

CHIPPING BARNET RESIDENTS FORUM

15 JUNE 2010 – As at 15 JUNE 2010

ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED AT THE FORUM MEETING

	Issues Raised	Response
1	<p>Mr Peter Branch (unable to attend the meeting)</p> <p>Church Farm Swimming Pool</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.</p> <p>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>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.</p>	<p>Matthew Gunyon/Leisure Contracts Manager</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>3</p>	<p>Mr Phil Fletcher</p> <p>What pledges to reduce greenhouse gas emissions have Barnet LB already signed up to?</p>	<p>Hester Fairgrieve</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>
<p>4</p>	<p>Mr Howard</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.</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>Lyn Bishop/ Neil Richardson</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>Martin Cowie</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, policy considerations and viability and deliverability. A draft final Strategy is anticipated to be prepared by late summer</p> <p>Martin Cowie</p> <p>Implementation and delivery of the three options is being considered as set out above in 4 2).</p>

<p>5</p>	<p>Jill Stocker</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>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>Neil Richardson</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> <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 reponses to the questionnaires that help guide the council as to whether there is merit in investigating restriction etc in more detail. 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 infeered that the council intend to introduce one which is not the case at th general parking questionnaire stage.</p>
----------	---	---

	<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>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 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>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>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>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>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>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> <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.</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>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>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> <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>
6.	<p>Domnic O'Dell</p> <p>I am a resident of Birley Road N20. 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. This is a very family orientated road with many parents, like myself, exasperated with the problem. Can we discuss the timetable for adding a residence parking zone for this street and neighbouring Naylor road at the forum?</p>	<p>Neil Richardson</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>

7	<p>Mr Chris Smith</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>Neil Richardson</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>
8	<p>Mr Gordon Massey</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>I will be able to attend from 6.30 to 7.30 pm only so would be grateful if this item was early on the agenda. I think it likely you will have a question from Puller Rd on the same issues so it might be sensible to put them adjacent</p>	<p>Neil Richardson</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>
9	<p>Linden Groves</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>Lyn Bishop</p>

10	<p>Mr John Dix</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 2. Does the Council believe in greater transparency, greater public participation and the release of more data to residents? 	<p>Chris Palmer</p>
11	<p>Michael Storey</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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) act to either force Tesco to repair or rebuild the site, or b) take steps to have planning permission for the site revoked? 	<p>Martin Cowie</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>

<p>12</p>	<p>Pam Edwards</p> <p>Issue raised at the last forum regarding the cost of holding a community event.</p>	<p>Response:</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.</p> <p>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>
<p>13</p>	<p>Mr T Green</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>To make things clear to local residents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Please could you list the criteria for "District Centre" status (or its replacement buzzphrase "Priority Centre")? b) Please could you list the criteria for "Town Centre" status? c) Please could you identify which District Centre criteria New Barnet meets. Please be specific if possible. d) Does New Barnet being a "District Centre" make it easier or harder to build large-scale retail developments there? e) Would being a "Town Centre" offer New Barnet more protection against inappropriate developments? 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>Martin Cowie</p> <p>Due to the detailed nature of the question, a written response will be sent to Mr Green</p>

<p>14</p>	<p>J McKenzie</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>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>Neil Richardson</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> <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.</p> <p>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.</p>
-----------	--	---

		<p>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>
		<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>
15	<p>Mrs Massey 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"> • Late Crown and Anchor - windows, shutters and advertisements. • Abasi Halal shop opposite the church • 90A High St which has been insensitively split into two shops 	<p>Martin Cowie 1) 47 High Street (late Crown & Anchor)</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>(2) 47 High Street (Abasi Halal shop)</p> <p>A planning enforcement notice dated 19 August 2009 was served against the unauthorised shop front requiring its removal.</p> <p>Planning permission was granted 17 November 2009 for the installation of a retractable awning and alterations including recess of shop front.</p> <p>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> <p>(3) 90a High Street</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>
--	--	--