

# CHIPPING BARNET RESIDENTS' FORUM

## MEETING HELD ON 15 JUNE 2010 ACTION NOTES

held at: Chipping Barnet Library, Stapylton Road, Barnet EN5 4QT

\*Chairman: Councillor Lisa Rutter      Vice-Chairman: \*Councillor Kate Salinger  
\*Denotes Councillor Present

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
1	<p><b>Mr Peter Branch (unable to attend the meeting)</b></p> <p><b>Church Farm Swimming Pool</b></p> <p>For the past two years I have been trying to find out through my local councillors in East Barnet Ward and Greenwich Leisure Ltd (GLL) what, if any, money is being spent on routine maintenance. To date I have received no communication other than being fobbed off by Robert Rams a year or so ago. The swimming pool is slowly falling apart, the ventilation does not work well and mould is growing back over the walls and ceiling in the changing rooms frequently used by schools and swimming tuition. The council or GLL tried painting over the mould last year but not surprisingly it has returned. The ventilation fans are clogged up with years of neglect.</p> <p>At the meeting Mr Dix said that the response was poor and that the pool was valued.</p>	<p>The Chairman referred to the disappointment voiced by Mr Dix and requested that officers look into the problems identified and that a response should go to Mr Branch directly.</p>	<p><b>Matthew Gunyon/Leisure Contracts Manager</b></p> <p>The Council is currently reviewing its partnership with GLL to better align the services provided to the Councils Corporate Priorities. As part of this review we are negotiating what information is provided by GLL to the Council this would include detailed information on income and expenditure including Maintenance costs. Once we have agreed this position with GLL the Council will make available to the public as much of the information as is permitted within the agreement.</p> <p>In the interim I shall take the comments regarding Church Farm to GLL and request a response and proposed actions to improve the facility going forward.</p> <p>Action: Matthew Gunyon to respond directly to Mr Branch after investigating the issues</p>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Update (and by whom)</b>
	The swimming pool temperature three weeks ago was so hot it was like sitting in a Jacuzzi, impossible to swim in and a complete waste of energy and water trying to cool the pool.		<b>ACTION: Matthew Gunyon to contact Mr Branch</b>
2	<b>Mr Daniel Hope</b> Parking in and around Hampden Square. At the meeting he also asked whether there were plans for residents living just adjacent to the square would be brought into the consultation process.	<p>At the meeting, the Chairman said that there had been a number of consultations carried out and that there had been no adverse responses. Neil Richardson said that the consultation had followed statutory procedure and he outlined why the scheme was being considered including any displacement. He also outlined the proposed improvements to the car park at Osidge Lane.</p> <p>Neil Richardson outlined how the decision to carry out a consultation was arrived at and he said that documentation regarding the process could be made available upon request.</p> <p>Neil Richardson confirmed that CCTV would not be used to issue PCNs.</p> <p>Finally, the Chairman said that residents would be listened to and that if a scheme was not working well, officers would address the issues.</p>	<p><b>Neil Richardson</b></p> <p>Following the successful completion of informal and statutory consultations in the area, it has been agreed to introduce a pay and display scheme on Hampden Square that is envisaged will provide better parking management in the area and therefore improve the trading environment for local businesses. Dedicated loading bays will also be provided. Unfortunately due to problems experienced procuring the pay and display machines the scheme's introduction has been delayed but it is hoped the scheme will become operational by the end of July. The tariff that will apply at the pay and display facilities will be as follow:</p> <p>Operational Hours: Mon- Sat 9am- 6pm Maximum Stay 3 Hours Charges: Up to 30 Minutes Free</p> <p>Up to 1 hour- 50p</p> <p>Up to 3 hours-£1.00</p>
3	<b>Mr Daniel Hope</b> Brunswick Park Community Hub	Martin Cowie outlined the planning application for a new health centre and library with consultation expiring on 22 July 2010. All views should be forwarded in writing.	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
4	<p><b>Mr Phil Fletcher</b></p> <p>What pledges to reduce greenhouse gas emissions have Barnet LB already signed up to?</p>		<p><b>Hester Fairgrieve</b></p> <p>Barnet has signed up to the Nottingham Declaration on Climate Change. Authorities that sign up to the declaration pledge to tackle climate change in their area and help the UK deliver its national climate change targets. In April 2008 we also signed up to a specific Local Area Agreement target to reduce per capita CO2 emissions in the Borough by 11% by 2011 (from a 2005 baseline).</p>
5	<p><b>Mr Howard</b></p> <p>1). Please can we have an update on the long overdue proposals for PCSOs to issue fixed penalty notices for minor civil offences such as dog fouling, graffiti and litter dropping in public places</p> <p>2) When will the local community be informed of the outcome of the Town centre framework for New Barnet especially in light of the overwhelming support for option one from the community. He asked where was the 'Bottom – Up and localization approach' that had been promised.</p> <p>At the meeting Mr Hope put forward a view that residents were</p>	<p>At the meeting, Martin Cowie said that the community had responded to a series of options and that dialogue was ongoing with key stakeholders. Subsequent to consultation a preferred approach would be presented. He said that a robust approach was being taken and that the council appreciated community</p>	<p><b>Lyn Bishop/ Neil Richardson</b></p> <p>Cabinet Committee considered the option to transfer powers to the police to issue FPN's and resolved not to transfer this power</p> <p><b>ACTION: Lyn Bishop to provide a written response to Mr Howard on what steps the council was taking regarding enforcement.</b></p> <p><b>Martin Cowie</b></p> <p>Following public consultation in March the consultant team are now undertaking detailed testing of the three options proposed for New Barnet. This process includes reviewing the responses of the local community, views of Members and other stakeholders,</p>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Update (and by whom)</b>
6	<p>stakeholders and that they were not being sufficiently consulted. There followed a debate amongst residents as to the remits or otherwise of the council's consultation processes and the view that the most important stakeholders were local residents.</p> <p>3). When will there be follow up discussions with the community on how option one can be implemented in New Barnet as envisaged in the National Conservative Party manifesto to involve local communities in drawing up plans for their neighbourhood.</p> <p><b>Jill Stocker</b></p> <p>1. The 'No waiting at any time' scheme- It is unacceptable and excessive. Self regulating alternatives such as railings, bollards or raised kerbs are a better option. Large vehicles do not need to mount the pavement in order to turn. They cannot as there are always other cars in close proximity. Will the council press ahead with this idea regardless? It is a waste of public resources. Residents affected by this will be attending and speaking in order to find a solution that will benefit all parties</p>	<p>Involvement. He said that council procedures were followed in respect of consultation and that the results would be available</p> <p>When the preferred option had been identified.</p>	<p>policy considerations and viability and deliverability. A draft final Strategy is anticipated to be prepared by late summer3666+</p> <p><b>ACTION: Neil Richardson to investigate why Dinsdale Gardens had been renamed Greenhill Gardens</b></p> <p><b>Martin Cowie</b></p> <p>Implementation and delivery of the three options is being considered as set out above.</p> <p><b>Neil Richardson</b></p> <p>It is considered that yellow lines are the most effective way to prevent parking obstruction from occurring and improve safety as alternatives such as railings and bollards do not prevent parking on the road. The introduction of measures such as these are only progressed following a statutory consultation that includes seeking comment from the locally affected population. However, at present</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>2. Will the council be issuing a fact sheet to all residents re the possible ramifications of the introduction of a CPZ prior to the questionnaire? Can the council please explain why the measurements that will be taken for the CPZ will be different rent to those taken when the Council conducted the three day survey? (1m from each side of a dropped curb and junction line allowing 5m for car space.) Can they please explain how 30-40 parking spaces could be lost with the introduction of a CPZ? Yellows over dropped curbs don't count as they are not public parking spaces but entrances.</p>	<p>At the meeting, Neil Richardson confirmed that there were no plans to introduce a CPZ at the present time.</p>	<p>No definitive view has been taken as to how any informal consultation should be carried out should one take place. Usually the questionnaires are a general parking questionnaire which is intended to gain the views of property owners regarding their current individual parking situations. It is the Responses to the questionnaires that help guide the council as to whether there is merit in investigating restriction etc in more detail</p> <p>. Traditionally explaining what a CPZ is, or any other forms of control come to that when carrying out a general parking questionnaire has been avoided as it has been inferred that the council intend to introduce one which is not the case at the general parking questionnaire stage</p> <p>The survey was carried out to establish parking demand in the roads and assumed that parking was not allowed with 10metres of a junction or within 1metre of a crossover which is a general rule of thumb applied in these circumstances; but that parking would take place on both sides of a road. It should be noted that we have no proposals to introduce a CPZ in these roads at this time, and the exact number of parking spaces that may be provided has not yet been determined. However, if a CPZ is designed, there will inevitably be a</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>3. If parking on both sides and on the kerb is tolerated now, why would the introduction of bays make a difference? Surely as in the two way Alston Road, wider and narrower bays can be implemented? Why did the council suggest parking on one side of the road could be an option? We are almost the same width as Alston Road yet we are one way. We can park the way we do without controls and be safe, yet with controls we will be deemed unsafe. Explain?</p> <p>4. Why did the Council reply to my petition with answers that had not been checked? i.e. width of road, obstructions, amount of street furniture etc. This is affecting people's lives and needs to be treated seriously</p> <p>5. I would like to know how many cars are registered to Alston/Stapylton/Strafford/Falkland/Salisbury/Carnarvon Roads. Also The Drive and The Avenue respectively</p> <p>6. How many residents have written to the council about the parking situation in our roads since the CPZ's were introduced? How many have been in favour of controls how many against?</p>		<p>reduction in space identified for parking as we can't introduce parking where it is deemed inappropriate irrespective of whether vehicles may be parked there now.</p> <p>As referred to above, no proposals are in place regarding a possible parking layout and the suggestion of parking on one side of the road only appears to have been taken out of context as it was referred to as one of the many options that are considered when designing a parking layout – it does not mean that this has been determined as appropriate for this particular area. Again the issue of whether current parking practice is safe or unsafe is a matter of opinion, but if parking bays are seen to be formally introduced, they must be provided in accordance with current guidelines and practice.</p> <p>The Design Team acknowledged receipt of the petition but did not comment on the contents of the petition in the response. Therefore it is not clear what answers that were not checked are being referred to?</p> <p>The Council are only aware of vehicle ownership details of those residents who have applied for residents permits. It does not access national databases of vehicle ownership in isolation.</p> <p>No consultation regarding a CPZ has recently been carried out in these roads, however, the council has received a total of 67 requests from residents of Puller, Sebright and Calvert Roads for parking matters to be investigated</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>7. How do the council respond to our roads belonging to a separate zone to the C zone that surrounds us- A for example? Becoming C zone will not stop the overflow into our roads, it will only increase it. We want to be able to park in the evening as well as during the day.</p> <p>8. If we cannot have permits will the council consider the free option in Brunswick Park Road? We need some form of policing and control.</p> <p>9. When will the results of the last CPZ review become available?</p> <p>10. What steps are the council taking to help local workers park more cheaply or for free? Hadley Green Road and Ravenscroft Park are always empty and most CPZ areas are half full during the day.</p>		<p>Detail of the nature of the parking controls including times of operation and whether it should be a separate CPZ would be established should the option of a CPZ be explored further in order to come up with the best possible solution for these roads.</p> <p>Any discussion regarding possible future parking provision would seek to establish the most appropriate parking provision.</p> <p>Officers anticipate presenting the findings of the review to local ward members in the first instance prior to advising all within the CPZ of the outcome and any possible further actions. At this stage the information will of course be available to any that wish to see it which is anticipated to be within the next few months The Council are keen to ensure that every effort is made to minimise detrimental impact caused through parking pressure on local trading viability. To this end it is undertaking discussions with local businesses as part of a Town Centre Strategy to explore what options might be possible to promote opportunities for the business community</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>11. Our problems naturally began when residents opted to not be included in the surrounding CPZ's. Did the council advise residents what could/would potentially happen if they were not included or did they just point out how many places would/could be lost and how terrible it would be if we opted in? Why was this stance taken? How is it all the other roads opted in? Were they suffering what we are now perhaps? Were we always designated to be the overflow? The council knew the figures at the time yet no resident has informed me of any other information being circulated prior to that review. Explain why please.</p> <p>At the meeting, various residents supported Ms Stocker and they amplified their own particular concerns, in particular the problems caused by inappropriate parking on an identified corner. Mr Massey said that the council was trapped in rules and regulations and were incapable of looking at the whole picture.</p>	<p>Neil Richardson referred to the corner in question and said that in general the council was unhappy to put in restrictions that it would have difficulty in enforcing. He said that the council were aware of a number of concerns with residents having differing views. He confirmed that schemes of this nature were not currently being progressed.</p>	<p>When previously consulted the majority of residents in Puller, Sebright and Calvert roads did not want to be included in a CPZ. Consideration of what roads should or shouldn't be included within a CPZ is heavily influenced by local demand, but also has to factor in issues such as traffic movement and safety. Given the location and layout of these roads the Council acceded to the majority view and did not include Puller, Calvert or Sebright Road in the CPZ. At the time of the last survey in 2004 occupiers of Puller, Calvert and Sebright Roads were asked if they wanted to be included within the Chipping Barnet CPZ and would have responded based on their experiences of being just outside an existing CPZ. The council acceded to the majority view of the responses from the three roads.</p>



	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Update (and by whom)</b>
7	<p><b>Domnic O'Dell</b></p> <p>I am a resident of Birley Road N20.</p> <p>I would like to table a question regarding the extreme frustration over the provision of free parking in this road despite local businesses, commuters and shoppers using the road for their own needs to the exclusion of residents.</p> <p>At the meeting, Mr O'Dell and his family were present to emphasise their concerns regarding the parking problems exacerbated by office workers day time parking. He said he would be delighted to pay for a parking space.</p> <p>This is a very family orientated road with many parents, like myself, exasperated with the problem.</p> <p>Can we discuss the timetable for adding a residence parking zone for this street and neighbouring Naylor road at the forum?</p>	<p>At the meeting, Neil Richardson confirmed that the council had considered and noted the various requests over the years for the introduction of a CPZ.</p> <p>The Chairman suggested that residents should engage more with their Local Ward Councillors who could listen to concerns and recommend a way forward.</p> <p>In response to a suggestion put forward by a resident regarding discounted car parking rates for local workers at the Spires, Neil Richardson said that the council was engaging with the owners of the Spires to see whether there was a viable scheme that could be introduced.</p>	<p><b>Neil Richardson</b></p> <p>Officers are aware that some residents of this area would like to see CPZ restrictions introduced. However, although concerns have been raised regarding parking pressure there are no plans at this time to investigate the matter and do envisage doing so in the near future</p>
8	<p><b>Mr Chris Smith</b></p> <p>Raises a concern that there are many residents who oppose the call for particular traffic management initiatives in the Puller Road area</p>		<p><b>Neil Richardson</b></p> <p>The concern has been noted and Mr Smith can be assured that decisions on whether measures should be introduced are only taken after consultation with the local community and consideration of any concerns raised.</p>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Update (and by whom)</b>
9	<p><b>Mr Gordon Massey</b></p> <p>It is now some 12 months since the review of the CPZ CA-C was initiated. A number of residents in Carnarvon Rd expressed concerns regarding parking in their road and the way that the CPZ is operating. We are also aware of pressures elsewhere in the area for other streets to be included in this CPZ or for a new CPZ to be created. When is the council going to engage with the community regarding the findings and options for change.</p> <p>At the meeting, Mr Massey said that he would be happier with more resident engagement and that the detail should be made available for analysis following a review.</p>	<p>At the meeting Neil Richardson said he accepted that 12 months was a long time. He outlined the customer-led rolling programme and that some consultations had taken two years.</p> <p>In response to concerns raised about those residents living on the fringe of CPZs, Neil Richardson outlined the reasons why reviews took place within an area and that those residents living outside the CPZ might have their concerns addressed at this stage. He outlined the reasons by statistical analysis was not made public but confirmed that information and results were put on the web.</p>	<p><b>Neil Richardson</b></p> <p>Progression of outcomes of the review has unfortunately taken longer than anticipate due to other work priorities and the detail and diversity of comments raised both within and outside of the existing CPZ.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the findings of the review will be presented to local ward members in the first instance prior to advising all within the CPZ of the outcome and any possible further actions which is hoped to be within the next few months.</p>
10	<p><b>Linden Groves</b></p> <p>I was thrilled to have what seemed to be a constructive working meeting with Lynn Bishop and others this spring, at which we agreed a plan to take the allotment project forward. We were particularly pleased that the project has been allocated its own intern officer. But my recent emails enquiring as to progress have gone unanswered, which is making me worried that we have met a hitch and forcing me to resort to these Forums once more as the only means of effective communication with the council. May I ask, what stage has the project got to?</p>	<p>At the meeting, Martin Cowie confirmed that there were no proposals to redesignate the land in question.</p> <p>Councillor Salinger undertook to contact Lyn Bishop with a view to moving the issues forward</p>	<p><b>Lyn Bishop (response not received in time for the meeting)</b></p> <p>Unfortunately the member of staff leading on the project left the Council and it would appear that any emails may have not been re-directed. The costs for clearing the site, repairing and replacing the fence have been collated. Confirmation that site is available for the use of allotments and the costs for setting out the site are still to be sourced. At this point an application for grant funding can be made by the resident group.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Lyn Bishop to contact Linden Groves</b></p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	At the meeting, Linden said that she was disappointed not to have receive a response to her questions.	.	
11	<p><b>Mr John Dix</b></p> <p>1. Will Barnet Council be undertaking any public engagement activities in the next six months in order to explain the specific proposals of the Future Shape Strategy to residents?</p> <p>2. Does the Council believe in greater transparency, greater public participation and the release of more data to residents?</p> <p>At the meeting Mr Dix said that that the responses did not answer his questions. He wanted to know specifics and what Future Shape was about. He also said that the response to question 2 was not adequate, and referred to a recent Cabinet document referring to Transparency as a potential 'risk' in that Freedom of Information requests would see a rise in number.</p> <p>A resident asked for a breakdown of the consultant costs for the New Barnet Consultation.</p>	The Chairman said that a more specific response would be sought and a letter to be written to Mr Dix.	<p><b>Chris Palmer response:</b></p> <p>1. The delivery of the Future Shape programme is linked to how the council can deliver better services to residents with less money. Over coming months the council intends to engage fully residents as to how services can develop in the difficult financial circumstances that the public sector faces. The scale of this involvement will relate to the challenge we face.</p> <p>2. The council is exploring how we publish information more widely and in forms that are genuinely useful to residents.</p> <p>Earlier this year Council passed a motion committing to all expenditure over £500 being published on line. The first round of this will be published shortly. However this will be published as raw data and we will develop how this is presented over the coming months. We welcome suggestions from residents about how this can be most usefully presented in the future.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Chris Palmer to respond direct to Mr Dix</b>  <b>ACTION: Martin Cowie to supply consultants' costs.</b></p>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Update (and by whom)</b>
12	<p><b>Michael Storey</b></p> <p>In April 2009, planning permission was granted to build a Tesco Express at 7-11 Victoria Road, New Barnet. It is now June 2010, and work has still not started. The site lies derelict, and, along with Tesco's other property (adjacent and also derelict) gives New Barnet a rundown feel. In the meantime, Tesco has managed to fit out and open similarly sized supermarkets in Greenhill Parade and Chipping Barnet.</p> <p>The council, if it wishes, has the power to break this deadlock and force Tesco to remedy the state of the site. This has been raised by residents at previous Residents' Forums, but no visible action has been taken by the council.</p> <p>Please could you tell me what cut-off date the council will set itself to either:</p> <p>a) act to either force Tesco to repair or rebuild the site, or</p> <p>b) take steps to have planning permission for the site revoked?</p> <p>In Mr Storey's absence, Mr Howard raised the issue of stakeholders and reiterated the poor condition of the site.</p>	<p>At the meeting, Martin Cowie outlined the current position regarding the Tesco site and the likelihood of a s215 notice being served. He said that he was disappointed to hear about the poor services from officers and he outlined the comprehensive consultation carried out in March 2010. Outcomes of this consultation was being analysed.</p>	<p><b>Martin Cowie</b></p> <p>The planning authority cannot revoke the planning permission but it is seeking to remedy the situation by requiring Tesco to improve the condition of the site.</p>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Update (and by whom)</b>
13	<p><b>Pam Edwards</b></p> <p>Issue raised at the last forum regarding the cost of holding a community event.</p>		<p><b>Lyn Bishop</b></p> <p>The arrangements for the waiting restrictions for the East Barnet Festival 2/4 July 2010 have been completed and Pam Edwards has been advised that the cost will be the same as last year i.e. £363.00. The Council has already spoken to Mrs Edwards who has agreed to the cost and will be sending a cheque for this amount in due course.</p>
14	<p><b>Mr T Green</b></p> <p>According to council planners, New Barnet is a "District Centre", giving it equal status to the borough's largest local centres such as Chipping Barnet, North Finchley, Edgware, etc. However, in the Council's Town Centre Framework document for New Barnet, the centre is referred to as a "suburban railway village". A short stroll down East Barnet Road quickly confirms that, Sainsbury's aside, this small local centre seems to have few, if any, of the criteria required for "District Centre" status.</p>	<p>At the meeting, Martin Cowie outlined how designation took place. New Barnet was designated in planning terms and was one of the smallest in Barnet and London as a whole.</p>	<p><b>ACTION Martin Cowie</b></p> <p><b>Due to the detailed nature of the question, a written response will be sent to Mr Green</b></p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>To make things clear to local residents:</p> <p>a) Please could you list the criteria for "District Centre" status (or its replacement buzzphrase "Priority Centre")?</p> <p>b) Please could you list the criteria for "Town Centre" status?</p> <p>c) Please could you identify which District Centre criteria New Barnet meets. Please be specific if possible.</p> <p>d) Does New Barnet being a "District Centre" make it easier or harder to build large-scale retail developments there?</p> <p>e) Would being a "Town Centre" offer New Barnet more protection against inappropriate developments?</p> <p>f) What more can New Barnet's residents and elected representatives do to get the planning team to redesignate New Barnet a "Town Centre", not a "District Centre"?</p>		
15	<p><b>J McKenzie</b></p> <p>Given the years of disruption caused by the JCoSS building works, how does the council plan to guarantee that local residents will not suffer further traffic and parking misery when the school opens?</p> <p>To ensure that traffic levels are being monitored, will the council undertake to commission an annual independent traffic report for the affected areas of New Barnet, starting before the school opens this autumn?</p>		<p><b>Neil Richardson</b></p> <p>JCoSS implemented a Construction Management Plan to reduce the impact wherever possible and to ensure vehicles used the most appropriate routes to the site. Unfortunately, as with all developments of this size there is an element of disruption caused by construction and the associated vehicles that are required to build a development. Action has been taken if vehicles have contravened the Construction Management Plan and the contractor has made every effort to reduce impact on the residents in the vicinity.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>In the travel plan submitted as part of JCoSS's planning application, pick-up/drop-off points were designated at Mount Pleasant and New Barnet station. Please could the council confirm the exact location of the Mount Pleasant point, and confirm that it has, or will carry out independent suitability tests/traffic assessments on the two sites before the travel plan for 2010-11 (which is already late), is approved</p>		<p>There will be a gradual increase in trips on a year-on-year basis and it should be noted that in the first two/three years the school will have fewer pupils than the previous Upper school and as a result the overall level of trips will be less than the trips to the previous East Barnet School. A full traffic analysis of the development was undertaken during the planning process. It is accepted that there will an increase in overall trips to the development by the time the school is fully operational. However, on balance, it is considered that the impact of these trips can be accommodated on the existing highway network subject to the S106 agreement for improvements to improve crossing facilities and routes for pedestrians, staggered start times so trips do not conflict with other school in the locality, School Travel Plan, Car Park Management Plan and Activities Management Plan. The council was not intending to under any independent traffic reports in the area. There will only be one year intake when the School opens in September 2010 and it is not yet known the number of coach/minibuses that will be running or the exact routes there will be using. Using the information that the school have already received it is unlikely that more than a couple of mini-buses will operate in the first two years.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>At the meeting Mr Dix said that Neil Richardson should have attended the public meeting where feelings ran high due to the school not complying with the travel plan.</p>	<p>In response, Neil Richardson said that he was unaware of the meeting referred to by Mr Dix and undertook to investigate.</p> <p>Martin Cowie said that the council was aware of the issues and that the impact would be gradual over the next seven years.</p>	<p>Both the School Travel Plans and Car Parking Management Plan are design to encourage sustainable travel choices, towards more sustainable modes of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport. The School appointed a School Travel Plan Co-ordinator at the beginning of the year and have actively been developing their School Travel Plan which has now been submitted to the Council. However, this can only be a framework School Travel Plan at this stage as the school is not yet open and there are currently no pupils/staff to include within the School Travel Plan process. The school will review the School Travel Plan within the first 6 months of opening to include the actual information from Pupils and Staff and set further actions and targets. Both documents will be regularly reviewed to take account of any specific issues that arise.</p>



	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
16	<p><b>Mrs Massey</b> Can planning give us a progress report on their efforts with the following buildings in Wood St Conservation Area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Late Crown and Anchor - windows, shutters and advertisements.</li> <li>• Abasi Halal shop opposite the church</li> <li>• 90A High St which has been insensitively split into two shops</li> </ul>		<p><b>Martin Cowie</b></p> <p><b>1) 47 High Street (late Crown &amp; Anchor)</b></p> <p>An appeal against a planning enforcement notice served against the unauthorised shutters and windows was dismissed 29 January 2010. The owners of the property met the planning enforcement officer dealing with this case late March 2010 and they were reminded of the need to immediately comply with the requirements of the enforcement notice and to immediately remove the illegal signs</p> <p>No further contact has been made with the council and the breaches continue. In this respect, the council are now initiating prosecution procedures.</p> <p><b>(2) 74 High Street (Abasi Halal shop)</b></p> <p>A planning enforcement notice dated 19 August 2009 was served against the unauthorised shop front requiring its removal. Planning permission was granted 17 November 2009 for the installation of a retractable awning and alterations including recess of shop front. This planning permission has to date not been implemented, therefore the requirements of the effective enforcement notice still stand. In this respect, the council are now considering initiating prosecution procedures</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
			<p><b>(3) 90a High Street</b></p> <p>A letter dated 14 May 2010 was sent to the owners of the property requesting a planning application for the unauthorised changes made to the shop front within 28 days from the date of the letter otherwise enforcement proceedings would be considered. No planning application has been received to date</p>
17	<p><b>Mr Zeital</b></p> <p>Raised an issue at the meeting in respect of the lack of liaison taking place between Barnet and Enfield Councils when it comes to traffic management . He lived in Crown Lane and came within the Borough of Barnet, with neighbours coming within the Enfield boundary. He has attended Enfield forums and raised the issue about Enfield's failure to improve Chase Side. He asked that Barnet takes up these issue on behalf of residents.</p>	<p>At the meeting the Chairman said that she had referred the issues onto Environment and Operations for investigation. She understood that a survey had been undertaken.</p> <p>Neil Richardson spoke about the outcome of the survey and the concerns regarding rat-running. Enfield has been contacted but currently they did not recognise this as an issue to be addressed.</p> <p>Signalling at Cockfosters Road had also been identified and that this was operated by TfL. He assured residents that Barnet were in continual dialogue with both Enfield and TfL.</p> <p>In response to a question from Mr Ives regarding the payment for consultants, Martin Cowie confirmed that residents were not charged for planning services.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: Neil Richardson to take up those suggestions by residents for further investigation.</b></p>
18	<p><b>Mr Hope</b></p> <p>Raised an issue at the meeting in respect of the Core Strategy. He asked why there had been a delay and what was the status of the draft that was considered at Scrutiny.</p>	<p>It was confirmed that the Core Strategy had been delayed to a future Cabinet meeting, resulting in not being able to publish the responses.</p> <p>Martin Cowie said that the document was a work in progress and the report would be published when it is considered at Cabinet.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: Martin Cowie to write direct to Mr Hope regarding the draft</b></p>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Update (and by whom)</b>
19	<p>Mr Shuttleworth referred to the last forum and the traffic calming measures in Chase Way. He asked that the council speaks with the Police regarding speeding vehicles and the fact that he had received no response to a letter he had sent to the council In November 2009.</p> <p>A resident said that there had been a road traffic accident in the area recently and she was concerned that the information was not properly collated.</p>	<p>Neil Richardson apologised for there being no response and said that due to the configuration of the road, traffic speeds were actually lower than perceived. The council was liaising with the Police with a view to enforcement in addition to possible traffic measures that could be applied. These did not entail physical measures, but attempting to keep vehicles out of the area.</p> <p>In terms of accident figures, Neil Richardson said that only those with injury implications were recorded. Damage only incidents were not recorded as not all of these were reported.</p>	
20	<p>Mr Hope referred to the lack of response in the last action notes regarding update on the Council's withdrawal from the Local Government Association</p>		<p><b>ACTION: Margaret Martinus to write to Mr Hope with a fuller response.</b></p>
21	<p>Mr Howard's question about insulation of dwellings</p>		<p><b>ACTION: Chief Executive of Barnet Homes to respond regarding insulation of dwellings</b></p> <p>The previous response to the Forum stated that the design of the properties on Dollis Valley Estate precludes the installation of cavity wall insulation. However, Mr Howard is correct, there are other measures which contribute to the reduction of carbon figures. In the case of Dollis Valley we have already delivered double glazed</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
			<p>windows and installed efficient condensing boilers within the Decent Homes Programme on the retained properties. We estimate that these works have a considerable effect on reducing carbon emissions by as much as one tonne per property (double glazing by 1/4 of a tonne per property and condensing boilers by 3/4 of a tonne per property). We will also be delivering condensing boilers on a number of properties on the blocks planned for major regeneration and will align business cases for further such works with the progress of the regeneration schemes.</p> <p>Overall we estimate that the work we have delivered up until the start of the Cavity Wall Insulation programme has contributed to reducing carbon levels by 1.2 tonnes per property. On our recent successful Granville Road Innovation scheme we have set targets to reduce carbon emissions by 4 tonnes per property We will also be examining a number of other measures which will contribute to carbon reduction from some of our exemplar projects. This includes a number of softer measures such as briefing our tenants on what can be achieved through turning off their appliances etc. (fuel savings and small contributions to carbon reduction) to piloting motion communal lighting at Granville Point where we are currently evaluating the results and setting ambitious targets for all of our stock.</p>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Update (and by whom)</b>
22	Residents asked for an update in respect of filling potholes throughout the roads in Barnet.	Neil Richardson said that good progress was being made and he outlined this to the meeting. In addition, he encouraged residents to report any potholes	<b>ACTION: Neil Richardson undertook to look at Oaklands Road</b>
23	Referring to Mr Goldberg's previous request for disabled parking bays outside Waitrose, the resident indicated the best location for this.	Neil Richardson confirmed that should the scheme go ahead, the location was as Mr Goldberg had suggested.	
24	Mr and Mrs Wheeler referred to the lamp post signs, it was reported that these had been posted on the wrong side of the road and that some were obscured by trees.		<b>ACTION: Neil Richardson to refer this to Paul Bragg for investigation</b>
25	Mr Shuttleworth referred to the proposed new Brunswick Park Medical Centre.		<b>ACTION: Martin Cowie to send Mr Shuttleworth details. Responses were needed by 22 June 2010.</b>
26	Mr Hope referred to a response he was awaiting from Lyn Bishop (from the forum that took place two meetings ago.)		<b>ACTION: Lyn Bishop to contact Mr Hope direct</b>
	<b>DATES AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING</b>	Chipping Barnet Library, 6.30pm on 20 July 2010.	

The meeting finished at 9.30 pm

Officers Present:

Neil Richardson

Martin Cowie

Pauline Bagley

Lead Officer – Environment and Operations

Head of Planning and Development Management

Democratic Services

Councillors Rawlings, Longstaff, R Cornelius were also present

In addition, there were approximately 65 members of the public.

**FORTHCOMING PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
AND SUB-COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

(meetings usually start at 7.00pm)

AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE: - ALL TO BE HELD AT HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, NW4 4BG

Chipping Barnet

Democratic Services Contact: Pauline Bagley, Tel: 020 8359 2023

Hendon

Democratic Services Contact: Paul Frost, Tel: 020 8359 2205

Finchley and Golders Green

Democratic Services Contact: Stephanie Chaikin, Tel: 020 8359 2019

**Forthcoming meetings:**

**Finchley & Golders Green**

**6 July**

**28 July**

**31 August**

**Chipping Barnet**

**6 July**

**28 July**

**31 August**

**Hendon**

**6 July**

**28 July**

**31 August**

***Public requests to speak at Area Planning Sub-Committees on planning applications***

Written requests to speak on planning applications should be notified to the relevant Area Planning Officer by 10.00am on the 2<sup>nd</sup> working day before the day of the meeting.

***Public requests to speak at Area Planning Sub-Committees on matters other than planning applications***

Written requests to speak on matters other than planning applications must be received by the Democratic Services Manager by 10.00am on the 2<sup>nd</sup> working day before the day of the meeting.

***Public requests to ask questions at Area Planning Sub-Committees***

Any request to ask a question (exact wording) on the work of the Sub-Committee must be received by the Democratic Services Manager by 10.00am on the 7<sup>th</sup> working day before the day of the meeting.

• **AREA ENVIRONMENT SUB-COMMITTEES:**

Venue: Hendon Town Hall, the Burroughs, NW4 4BG

Chipping Barnet

Democratic Services Contact: Stephanie Chaikin, Tel: 020 8359 2019

Finchley & Golders Green

Democratic Services Contact: Nick Musgrove, Tel: 020 8359 2024

Hendon

Democratic Services Contact: Jonathan Regal, Tel: 020 8359 2012

**Forthcoming meetings:**

---

**Finchley & Golders Green**

24 June & 14 October

**Chipping Barnet**

14 October

**Hendon**

14 October

---

***Public requests to speak at Area Environment Sub-Committees***

Written requests to speak on issues on the agenda must be received by the Democratic Services Manager by 10.00am on the 2<sup>nd</sup> working day before the day of the meeting.

***Public requests to ask questions at Area Environment Sub-Committees***

Any request to ask a question (exact wording) on environmental matters must be received by the Democratic Services Manager by 10.00am on the 7<sup>th</sup> working day before the day of the meeting.

**PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

Venue: Hendon Town Hall, The Burroughs, NW4 4BG

Democratic Services Contact: Maria Lugangira (tel: 020 8359 2761)

***Public requests to speak at Planning & Environment Committee***

Written requests to speak on planning applications should be notified to the relevant Area Planning Officer by 10.00am on the 2<sup>nd</sup> working day before the day of the meeting.

**Public requests to speak at Planning & Environment Committee on matters other than planning matters**

Written requests to speak on matters other than planning applications must be received by the Democratic Services Manager by 10.00am on the 2<sup>nd</sup> working day before the day of the meeting.

***Public requests to ask questions at Planning & Environment Committee***

Any request to ask a question (exact wording) on the work of the Committee must be received by the Democratic Services Manager by 10.00am on the 7<sup>th</sup> working day before the day of the meeting.

**Forthcoming meetings:**

**29 July, 20 September, 20 October**