18.6 19.1. & 19.2.

 Ask the council/ PB to immediately recognise the fact that the council has failed thus far in protecting the Health, Safety and Welfare of all the residents existing and new on the West Hendon Estate and the neighbouring area and must compensate the residents accordingly, make a start in doing the regulatory action that they are empowered to do this is to include a full health check programme for all residents an local people and set up permanent air monitoring that should have been demanded at the start of this development but not thought of and was taken advantage of by the developers.. 19.1. & 19.2.

20.1. MP for Hendon Matthew Offord slatted the very residents and the estate that they lived on as degenerates and spongers living on a sink estate that he refused to visit and made up various un-substantiated untruths to make his claims look credible knowing that he would not be challenged on the BBC1 Money Programme on Sunday 17th January 2016 (A.13 The money Programme Sunday 17th January 2016). <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HVRjVVI-bt4>

20.2. Also Mrs Angry wrote a piece on that part of the Money Programme (A.14 The money Programme Sunday 17th January 2016). <http://www.brokenbarnet.blogspot.co.uk/2016/01/the-last-betrayal-or-breaking-of-west.html?m=1>

20.3. I also wrote a letter of complaint to the BBC1 asking for a right of reply with the chance of having Matthew Offord opposite me defending his statement, but I never received a reply. (A.15 The money Programme Sunday 17th January 2016).

20.4. Cllr Tom Davey stated at a full council meeting at Hendon Town Hall that he would rather have people that could afford the higher housing prices than the current ones that cannot. <https://amp.theguardian.com/society/2015/apr/21/ultra-tory-housing-policy-poor-out-of-barnet>
<https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=KdSQDA7gE5M&autoplay=1>

<http://voxpolygonline.com/2014/04/16/tom-davey-another-example-of-the-best-conservatism-has-to-offer/>

20.5. Barnet Conservative councilor and Deputy Mayor, Sury Khatri, has broken ranks and admitted that so-called 'affordable housing' is not actually affordable and the term is "insulting residents' intelligence". 25th July 2016 (A.16 The full council meeting 9th April 2016).

Page 21 of 21

http://www.barnetlabour.org.uk/tory_deputy_mayor_calling_affordable_housing_affordable_is_insulting_residents_intelligence

21.1. Barnet's Mayor Hugh Rayner came under fire for the "unfair" way he has treated tenants living in the properties he owns. http://www.times-series.co.uk/NEWS/11274996.POLL_Should_Barnet_Mayor_Hugh_Rayner_resign/

21.2.. "the estate we're in" the hour long documentary shown on BBC1 at 10:45 – 11:45pm on Tuesday March 2016 documenting the issues and problems they faced and the obstacles that they faced. (A.17 "the estate we're in Tuesday 15th March 2016). <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b00t0ydd>
The treatment of the way non-secured tenants is highlighting the way that Barnet council has deliberately denied many 100's of tenants their housing rights. Tenants such as Peter Parker of Sweets Way still finding himself after two years since being forced out because of regeneration. The fact that Cllr Richard Cornelius admitted that it would have only cost £11.5million to bring the estate up to Decent Homes Standards. Cllr Richard Cornelius has never admitted whom the trouble makers were when speaking to Barratt site manager Nathan Smith or who were the two left that still had to be dealt with, even when requested to.

21.3. Documentary/secret streets/ Deptford <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b01jt9bv>
Showed that councils have been willing to deliberately hide the facts and the truth from residents to ensure that they can force tenants out of their homes to pull them down to allow new construction to be built, knowing that the original building were sound.

We respectfully ask the inspector to;

 Ask the council/ PB to immediately take into account the lack of transparency in our ruling section of the council and request open and answers to the many questions these raise, and question the planning agreements and permissions that have been given throughout the development of our estate to allow our community and elsewhere within this borough. 15.5. 16.5. 20.1. 20.2. 20.3. 20.4 20.5. 21.1. 21.2. & 21.3.

21.4. 9.3 Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Convention states *"Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interests and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law"*. we point out the decision by the Public Inquiry Inspectorate and the Secretary of State's decision NOT to give the council the power to invoke the CCPO due to the fact that it did indeed deny the lawful rights of the homeowners to be able to by a similar or the equivalent property close by.

21.5. The CPO Report to the Secretary of State for Communities and the Local Government Dated 6 August 2015. Appertains in particular to individual homeowners Deed of Covenants, the alleged market value that is stacked against the individual homeowner. The Human rights issue for homeowners that was assumed would be resolved satisfactory but was not and still needs to be resolved.

Jasmin Parsons 62 Marsh Drive Hendon NW9 7QF