

MEETING**CHIPPING BARNET RESIDENTS FORUM****DATE AND TIME****TUESDAY 24TH JANUARY, 2017****AT 7.00 PM****VENUE****GREEK CYPRIOT CENTRE, BRITANNIA ROAD, FINHCLEY ROAD, N12**

Dear Councillors,

Please find enclosed additional papers relating to the following items for the above mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda.

Item No	Title of Report	Pages
1.	ISSUES LIST WITH RESPONSES	3 - 14

J. Natynczyk 020 8359 5129 jan.natynczyk@barnet.gov.uk and Sheri Odoffin 020 8359 3104 sheri.odoffin@barnet.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

CHIPPING BARNET RESIDENTS FORUM

**Greek Cypriot Brotherhood Community Centre,
Britannia Road, North Finchley, London N12 9RU**

24 January 2017

7PM

Chairman: Councillor Lisa Rutter
Vice Chairman: Caroline Stock

ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED AT THE FORUM MEETING

Items must be submitted to Governance Service (ChippingBarnet.ResidentsForum@Barnet.gov.uk) by 10.00am on the fifth working day before the meeting (for example, if a meeting is due to take place on a Thursday evening, questions must be received by 10am on the preceding Thursday)

AGENDA ITEM 2

	Issue Raised	Response
1.	<p>NO TO A ZEBRA AT THE CHASE WAY/CECIL ROAD CROSSROADS, LONDON N14 (41 signatures at time of publication of this list)</p> <p>Lead Petitioner: Petros Georgiou Ward: Brunswick Park</p> <p>We the undersigned petition the council to not place any zebra crossing at the Chase Way/Cecil Road N14 junction on the grounds that follow, numbered 1-13. These have been prepared on the basis of: 1) a majority view of Chase Way residents, and views expressed by others; & 2) the Capita Safety Report Nov 16, recommending a SW zebra over a NE zebra. This petition works in conjunction with and is in addition to a petition submitted 8 Aug 2016, seeking 'no SW of table zebra' and '20mph speed limits in Chase Way north & south of the raised table'. We believe a zebra at this junction will pose serious safety risks rather than contribute to "safe crossing" as intended by Walksafe N14.</p> <p>Full details of the petition:</p> <p>http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/mgEPetitionDisplay.aspx?ID=500000021&RPID=562529919&HPID=562529919</p>	<p>To be dealt with in line with the Council's constitution:</p> <p>The Lead Petitioner will be given three minutes to present the petition to the Forum. Following the presentation the Residents Forum Chairman will decide to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Take no action; <input type="checkbox"/> Refer the matter to a chief officer to respond to within 20 working days; or <input type="checkbox"/> Refer the matter to the relevant Area Committee (if funding is required)

	Issue Raised	Response
2.	<p>Safety at Lyonsdown/Longmore Junction (87 signatures at time of publication of this list)</p> <p>Lead Petitioner: Nikki Thorpe Ward: New Barnet</p> <p>We the undersigned petition the council to Investigate the safety of, and take consequent action to improve the safety of the complex junction at the top of Longmore Avenue, where it meets Lyonsdown Road.</p> <p>Full details of the petition: http://committeepapers.barnet.gov.uk/mgEPetitionDisplay.aspx?ID=500000022&RPID=562529978&HPID=562529978</p>	<p>To be dealt with in line with the Council's constitution:</p> <p>The Lead Petitioner will be given three minutes to present the petition to the Forum. Following the presentation the Residents Forum Chairman will decide to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Take no action; <input type="checkbox"/> Refer the matter to a chief officer to respond to within 20 working days; or <input type="checkbox"/> Refer the matter to the relevant Area Committee (if funding is required)
3.	<p>Commuter parking in both Great Bushey Drive & Oak Tree Drive N20</p> <p>Submitted by: David Harvey Ward:Totteridge</p> <p>Is now far worse since the introduction of the 'TW' Controlled Parking Zone in Naylor Road, Birley Road and Hayward Road. We should like the council to consult with the residents of both Great Bushey Drive & Oak Tree Drive with a proposal to extend the 'TW CPZ' into both of these streets.</p>	<p>As you are aware, the Council introduced the 'TW' Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) early last year. This was after a significant number of joint and individual representations from residents of the relevant roads.</p> <p>In making the decision to introduce the CPZ, it was also decided that Ridgeview Road should be subject to CPZ controls subject to the relevant processes being satisfactorily completed, following joint and individual representations from a number of residents of the road.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>The residents of Ridgeview Road have been consulted but the additional parking bays that were agreed by Committee (For the use of the hospice,) need to be consulted on prior to the scheme being implemented.</p> <p>It is expected that, subject to satisfactory completion of an associated consultation exercise, that the 'TW' CPZ will be extended into Ridgeview Road later this year. There are no current plans to extend the CPZ into further roads, or to introduce a new CPZ into roads in the local vicinity of Great Bushey Drive.</p> <p>A CPZ for Great Bushy Drive and Oak Tree Drive, has been added to our prioritisation list for consideration in next years programme. Therefore no consultation will take place until it has been confirmed if this location will be on the programme.</p> <p>As you may imagine, the Council receives many requests for new or amended parking controls relating to yellow lines, loading and parking bays and CPZ's.</p> <p>Each request that we receive is assessed and then prioritised, and as we already have received requests for a CPZ in Great Bushey Drive, it will be included on a priority listing to be presented to the Environment Committee later this year to decide which schemes should be progressed in future years' work programmes.</p> <p>Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk</p>
4.	Accidents occurring when vehicles turn left out of Southway into Totteridge Lane and out of Hill Crescent into Totteridge Lane	We have examined the history of injury accidents at the

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>Issue submitted by: Michael Caro Ward:Totteridge</p> <p>As a result of concerns about the number of accidents occurring when vehicles turn left out of Southway into Totteridge Lane and out of Hill Crescent into Totteridge Lane, I have been asked to write to you on behalf of the Totteridge Residents Association to explain what I think are the causes and how these junctions might be improved. I have looked at these junctions, watched vehicles turning left out of Southway into Totteridge Lane and turning left out of Hill Crescent and Totteridge Lane, measured the angle of the turns and the looked at the road surfaces at the junctions and the size of the pavements on the left hand side of each junction. Here are my observations. The junctions require any vehicle turning left to make a 90 degree turn into Totteridge Lane. Totteridge Lane at that point is (for an A road) a relatively narrow two lane road. Southway and Hill Crescent are also narrow two lane roads. Most people making a 90 degree left turn tend to go wide, i.e. they have a tendency to go further beyond the boundary line of the pavement (which is at 90 degrees to them) than they need to before turning their steering wheel hard left. I think this tendency arises because drivers want to avoid their rear wheels hitting the kerb on their left . You can see the same tendency in slow motion if you watch people turning into their own driveways. In my view it is this tendency that is the primary cause of accidents. Coupled with this tendency, the risk of accidents at these points is compounded for the following additional reasons: • when you are turning left out of Southway into Totteridge Lane or out of Hill Crescent into Totteridge Lane your visibility to the right is restricted, firstly because there is curve in Totteridge Lane in the case of the Southway Junction and secondly because in both cases there are bushes and trees with branches protruding over the pavement on Totteridge Lane just to the right of the junctions; • there is a sunken drainage grating on the left corner of Southway which some drivers may</p>	<p>junctions of Totteridge Lane with Southway and Hill Crescent. None of the reported injury accidents at these junctions are associated with left turning vehicles from the side roads straying into the opposite carriageway, which appears to be the main concern described.</p> <p>Over the last five years there have been three injury accidents at the Totteridge Lane/Southway junction, all of which were shunt type accidents where a following vehicle failed to stop in time when the vehicle in front slowed down or stopped. In all three cases the vehicles involved were travelling along Totteridge Lane, in two cases eastbound (ie on the side of the road furthest from Southway), in one case westbound. In one case the slowing vehicle eastbound vehicle is thought to have braked sharply, but this is not suggested as a contributory factor in the other incidents. Vehicles turning left out of Southway do not appear to have been a factor in any of these incidents.</p> <p>At Totteridge Lane/Hill Crescent over five years there have also been three reported injury accidents: one involved a vehicle turning right into Hill Crescent in colliding with an overtaking motorcycle, one a shunt type accident where a vehicle overtook a stationary bus and drove into the back of stationary vehicles that were waiting for a vehicle to turn right into Hill Crescent and one involved a westbound bus braking sharply causing injury to a passenger.</p> <p>The footways (especially at the corner of Southway) are not exceptionally wide. Widening the carriageway either in Southway or Hill Crescent or in Totteridge Lane is likely to be an expensive undertaking that would be hard to justify on road safety grounds. It is likely that diversion or protection of utility services would be necessary which can result in very high costs for highway</p>

Issue Raised	Response
<p>seek to avoid causing them to go further into Totteridge Lane than they should in order to avoid sinking into the drainage grating; • although not as bad as the drain grating at the Southway junction there is also a drain near the corner of Hill Crescent and Totteridge Lane and this may have a similar effect; • Totteridge Lane is narrow at both junctions; • Southway and Hill Crescent are both narrow roads; • vehicles travel much too fast along Totteridge Lane and this means that drivers turning left out of Southway and Hill Crescent have a limited time within which to make the manoeuvre and try to do so too fast. I am also concerned about the junction of Longland Drive and Totteridge Lane. I have noticed that drivers turning right out of Longland Drive into Totteridge Lane often do so at speed because there is a limited time within which they can make that turn. Because they have accelerated out of Longland Drive they are going too fast when they reach the pedestrian crossing and often cannot stop in time. You will see this if you spend a few minutes watching drivers there. It is quite likely that a driver is going to hit a pedestrian at some point if it has not already happened.</p> <p>What action are you asking the Council to take I have the following suggestions to improve the junction to try to reduce the current inevitable risk of accidents: 1. If Southway and Hill Crescent at the junctions could each be widened by about a foot by cutting back the pavement on the left hand (west) side of Southway and Hill Crescent (perhaps in each case for a distance of about 20 feet along Southway and Hill Crescent from the corner) that would make a big difference and considerably reduce the tendency of drivers to go so wide when turning. The pavements are wide enough to allow for that cutting back there. 2. If the pavement along Totteridge Lane at those points could also be widened for a distance of about 20 feet that would also minimise that risk. 3. There is only a dotted white line in the middle of Totteridge Lane at those points. That section of Totteridge Lane and indeed all sections of Totteridge Lane near any junctions e.g. Northcliffe Drive, Pine Grove, The Green really need double white lines. 4. It is possible that some astute hatching of Southway and Hill Crescent at the intersections could</p>	<p>changes. There is a significant level difference between the footway and carriageway near Southway and trees on the verge near this point are also protected by Tree Preservation Orders. It is doubtful that the Totteridge Lane carriageway could be widened here without adversely affecting the trees and significant work to manage the difference in level. The verges on this part of Totteridge Lane also form part of Totteridge Common land which may be an additional constraint.</p> <p>Junction warning signs on the main road can help alert drivers to the possibility that vehicles may slow or stop to turn or to allow other vehicles to turn. There are already junction warning signs provided on both approaches to Southway, but reviewing the location of these and considering provision of warning signs on the approaches to Hill Crescent may be appropriate in view of the pattern of injury accidents observed. This improvement has been added to a list of proposals to be prioritised for improvements. Highest priorities would be included in the work programme for next financial year.</p> <p>Injury accidents at the zebra crossing have included a vehicle driving into a motorcycle that was waiting at the crossing and a collision with a pedestrian running into the road. The accident report would be unlikely to mention if the vehicles had turned out of Longland Drive but there is no indication that they were unable to stop through driving fast.</p> <p>The level of injury accidents at the Longland Drive junction is such that it is already identified by us for prioritisation for a junction improvement scheme. It is unlikely that this would involve traffic signals but alternative methods of control would be investigated if the scheme achieves a high enough priority.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>also help to induce drivers to position themselves better for the left turn although I think that, given the narrowness of Southway and Hill Crescent, hatching on its own will not work unless the pavements are also cut back and the sunken drain grating is dealt with. 5. Proper and rigorous enforcement of the 30 mile speed limit on Totteridge Lane in both directions is required. Ideally I would like to see average speed cameras. 6. The bushes and trees must be cut back and all other impediments to visibility must be dealt with. I also wonder whether the current designs of the junctions actually meets the requirements of the Standards for Highways? The risk in re Longland Drive could be minimised if the speed limit on Totteridge Lane were properly enforced, if traffic lights were put in place at that intersection and the pedestrian crossing were moved further to the East along Totteridge Lane.</p>	<p>There are currently no agreed proposals for the Longland Drive junction. An improvement at the junction has been added to a list of proposals to be prioritised for investigation. Highest priority locations would be included in the work programme for next financial year.</p> <p>Enforcement of the speed limit is a matter for the Police.</p> <p>With regard to other elements of the enquiry, it is not uncommon for roads that have been present for many years to not be designed to modern standards. The white centre line marking in Totteridge Lane is a warning line that is the appropriate marking in the circumstances. Double white lines systems should only be provided where visibility is severely restricted.</p> <p>Highways.correpondence@barnet.gov.uk</p>
5.	<p>Street lighting in the Victoria Road, Park Road and Crescent Road</p> <p>Issue submitted by: Jon Dix Ward:East Barnet</p> <p>The street lighting in the Victoria Road, Park Road and Crescent Road area (EN4) is now so dim that it is very difficult to see the pavement and my daughter feels unsafe when walking there at night. In particular the stretch of Park Road, that runs between Victoria Road and Crescent Road is incredibly dim as trees shade the street lights. Who makes the decision on how dim the street lights are set, do they ever walk on these streets at night and can you reconsider the street lighting levels which now seem to have been reduced to such an extent that they are entirely</p>	<p>The street lighting in the Victoria Road, Park Road and Crescent Road area (EN4) is now so dim that it is very difficult to see the pavement and my daughter feels unsafe when walking there at night. In particular the stretch of Park Road, that runs between Victoria Road and Crescent Road is incredibly dim as trees shade the street lights. Who makes the decision on how dim the street lights are set, do they ever walk on these streets at night and can you reconsider the street lighting levels which now seem to have been reduced to such an extent that they are entirely ineffective. I would also note that the pavement in this area is very uneven making it very easy to trip.</p> <p>We have reviewed the roads mentioned by Mr Dix and confirm</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>ineffective. I would also note that the pavement in this area is very uneven making it very easy to trip.</p>	<p>all assets appear to be functioning as expected, with the exception of a single column in Park road, column nr.12, which is currently being attended and will be resolved.</p> <p>All three of the roads, Victoria Road, Park Road and Crescent Road, being in the same general area, were fitted with the central management system (CMS) equipment in 2013. These roads are classified as Residential Roads and the lighting profiles were set when the CMS was installed, to this category. The lighting profile has remained constant since 2013 and has not been changed since then. The lighting profile for these three roads is identical to all other residential roads in the area, indeed, throughout the Borough.</p> <p>Victoria Road and Crescent Road lighting columns were replaced under the Street Lighting PFI Contract capital works programme in 2011 and 2010 respectively. Park Road was not deemed necessary to be replaced during that phase of the PFI, as the assets were originally installed around 1990 and have plenty of life in them. However, it is likely Park Road will be replaced at some point during the Contract, based on electrical and/or structural intervention criteria.</p> <p>Following the comments made by Mr Dix, we have requested the service provider to visit all three roads and confirm both the efficacy of all street lighting in the area and also to review the situation with trees in these roads. They will be carrying out night time photometric tests, at a number of sites in each road, and we will review the reports once received. This testing will identify where there may be areas of concern and, should there be any, these will be addressed to ensure the appropriate lighting standards continue to be achieved.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>It is not possible to have the tree issues, noted by our service provider, addressed prior to the forum, because of the processes we need to follow. However, I assure you, the issues which have been identified where trees/foliage are interfering with light output, as reported by our service provider following their visits, will be addressed forthwith in accordance with the relevant procedures.</p> <p>our service provider will visit the areas, highlighted by Mr Dix, during the evenings of this coming week, beginning Monday, 23rd January.</p> <p>They will have two objectives for their visits, namely: to confirm any obstructions to light output from foliage along all three roads mentioned and; to carry out formal photometric tests at x2 sites, at least, in each of the three roads.</p> <p>I would add, after reviewing the comments made by Mr Dix, our own engineer took the initiative and visited all three roads on Thursday evening of last week, the 19th January. During his visit it was noted the street lighting in all three roads was functioning correctly and was providing the anticipated and acceptable level of lighting for these roads.</p> <p>However, there does appear to be some interference to lighting levels, in the area of Park Road specifically mentioned by Mr Dix and other isolated locations. This is caused by foliage from trees and bushes, as well as the significant number of parked cars, which is nature of this type of residential road.</p> <p>Our service provider will pay particular attention to any foliage issues and, if it falls within their remit, they will rectify any such issues, otherwise they will report the matter to appropriate</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>colleagues in the relevant departments for them to resolve. Unfortunately, they will not be able to provide any suggestions in respect of car parking in the area.</p> <p>Hopefully this will provide adequate responses to the various points raised by Mr Dix, in order for you to respond accordingly, but if you require further information, or have additional queries on this, or related matters, please let me know directly.</p> <p>Roger.gilbert@barnet.gov.uk</p>
6.	<p>The Petition from The Ridgeway presented in September</p> <p>Submitted by: Mr Frederick Mayer Ward: Various</p> <p>Regarding The Petition from The Ridgeway presented in September. Traffic & Junctions. The Committee left the matter open pending progress on work with local schools to set up a Ride and Stride Scheme with a view to a TfL funding application to include the road in a 20Mph zone. Subsequently unbeknown to members of the committee a notices have been installed on all road round the schools excluding The Ridgeway notifying of a 20mph zone. Question - Can the committee take the initiative and find a way of getting The Ridgeway included in the Zone? The Ridgeway is closer to a primary school than one of the roads included in the zone. Residents have called for action. The Road is the start of a cut through and it makes obvious common sense to have 20mph signage at the start of the route.</p>	<p>The proposed 20mph zone has been designed following Holly Park School's request for a 20mph speed limit in their School Travel Plan in recent years. 20mph zones around school are usually relatively small areas of controls to ensure compliance with the reduced limit in the vicinity of the school. At this location the area was expanded to incorporate the other schools entrances in the vicinity, St John's CoE Primary school, Friern Barnet School and Teddies Nursery on Beaconsfield Road.</p> <p>There is concern that if the zone was extended to include a wider area and additional roads such as The Ridgeway and Park Way, this could potentially reduce the compliance with the reduced speed limit.</p> <p>If these roads were included it would involve additional design and consultation before the proposed zone could be implemented. Therefore, it is recommended that scheme is implemented as per the original proposal with a view to monitoring the surrounding roads.</p> <p>Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
7.	<p>Change the system for submitting questions to residents forums</p> <p>Submitted by: Jon Dix Ward: All</p> <p>When did you change the system for submitting questions to residents forums from email to a web form and will questions continue to be accepted if submitted by email.</p>	<p>The webforms were designed and implemented in October 2016 in time for the last round of Residents Forums. Residents are encouraged and directed to the webform in order to submit an issue, but emails will still be accepted.</p> <p>. paul.frost@barnet.gov.uk</p>
8	<p>Webform</p> <p>Submitted by: Jon Dix Ward: All</p> <p>The webform to submit questions to this forum says that Issues "must be relevant to your local area ie Finchley and Golders Green, Chipping Barnet or Hendon". The Constitution says "Residents Forums provide an opportunity for any resident to raise local matters. Local matters are any matters which are relevant to the Council except for matters relating to specific planning or licensing applications". As the webpage is not an accurate reflection of the constitution please can you amend the webpage to reflect what the constitution actually says.</p> <p>Amend the webpage for submission of issues to residents forums to reflect what the constitution actually says rather than someone's false interpretation.</p>	<p>The Governance Service have discussed issues 7 and 8 with Mr Dix and reached a very positive outcome. The webpage that enables residents to submit issues will be amended to reflect the following:</p> <p><i>'Residents are encouraged to complete this webform in order to submit an issue to the appropriate Resident's Forum.</i></p> <p><i>Resident's Forums provide an opportunity for any resident to raise local matters. Local matters are any matters which are relevant to the Council except for matters relating to specific planning or licensing applications.'</i></p> <p>Following the Chipping Barnet Resident's Forum and the outcome of these two issues it is hoped that this amendment can be implemented by the Governance Service. In addition it is noted that feedback in respect to this webform has been very</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>positive.</p> <p>Mr Dix is welcome to provide any further feedback to assist the Governance Service in order to make further improvements and Mr Dix is thanked for his assistance to date.</p> <p>Paul.frost@barnet.gov.uk</p>

Contact: Governance Service, Assurance Group, London Borough of Barnet, NLBP, Building 2, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP.
 Tel: 020 8359 5129, Email: chippingbarnet.residentsforum@barnet.gov.uk

Future meeting dates:

Date of meeting	Location	Deadline Date for Issues
22 March 2017 at 7pm	TBC	15 March 2017

Items and questions must be received by the Governance Service by 10am on the fifth working day prior to the meeting for the item to be discussed at the Forum.