

CHIPPING BARNET RESIDENTS' FORUM

MEETING HELD ON 20 JULY 2010 ACTION NOTES

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

Chairman: Councillor Lisa Rutter Vice-Chairman: *Councillor Barry Evangeli

*Denotes Councillor Present

Apologies from Councillor Rutter (clash of appointments)

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
1	<p>Mr Dix Confirmed that he had yet to receive a response from Mr Palmer regarding issues raised at the last forum regarding consultation on Future Shape and whether the Council believed in greater transparency.</p>	<p>The Chairman requested that this response should be sent to Mr Dix the minimum of delay</p>	<p>Chris Palmer to respond to Mr Dix</p> <p>Various emails have been exchanged. A paper regarding Future Shape has been appended to the action notes.</p>
2	<p>Mr Dix How much does it cost to operate the Leader Listens blog? When will the leader update this site given that, as of 14 July, the last posting was 15 February, some 5 months ago.</p>		<p>Chris Palmer to respond to Mr Dix</p> <p>Various emails have been exchanged. He confirmed that the Leader Listens has been closed as the council's hosting contact blog pending a review of the overall strategy for both the council website and the relationship of that site to councillor's blogs. It is likely that a future blog by the leader of the council would be more closely integrated in the main council website. The blog has not attracted any additional costs this year</p>
3	<p>Mr Dix Allowances for the Council leader will rise by £19,318 (+55%) with massive above inflation increases for the deputy leader, cabinet members and certain committee chairmen</p>	<p>Councillor Evangeli In response to this and all other questions regarding Members' Allowances, the Chair said that the decision had been taken at full Council and was not the subject for debate at Residents' Forums. He advised residents</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
3	<p>(although not chair of the Residents Forum). How does the council believe this will be viewed by residents at a time when the council are freezing wages and reviewing services.</p> <p>At the meeting Mr Dix said that he accepted that the new scheme was cost neutral however he wanted</p>	<p>who wished to raise issues to get in touch with their local ward councillors at their surgeries, or by phone or e-mail. He added that the press were not reporting the full story. Councillor Evangeli said that the London Councils Scheme had been adopted by Barnet and various other councils and that it brought Barnet in line with 20 other local authorities.</p>	
	<p>know how the Council felt, bearing in mind that thousands of Council employees were subject to a pay freeze or worse. Mr Dix gave a vote of thanks to Councillor Salinger for her stand on the issue of allowances.</p> <p>Mr Ashwood said that he had spent six months trying to access the Leader but had no success. This was also the case when trying to speak with the Chief Executive.</p>	<p>The scheme in Barnet proved cheaper than the previous one as it eliminated the use of multiple special responsibility allowances. Not all Councillors took their allowance and of those with an increase, in many cases this amounted to a rise of a few pence per week. He said that there was a huge responsibility on Cabinet members to manage the Council's budget.</p> <p>The Chairman brought the issue to an end by reiterating that residents could bring up issues individually with their own Ward Councillors. Similarly, the Chairman, in response to a question from a resident regarding the Council decision to remove Councillor Salinger of some of her responsibilities, they were advised to refer any concerns to their local Ward Councillors.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
4	<p>Karen Miller Can you please give me an update on the £1m offered under the Play Builders Scheme which offered Every Local Authority capital funding to deliver at least 20 play areas.</p> <p>(a) How many play areas did Barnet identify needed replacing old equipment for new?</p> <p>(b) How many completely new play areas were identified as being required with emphasis on the needs of 8 - 13 year olds and based on local needs analysis?"</p> <p>(c) Which play areas made it to the final list for works to be.</p>	<p>Response: Jenny Warren Phase One of the Playbuilder programme to complete 11 playareas for 8 – 13 year olds was delivered between April 2009 and March 2010.</p> <p>(a) Many of Barnet’s current play areas have little or no provision for older children; subsequently in many cases the playbuilder play areas have been built as completely new play areas next to current play provision. In one site – Oak Hill Park, one piece of redundant equipment was replaced.</p> <p>(b) One completely new play area was built in Bethune Park where there was no play provision.</p> <p>The following 11 sites received a play area in Phase One.</p>	<p>Jenny Warren To respond regarding:</p> <p>(a) Who will be paying for the slide at Oak Hill Park</p> <p>The costs of the modifications to the slide have been met by the play builder funding.</p> <p>(b) The toddler toy at Tudor Sports Ground</p> <p>It is not intended to make any alterations to the play equipment at Tudor. The playbuilder programme remains under review by the Department of Education and a final position regarding the future of the scheme was expected at the end of August, but is yet to be received</p>
	<p>At the meeting Ms Miller said that the slide at Oak Hill Park was enclosed with fencing and the earth was sliding away. She asked who was bearing the cost of remedying the problem.</p> <p>In respect of the toddler toy at Tudor Sports Ground, Ms Miller said that the siting of this apparatus was inappropriate as it had direct access to a cycle area. She said that an accident was bound to happen.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Bethune Park ❖ Tudor Sports Ground ❖ Oak Hill Park ❖ Swan Lane Openspace ❖ Stoneyfields Park ❖ Mill Hill Park ❖ Silkstream Park ❖ Colindale Park ❖ York Park ❖ Sunnyhill Park ❖ Cherry Tree Wood <p>The second phase which would include a further 11 sites is currently under review.</p>	
5	<p>Karen Miller As the Travel Plan Policy for JCOSS has not been submitted yet and will definitely not make the required 6 months prior to opening deadline, can you tell me what penalties will be imposed on the school.</p> <p>At the meeting Mr Howard</p>	<p>Response: Martin Cowie</p> <p>Condition 16 of the planning permission for the new school approved 17 March 2010 (Reference No. B/02152/10) requires that: within one calendar month of the date of this decision notice a School Travel Plan framework and the school travel plan shall be</p>	<p>Martin Cowie Confirmed that the Headteacher was aware of residents’ concerns.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>asked that residents had been told that the school did not have a school travel co-ordinator in place in March. If this was the case, how could one have been submitted and subsequently agreed in April 2010.</p> <p>A resident said that the school would not have known where their cohort would be travelling from until March.</p>	<p>submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The documents shall set out the school's transport policy to incorporate measures to reduce trips to school by car and encourage non car modes such as walking, cycling and public transport. Details of the start and finish times for pupils shall also be incorporated in order to minimise conflict on the local highways network. The scheme as submitted shall be approved in writing by the local planning authority and the use shall be carried out in accordance with the school travel plan as approved. JCOSS submitted their School Travel Plan to the Council in March 2010 and it was</p>	
		<p>approved by its Traffic and Development Team and subsequently Transport for London (TfL) in April 2010. Following the opening of the school in September the School Travel Plan will be revised to incorporate consultation with the full School Community and be re-submitted by the end of March 2011.</p> <p>A copy of the School Travel Plan can be obtained through the School.</p> <p>Discussion took place at the meeting regarding the differences between the Travel Plan and the School Travel Plan. Martin Cowie said that when the school opened there would be robust monitoring as the school would be obliged to follow the School Travel Plan. Martin Cowie emphasised that this was the school's document and whether it was robust would become apparent when the school was operating fully.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
		<p>He assured residents that the school had been made fully aware of the concerns of residents and he hoped that these concerns would be addressed. In response to the issue of the problems at Chester roundabout and the station, Martin Cowie undertook to raise these again with the Headteacher.</p>	
6	<p>Ms Silverstone What is the current position regarding the proposed footpath that had been approved with works commenced but the stopping, on York Road New Barnet towards New Barnet station? Please</p>	<p>Response: Paul Bragg Following clearance of the land it became apparent that due to the gradient of the land it would be necessary to install a retaining wall in order for the footpath to be established. As this had not originally been anticipated, officers are now in the process of obtaining</p>	<p>Ms Silverstone has since been advised that the scheme has been included in the draft revised work programme for this year on which we await a formal agreement to proceed with the programme within the next few weeks</p>
	<p>confirm that funds are still available for this project and when the works will actually be completed? At the meeting Ms Silverstone said that she had been in dialogue with the Council and Network Rail for three years with some positive outcomes. She had concerns that the work had now come to a halt particularly as residents had been informed that funding was in place.</p> <p>Mr Ashwood raised the issue of funding being wasted and cited the case of a long length of new paving running from Totteridge Lane to Northway House now being ripped up and replaced.</p>	<p>detailed cost estimates for the retaining wall. The land transfer from Network Rail has not been completed yet although progress is being made with securing the agreement. Until all costs are known we will not be in a position to confirm whether sufficient budgets are available to deliver the scheme. At the meeting Neil Richardson confirmed that funding had been allocated to this scheme prior to all schemes being put on hold and were subject to review. He said that this review was almost complete and subsequent to this the list of scheme to go forward will be made available to the public. He did not envisage any problems arising with Network Rail.</p> <p>Neil Richardson said that he couldn't comment on this particular work but outlined the way bids were put into TfL and that there would have been a sound reasons for carrying out work.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
7	<p>Mr Ashwood Will the Leader justify her comments on what Councillors do as Mr Ashwood has made repeated requests to contact her to no avail. Will the Leader justify increases in salaries when in some cases members are receiving 5 times the hourly rate of the Prime Minister. Why does this administration think they are justified in obtaining these increases when most of them are responsible for millions of pounds of public money lost over the last 4 years. Mr Ashwood made several allegations and said that he dismissed the response given by Mr Lustig.</p>	<p>Response: Jeff Lustig The decision to amend the Member Allowances Scheme to take account of the recommendations made by the London Councils Independent Remunerations Panel was taken in public session at the meeting of the Council on 13 July 2010. The Leader spoke and set out her views when the matter was debated at the Council meeting. The debate and the decision have been widely reported. Due to the earlier statement made by the Chairman, no further discussion took place regarding this issue.</p>	<p>No further update</p>
8	<p>Michael Storey I was affected by the apparent impromptu changes to the normal traffic arrangements around the new JCoSS school on 7 July 2010 Please can the Council confirm what due procedure is for changing traffic arrangement (as in this instance from two-way to one-way traffic)? And, given that there didn't seem to be any public notification of the changes, can it confirm that due procedure was followed? If so, can it provide copies of relevant documents? If not, can it assure us that in future, the required public notice will be given.</p>	<p>Chris Chrysostomou Changing the traffic flow on a road from two-way to one-way can be done either by the publication of a traffic order or by the instruction and presence of the police in uniform. The publication of a traffic order takes approximately 4-6 weeks to prepare and involves statutory consultation. Our records show that the Council has not been approached by the school for changing the traffic arrangement on 7 July 2010. At the meeting Neil Richardson outlined how a request would be actioned by the Council and the PCSO outlined how the police were involved in traffic management issues. Neil Richardson said that the Council had no obligation to notify residents but would do so if it were possible. He undertook to investigate and report back as to how this arrangement had come into being.</p>	<p>Neil Richardson to report back on how the traffic arrangements had come to take place on 7 July 2010</p> <p>So far investigation indicates that this was an arrangement made between the school and the local police. The school will be advised that it is not the correct way to arrange such matters and discussion on temporary traffic management arrangements should take place with the Council in the first instance although this is not expected to be a regular occurrence</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
9	<p>Helen Green (a) Since construction began on the new JCoSS school, our road has suffered hundreds of cases of JCoSS site workers working outside of agreed hours, parking across residents' drives, obstructing traffic, causing disturbance, etc.</p>	A response to appear in the action notes	<p>Martin Cowie: Response</p> <p>See Appendix</p>
	<p>(b) Can the Council explain why JCoSS' Press Relations Guru Ben Rich (who, by dint of the fact he is employed by the school, cannot not independent) is in charge of monitoring traffic and parking infringements (and working out of hours) at the site? Surely, given the size of the development, there should be a council officer in charge of this? If not, why isn't there one, especially in the light of so many problems?</p> <p>(c) Can the Council tell us how many complaints it has logged from affected members of the public?</p> <p>(d) Can the Council detail how many spot checks it has carried out during the construction work, and the findings of those checks?</p> <p>(e) Can the Council tell us what will happen if the school breaks the terms of its planning consent, for example by not liaising with the community in timely fashion as required, or by not keeping to the terms of their Green Travel Plan?</p> <p>(f) Can the Council explain in detail how the drop-off points at New Barnet station and Mount Pleasant will be able to accommodate the number of coaches required to service a full school</p>		

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>(g) Can the Council explain in detail how the drop-off points at New Barnet station and Mount Pleasant will be able to accommodate the number of coaches required to service a full school?</p>		
	<p>(h) Can the Council explain why £40m was spent on JCoSS, which has been built to an exceptionally high standard, with innovative and energy-efficient architecture like natural ventilation that will keep students cool in summer and warm in winter, yet only £26m was spent on the larger East Barnet School, which, due to the poor design, already requires additional air conditioning to keep students cool?</p> <p>(i) Can the Council explain why my neighbour received a letter from one of our local councillors inviting her to join a "JCoSS-Local Residents Liaison Group", yet I did not, nor did my neighbour - who has also complained to the council about contractor parking - on the other side? Are local residents being "cherry-picked" to join a group which will enable JCoSS to tick a 'community engagement' box and validate their attempts to bulldoze through an unpopular (but not unexpected) alteration to their Green Travel Plan?</p> <p>(j) Can the Council explain why the first meeting of this group falls at the same time as the Residents' Forum? Is it poor planning, incompetence, or something more sinister?</p>		

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	(k) Although not invited, I intend to attend the liaison group, so will not be able to attend the Residents' Forum. I understand that other residents affected by JCoSS will be attending the Forum to support my views and I look forward to reading the Council's replies in the Action Notes.		
10	<p>Michael Storey At the June Residents' Forum, Martin Cowie outlined the current position regarding the Tesco site at 7- 11 Victoria Road, New Barnet and the likelihood of a s215 notice being served. Has there been any progress since the June forum? If so, can he provide details? On the same lines, could he please give details - no matter how small - of any recent discussions between Barnet Council and Tesco / ASDA about their future plans for New Barnet?</p> <p>At the meeting Mr Dix said that he had spoken with the Tesco Managing Agents who said that they were unaware of any issues. Mr Dix said that this was worrying</p>	<p>Martin Cowie The local planning authority has written to the owners and Tesco requiring improvements to the condition of the land and buildings or to implement their permission. In relation to No.15 East Barnet Road the local planning authority is currently considering the serving of a s215 notice to secure environmental improvements including re-painting, re-glazing and replacement of rotten timbers. The planning authority is also considering the serving of an enforcement notice in relation to the removal of the wooden hoardings. There have been no discussions with either supermarket about future plans in New Barnet since the last update on this matter.</p>	<p><u>15 East Barnet Road</u> A s. 215 notice was served on the owners on 30 July 2010. The notice is due to take effect on 3 September 2010 unless an appeal is made beforehand. The notice requires that the certain improvements be made to the property, for instance the renewal of the paintwork and windows. The owners have committed to undertaking some works to the land but are keen to open up discussion as to the precise requirements once their surveyors/ planning advisors have inspected. A separate notice was issued in respect of the fence/ hoarding on the same day. The notice is also due to take effect on 3 September and requires the removal of the structure before 3 December 2010.</p> <p><u>7-11 Victoria Road</u> The owners have cleared the land of the overgrowth and have renewed the wooden hoarding/ fence. They are currently considering how best to shore up the building so that the unsightly scaffolding can be removed. Unfortunately this is not a simple task and may take several weeks.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
		At the meeting Martin Cowie said that he suspected that both parties were awaiting the outcome of the Town Centre framework. He thought that Tesco would be waiting to see if there could be any merit in taking forward a larger scheme. Martin Cowie confirmed that any application lapsed after three years. He added that some of the health and safety issues were beginning to be critical.	The town centre planning framework will be published in the Autumn.
11	<p>Mr Howard (a). Now that the Council has been able to find £2.6 million from existing budgets to pay for a senior officer reorganisation , £300,000 from existing budgets for three new Assistant Directors of Finance and £15,000 from existing budgets for an increase in Councillors' expenses would I be correct in assuming that there is sufficient funds available in existing budgets to meet all of this year's planned commitments on a like for like basis as last year?</p> <p>At the meeting Mr Howard requested clarification as to whether the Council knew about the financial implications in advance regarding the additional funding required. If they did know, Mr Howard raised</p>	<p>Chris Malyon The Council set a balanced budget for 2010/11 without the need for drawing upon reserves. All planned commitments were therefore provided for within this resource plan. Since setting the budget the Government have reduced the level of grant funding to the Council for the year. Proposals on how this reduction will be covered will be considered by the Cabinet Resources Committee on 19th July.</p>	<p>Chris Malyon to respond to Mr Howard's question as to whether the Council knew in advance of the local elections of the reorganisations and the funding implications</p> <p>At the point of the local elections the then government of the day had set out a different approach to reducing public expenditure to that of the current Coalition Government. This approach was to phase in reductions in local government expenditure over a longer period and with greater phasing. It did not set out, or make any mention, of plans to cut local government grants 'in-year'</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>concerns that the Council went into the last local elections omitting to tell the electorate of the restructure and funding implications.</p> <p>(b) What are the Councils priorities for allocating resources to meet the Conservative Central Government policies and possible cuts?</p> <p>At the meeting Mr Howard reiterated his request for the Council's priorities.</p> <p>(c) Will the Council reinstate the wardens to sheltered housing as required under the contractual terms of tenancy when residents moved in to their flats?</p> <p>At the meeting Mr Howard</p>	<p>The Council allocates resources based on local priorities and the legislative framework. Given the reduction in central funding that will occur over the next few years it will do what it can to mitigate those reductions through driving out further efficiencies and developing alternative service delivery models. Ultimately however given the size of the challenge there will be an impact on the services provided and Members will have to make some very difficult decisions over the level of funding allocated to service areas</p> <p>At the meeting Councillor Richard Cornelius confirmed that all elements would be taken into account and that Barnet would deliver the best possible service for the best possible price.</p> <p>Mithu Gosh</p> <p>The Council's previous decision to withdraw funding for warden services was quashed following a judicial review. following this, officers were instructed by Cabinet in February this year to undertake a new assessment of the options in respect of any</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>challenged the officer's statement that there was no legal requirement on the Council to provide warden support. He said that any tenant who had moved into accommodation with the contract in place would have a new tenancy if the service was removed.</p>	<p>future proposals for housing provision with support for older people in the borough. These are now being developed for consideration by stakeholders and proposals will be brought back to Cabinet at a later date. Whilst there is no legal requirement on the Council to provide warden support at sheltered housing the proposals being developed are sensitive to the needs of existing residents as well as older people living in non-sheltered housing who are in need of support.</p> <p>At the meeting Councillor Evangeli said that the service had not yet been removed and no final decision had been taken.</p>	
12	<p>Mr Howard A meeting about JCOSS is being held in Livingstone school at 6.00pm on Tuesday 20th July. Is the council organising this meeting? Will the council be sending officers to the meeting? Will officers be minuting the meeting? Does the Council know why entry to the meeting is by invitation only from Councilor Rams?. Will any outcome of the meeting be accepted by the Planning Department as the views of the local community when access has been restricted to a few people only by invitation and does not include those most affected by the school's as yet to be agreed travel policy ?. The Planning permission in 2007 required the school travel plan to be agreed 6 months before the school opens.</p>	<p>Lisa Wright JCOSS submitted their School Travel Plan to the Council in March 2010 and it was approved by Transport for London (TfL) in April 2010. Following the opening of the school in September the School Travel Plan will be revised to incorporate consultation with the full School Community and be re-submitted by the end of March 2011. A copy of the School Travel Plan can be obtained through the School.</p> <p>At the meeting Martin Cowie confirmed that the meeting in question had not been organised by the Council and no Council officers were in attendance. He said that any feedback from residents who were attending the meeting would be gratefully received.</p>	<p>No further update required.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>As this has not yet been agreed will the Council require the school to remain closed until it is consulted upon with the community and agreed?</p> <p>Mr Howard said that the meeting had been by invitation only and that all documentation seemed to be in the name of Councillor Rams.</p>	<p>The Chairman said that Councillor Ram's name was mentioned as he was a school governor.</p>	
13	<p>Mr Howard</p> <p>JCOSS school held an open day for prospective parents on 7 July. In addition to stewards from the school there were two Police constables and a Police van in attendance for the duration plus at least three possibly more PCSOs. They set up a one way traffic system around Westbrook Crescent. No one recalls seeing any public notices or posters. Was this authorized by the Council? If so why was it not publicized? If no will the Council be turning a blind eye to similar arrangements when the school opens in September?</p>	<p>Chris Chrysostomou</p> <p>Changing the traffic flow on a road from two-way to one-way can be done either by the publication of a traffic order or by the instruction and presence of the police in uniform. The publication of a traffic order takes approximately 4-6 weeks to prepare and involves statutory consultation. Our records show that the Council has not been approached by the school for changing the traffic arrangement on 7 July 2010</p>	No further update

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
14	<p>Mr Howard Referred to the responses that had been included in the action notes of the last meeting and still raised a concern as to why the Council had not transferred powers regarding fixed penalty notice offences to the police when the latter were already trained to do the job.</p> <p>John Gardiner raised an issue with reference to the Council's decision, recorded in the Action Notes for the meeting held on the 15th June, not to delegate enforcement powers for minor offences to the police, and asked that could a full explanation of the reasons for this decision be given. At the meeting, it was the consensus that the views of this and earlier meetings of the forum should be conveyed to the Director.</p> <p>Mr Howard said that he understood that the Cabinet members was not willing for these offences to be criminalised. He asked for officers to clarify how the decision was arrived at.</p>	<p>Dorne Kanareck (in response to Mr Gardiner's issue) Although there are no plans to extend delegation of Fixed Penalty Notices to the Police the matter has not been the subject of a formal decision. If this is an area of policy you feel should be publicly pursued and debated you should make your views known to the Cabinet member for Community Safety – a copy of any views expressed by this forum will also be brought to her attention.</p>	<p>Dorne Kanareck to respond as to the reasons why the FPN powers had not been transferred to the police</p> <p>Cabinet Members did not support the proposal for the following reasons: The cost of implementing the regime could have been prohibitive with a risk of the income received from fixed penalties not covering the cost of administration. In the current economic climate such a risk could not be warranted. There are enough existing powers to tackle environmental issues without the implementation and delegation of further powers. For example the Police and PCSO's can prosecute offenders for littering, which includes educating and warning.</p> <p>In addition, the Director to note the views of this forum that the police were in a better position to carry out these particular duties.</p> <p>Officers be requested to say how the decision not to transfer powers had been arrived at.</p>
15	<p>Mr Howard Barnet Homes have still failed to answer my original question when I asked why they were not insulating the concrete walls on Dollis Valley estate to save the residents money and save CO2 at the same time. The answer given was a load of hot air as I stated at the meeting. I have heard nothing from them since the meeting.</p>	<p>A response had been added to the last action notes. However Mr Howard was unhappy with the response in that it was likely that the regeneration of Dollis Valley would now not take place for a further five to ten years and that there was a need to insulate these dwellings.</p>	<p>Sheila Oliver from Barnet Homes undertook to take back the concerns raised by Mr Howard and that a response is sent to him by the appropriate officer.</p> <p>Mr Howard has been e mailed a response. In addition, Mr Howard has been speaking directly with officers from Barnet Homes regarding the issue.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
16	<p>Linden Groves Would it be possible please to be given:</p> <p>a) a breakdown of the various costs that you have reached;</p> <p>b) an idea of the funding grants that you propose are applied for (and how);</p> <p>c) what the council is proposing as the next step forward; and</p> <p>d) how the council proposes to further support the project? It is now a year since the issue of opening allotment land was raised at this Forum and surprisingly little progress has been made considering that this is a relatively simple project.</p> <p>At the meeting Councillor Rawlings said that the response within the issues list did not go far enough. He also referred to the list of grants at appendix 2 and outlined why these were not appropriate in this case. He said that the Local Authority had asked Linden to find out the demand for opening the allotments and she had demonstrated the high interest. He said that Linden was not heading up a residents group and that the task was hard work, particularly asking residents to raise funding and do the work so that the Council would make money out of the project.</p> <p>Councillor Kate Salinger said that the issue had been back and forth for a long time and that it would be better if a residents group was formed. She said that</p>		<p>Councillor Rawlings and Councillor Kate Salinger to liaise regarding this project and report back to the forum</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	the gates and rubbish had been removed. She suggested that both she and Councillor Rawlings work together to take the project forward.		
17	<p>Vishy and Eileen Harihara Why do Barnet Council not have a policy for limitation on the size of basements in the Borough ? This method of extending the size of ones property, is becoming more popular by the day ,yet it appears that Barnet has no definite framework in place to deal with this . Other boroughs in London already have definite limitations (e.g in some boroughs basements are not permitted to be bigger than 50% - 100% of the footprint of the house) and surely Barnet should be doing the same.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie The conversion of an existing residential cellar or basement to residential accommodation to be used as part of the existing house is unlikely to require planning permission. The excavation of a new basement which involves major work would however require planning permission. The Council has recognised that this form of creating additional living accommodation to existing houses is becoming more common and took the opportunity whilst revising the Extensions to Houses Design Guidance Note 5 March 2010 to address this particular issue.</p> <p>Whilst each application will be considered on its own merits the guidance note provides the following advice which is summarised below:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basement that projects up to 3m beyond the rear wall of the house or no more than half its width beyond each side elevation will normally be allowed and the following points should be considered:- 	No further update required

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearby tree roots should not be damaged • No more than 50% of the amenity space should be removed • Neighbouring groundwater conditions should not be adversely affected • Any exposed area of the basement should be subordinate to the property being extended and respect its original design and proportions • Light wells together with forecourt parking arrangements need careful consideration <p>All rooms within a basement should be able to function for the purpose intended.</p> <p>At the meeting Martin Cowie amplified the way this type of application was processed and the policies and guidance in places to ensure proper regulation. He said that Barnet took a similar line to other local authorities and conceded that this type of application was becoming more commonplace and Barnet was trying to put forward some pragmatic advice and to apply sensible policies and guidance to take account of very different cases. Guidance was sought from Building Control colleagues in particular and that guidance hung off formal policies with each case being considered on its own merits.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
18	<p>Mr Dix Can the Council please state whether they are in favour of, or opposed to, the TFL proposal to remove the traffic lights at the junction of Margaret Road and East Barnet Road</p> <p>(other residents have also raised the issue of the lights in this location)</p>	<p>Chris Chrysostomou During early 2008 the council was contacted by TfL to discuss possible sites where traffic signals might be removed, which would reduce future maintenance costs. The funds for the work were only available until the end of the financial year. Four potential sites in the borough were identified for discussion, with one site converted from a pelican crossing to a zebra crossing at the time. The remaining three sites, including the East Barnet/Margaret Road Junction, were not progressed as concerns raised by local residents could not be satisfactorily addressed. Since 2008, the council has not discussed these proposals in any detail with TfL, and consider that the issues and concerns raised by the residents at the time to still be valid. It must be remembered that TfL can not remove any signals from the Borough Road Network without the prior agreement of the Council” At the meeting, the Chairman categorically stated that these lights would not be removed and that this statement was endorsed by the Cabinet Member.</p>	<p>Officers reiterated that there was no intention on the part of the Council to remove these traffic lights.</p>
19	<p>Mr Robb (requests an e mail response) What was the total cost of the recent New Barnet Town Centre Strategy in terms of Council management time, materials, and any fees paid to any organisations involved in producing the survey materials and in analysing them?</p>		<p>Martin Cowie to e mail Mr Robb The Town Centre planning framework has cost approximately £35,000</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
20	<p>Michael Storey Given that essential services are being cut across the borough to save money, and that the millions of pounds of Barnet council tax was never recovered from Iceland, could the Council detail where the extra money will come from to pay for the latest round of increases to councillors' allowances? Could the Council also confirm the total increase in allowances to councillors this year compared with last year (to the nearest pound is fine - no need to include the pennies). Could it also confirm whether town hall workers will also be receiving a similar pay rise in recognition of their hard work over the past 12 months?</p>	<p>Subsequent to the Chairman's statement at the beginning of the meeting, this issue was not discussed.</p>	
21	<p>Mr Fletcher Referred to the previous action notes and said that the reduction of 11% in emissions was 'pathetic' and he asked for specific examples the Council is undertaking to reduce the levels</p>		<p>Hester Fairgrieve To produce examples on how the Council are working towards reducing the levels of CO2 emissions A full response has been appended to these action notes</p>
22	<p>A resident referred to the proposals to build on Metropolitan Lane at Brunswick Park.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie outlined the process whereby the application was being referred to the Mayor of London and the seeking of public opinion. Martin Cowie added that it would not be possible to enter into live debate at the forum as the application was 'live'</p>	<p>Martin Cowie The application has been withdrawn</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
23	<p>Mrs Jill Stocker Referred to the reopening of the Graham Park and Wood Street campuses and the impact of parking in terms of the 15,000 students.</p> <p>Mr Massey referred to the estimated 80% of students who would travel to the college by public transport. He asked whether this figure was robust.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie said that parking was a key issue and that a great deal of time has been taken to ensure issues were being addressed.</p> <p>Mr Cowie undertook to send details on the student body numbers etc.</p> <p>He confirmed that s106 funding had been paid by the college to investigate the impact of the redevelopment.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie to send Mrs Stocker the data discussed Information has been emailed to Mrs Stocker</p>
24	<p>Mr Newton Referred to the s215 in respect of Furniture land and asked whether this was a material planning consideration.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie said that all applications were considered on their own merits and that allowing a building to become dilapidated did not help drive through a planning permission.</p>	<p>No further update required</p>
25	<p>Mr Dix Referred to the issues in respect of the long-term future of Church Farm Swimming Pool and asked whether the council was allowing the building to become dilapidated.</p>	<p>Neil Richardson suggested that an e-mail dialogue should be set up between Mr Dix and officers to ensure that any outstanding questions did not wait until the next meeting of the forum.</p>	<p>Since the forum, various e mails have been exchanged between Mr Dix and Matthew Gunyon/Leisure Contract Manager</p>
26	<p>Mr Hope Referred to the lack of an adequate response since the last meeting regarding published decisions, for example DPR's.</p> <p>Mr Hope requested that the Director of Corporate Governance be asked for a response.</p>	<p>Neil Richardson Said that Mr Hope had been supplied with a printed document and that the issue referred to was devolved and within the remit of the Director of Environment and Operations. Neil Richardson said that there were provisions within the Constitution to delegate responsibilities to officers.</p>	<p>Jeff Lustig to respond in respect of providing detail of devolved power for officer decision, as set out in the Council's Constitution</p> <p>Mr Hope was referred to the Council's Constitution</p>
27	<p>Mr Fletcher Asked what emphasis there was on eco-building in terms of planning. Mr Fletcher held the view that the use of particular types of sustainable materials should be mandatory.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie said that there was a policy to ensure that all new developments were as sustainable as possible. He said that there were codes for sustainable homes and that there was a minimum requirement for Level 4, working towards Level 6. However, meeting these levels were not mandatory.</p>	<p>No further update required</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
28	Mr Massey Again referred to the issuing of fixed penalty notices and said that as a taxpayer he found it extraordinary that these powers had not been handed over to the police. He requested information on what resources in terms of officer time had been allocated to these activities and how many interventions had been carried out over the past three months.		Dorne Kanareck to supply data on the level of resources allocated to the issuing of fixed penalty notices and the number of interventions over the past three months. The Council has 7 officers authorised to, amongst other duties, issue fixed penalty notices for dog fouling and littering. Over the last three months, April – July, the following warnings and penalties have been issued: Dog fouling = 0 warnings 0 FPN's Littering = 47 warnings 15 FPN's
29	Mr Massey Said that he was disappointed with the response that that he requested Neil Richardson would take views on board and feed the outcome of the CPZ consultations into the Town Centre Strategy.	Neil Richardson said that the Town Centre Strategy was yet to be formalised and that CPZ reviews would be taking into account. Information on the CPZ consultation was to hand but that there had been very little feedback from traders.	
30	Mr Fletcher Said that one way of addressing the disappearance of small traders would be to charge lower rates to this category	Councillor Cornelius informed the forum that Business Rates were set nationally and not by the Council	
31	Mr Massey Requested updates in respect of the three properties referred to in Issue 16 of the last meeting.		Martin Cowie undertook to respond directly to Mr Massey regarding these updates. A full response has been appended to these action notes
	DATES AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING	Coppetts Wood School, 6.30pm on 15 September 2010.	

The meeting finished at 9.00 pm

Officers Present:

Neil Richardson Lead Officer – Environment and Operations
Martin Cowie Head of Planning and Development Management
Sheila Oliver Barnet Homes
PCSO Noel Hartley High Barnet
Pauline Bagley Democratic Services

Councillors Rawlings, Longstaff, R Cornelius, Kate Salinger and Brian Salinger were also present

In addition, there were approximately 35 members of the public.

RESPONSE TO ISSUE 9

- (a) The planning authority is fully aware of the issues that have arisen locally as a result of the development and has investigated a number of matters brought to its attention by residents.
- (b) The planning authority's enforcement team continues to monitor construction work closely to ensure compliance with the agreed construction management plan, liaising with the schools representatives and its contractors and taking appropriate action when necessary.
- (c) There have been three planning related investigations following the receipt of complaints from members of the public. These investigations focused on the hours of working and the routing of delivery lorries. It should be noted however that the JCOSS development has been under close scrutiny from the planning authority since work commenced.
- (d) Numerous visits have been made to the site or to the area around the site to make sure that work is progressing according to the construction management plan. For most of the duration of the project work has been progressing in the approved manner. The lorry routes have generally been well-observed but for two phases, once at the beginning of the development and more recently when work has been undertaken in the vicinity of the new entrance and the weak bridge required a re-routing. Work (mainly inside crafts) was being undertaken outside of the stipulated hours in May this year. A 'breach of condition notice was served on 24 May 2010 requiring that the hours of work condition be obeyed on pain of prosecution. No further reports of out of hours work have been received.
- (e) In the event of further breaches of control the council may take one of many courses of action if it is expedient to do so. The exact course of action will depend on the nature of the breach identified
- (f) and (g) There will be a gradual increase in trips on a year-on-year basis, therefore although an initial prediction of the pupils travelling by coach and number of coaches was made during the planning application, the exact detail of the proposals for Mount Pleasant and New Barnet Station have not yet been drawn up and will be dependent of the final demand for the use of Coaches and the directions they will be travelling from. A contribution was secured from JCOSS toward number of off-site including improvements to the bus/coach drop off turning area in the vicinity of Mount Pleasant.

(h) . JCoSS is a voluntary aided school and received grant funding directly from central government, the local authority did not fund the building of the school. The amount of money available to the council to build East Barnet School was determined by the grant awarded to Barnet by central government as a 'Building Schools for the Future' pathfinder project.

East Barnet School also uses energy efficient architecture like natural ventilation – it is based on the same design principles as JCoSS. Both schools conform to the Building Bulletin 101 – Ventilation of school buildings, under which East Barnet School does not require additional air conditioning to keep students cool.

RESPONSE TO ISSUE 21

An 11% reduction in emissions in the local authority area over a three year period is a stretching target especially as Barnet currently has amongst the highest domestic emissions in London.

Examples of what we are doing to achieve this target include:

- Implementation of Decent Homes Standard programme for social housing. This has included double glazing 3,628 properties and the installation of 2,058 hi-efficiency boilers since 2005.

- Improving existing housing stock through green householder development design guidance (i.e. for those planning an extension etc) and building control
- We have adopted a Sustainable Design & Construction Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This sets a minimum eco standard for new (non-residential) development of 'Good' or 'Excellent'. Barnet's first excellent rated building was Middlesex University's Hatchcroft extension, and our own new estates – the Primary School Capital Investment Programme schools – are all designed to a very high eco standard.
- Supporting voluntary organisations and social enterprises such as the High Barnet Green Home Zone to work with homeowners and businesses and encourage them (through awareness raising and practical measures) to reduce their emissions.
- Visiting small businesses throughout the borough to offer advice and support on how they can reduce their emissions.

The Council has also been looking at how it can reduce emissions from its own operations.

Examples of what it has been doing include:

- Implementing an Energy Efficiency Programme for its buildings & schools. In the recent Town Hall refurbishment a range of energy and water savings measures were incorporated
- Procurement of a more fuel efficient fleet (e.g. refuse vehicles) to latest Euro standards. We are also looking at ways to reduce the use of transport
- Making more efficient use of assets and energy through reducing the Council's office buildings and locating the majority of staff at North London Business Park.
- Participating in London Remade, the Mayor of London's Green Procurement Code to encourage more sustainable procurement of goods and services.
- Holding a series of ongoing awareness raising events for staff.

RESPONSE TO ISSUE 31

1) 47 High Street

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, or seek to apply for an alternative scheme.

In addition, they were directed to remove the unauthorised advertisements in place on the front elevation.

Following this meeting, the owners applied for express consent to display the advertisements, though these applications were refused on the 16th August 2010. In addition, an application has been made for an alternative scheme in respect of the windows, doors and shutters at ground floor level, though this has yet to be determined.

The Council will be pursuing all outstanding matters upon determination of that application, expected towards the end of September 2010.

2) 90a High Street

The two units have been re-merged into a single shop and the canopy has been dismantled. The only outstanding issue is the roller shutter which is still yet to be removed. The local planning authority has set a deadline of 16 September for this to occur.

3) 74 High Street (Abasi Halal shop)

The previous internal flooring exposed by the works to the shopfront has been removed and replaced with tiles similar to those used at 'After Office Hours' next door.

In addition some works of repair/improvement have been undertaken. Due to the owner's financial position he has requested more time to change the shopfront and to complete the other improvement works.

Given this and as the shop front is currently permanently behind the goods shelves the local planning authority is considering an appropriate period of time for the works to be completed.

RESPONSE TO ISSUE 1

Future Shape of the Council - Executive Summary

Summary

The Future Shape programme was set up last year to look at how Barnet could tackle the challenges of meeting higher expectations from our residents with less money. The interim report on the programme is being submitted to Cabinet on 6 July. The programme is about how we do things differently in future to help make sure Barnet's citizens can lead successful and comfortable lives and fulfil their potential. It concludes that we need to focus in particular on three areas:

- a different relationship with citizens
- a one public sector approach – working with our partners across the borough
- a relentless drive for efficiency.

The programme has looked at delivering these objectives through seven strands. Three strands are reporting through this interim report. These are:

Property – recommending that we better manage our property portfolio (including our schools) through the creation of one central management unit to reduce costs;

'Transact' – bringing services together in clusters, improving their efficiency and focusing on what the public wants. In some cases we will, in time, consider who in the public and private sector we should involve in this;

Support – bringing together corporate support services from across the council to create a better, more efficient service and looking, over the longer term, at the potential for working with a partner to deliver these services (and potentially to use this partnership to deliver services to others).

The remaining four strands will report to Cabinet in the autumn.

The report recommends that we start work on the first three strands straight away.

Background

Barnet recognised last year that we faced some big challenges:

customers are more and more used to services which are available to them when they want them in the way they want them – for instance home deliveries from supermarkets that can be booked online in one hour time slots. They increasingly expect us to be able to provide them with better, more flexible services

we have had to deal with ever less money being available to provide services

at the same time, it's becoming more expensive to provide services – for instance as people are living longer with long-term health problems

and there are some really difficult problems to solve – such as how we persuade residents to reduce the amount of waste they produce.

We launched the Future Shape programme to look at how we address these challenges and enable our citizens to live the lives they want in future. The recent credit crunch means the programme has become even more important. We know that this will mean that there will be

further reductions in the money we, and probably our partners in the borough, receive in future as a result. So we need to find ways of doing more with less.

If we don't start to address these challenges now, we will find ourselves in a much more difficult position in a year or two. And if we leave it until then to address the issues, we won't be able to do so in a strategic way and are likely to have to take even tougher decisions about services and jobs.

The Future Shape programme is a way of addressing the challenges Barnet faces in a sustainable way. It is not about outsourcing all council services. Nor is it about one big-bang change to everything we do. It's about thinking and acting in a different way, of spending less but working together with partner organisation (such as the police and local NHS) and residents to achieve more. It's about making sure that our citizens can lead the lives they want and can achieve their potential when there is less public funding available.

In February 2009, seven groups were set up to look at different areas of council work. Council staff were invited to sit on the groups and our local partners were also asked to join in to see where there were opportunities for us to work together to save money and provide better services. The seven groups looked at the following areas:	
Barnet Strategy	To understand what our residents want and need and how we can work with other public, voluntary and community services in Barnet (such as the police, local NHS and Barnet College) to help meet these needs
The Vehicle	To look at how we can adopt a different approach to tackling difficult and costly issues in Barnet such as disadvantage, waste and poor health
Barnet Support	To see what potential there is for improvements and savings in our support services such as HR, ICT, Legal and Finance
Barnet Property	To look at how we can make the most of the buildings the council owns and occupies such as schools, libraries, offices and commercial premises
Barnet Access	To look at how residents currently access public services in Barnet and how we can simplify this and encourage people to help one another to get hold of the support and information they need
Barnet Transact	To see what potential there is for improvements and savings across all council services that are provided to residents. Also, to consider whether some services could be better provided through partnerships with others in the public, private or voluntary and community sectors
Barnet Assessment	To look at how we can improve the way we assess whether residents are entitled to certain services such as council housing, social care etc.

**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

16 September 2010

12 October 2010

9 November 2010

Chipping Barnet

16 September 2010

12 October 2010

9 November 2010

Hendon

16 September 2010

12 October 2010

9 November 2010

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 3rd 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 7th 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

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 2nd 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 7th 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 2nd 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 2nd 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 7th working day before the day of the meeting.

Forthcoming meetings:

20 September, 20 October, 11 November, 8 December 2010