

FINCHLEY & GOLDERS GREEN RESIDENTS FORUM

THURSDAY 6TH JUNE, 2019

AT 7.00 PM

CHURCH END LIBRARY, 318 REGENT'S PARK ROAD, LONDON N3 2LN

Chairman: Councillor Jennifer Grocock
(Chairman)

Vice Chairman: Councillor John Marshall MA (Hons)
(Vice-Chairman)

Governance Services contact: fandgg.residentsforum@barnet.gov.uk

No	Issue Raised	Response
1.	Finchley & Golders Green Residents Forum - Issues List with Responses	

This page is intentionally left blank



AGENDA ITEM 1

This page is intentionally left blank

FINCHLEY & GOLDERS GREEN RESIDENTS' FORUM
Thursday 6 June 7pm

VENUE: Finchley Church End Library 318-320 Gateway House, Regent's Park Road, N3 2LN

Chairman: Councillor Jennifer Grocock
Vice Chairman: Councillor John Marshall

ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED AT THE FORUM MEETING

	Issue Raised	Response
1	<p>Submitted by: Mr Griver Received: 19 May 2019</p> <p>I'd like to bring the following matter to the attention of those attending the 6th June Finchley & Golders Green Residents Forum - unfortunately I am unable to attend myself.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised by residents and businesses of Finchley regarding anti-social behaviour around the station exits of Finchley Central tube station, particularly Station Road. The Station Road exit frequently has people drinking in public and taking drugs, with some women complaining of sexual harassment as they leave the station. The police have recommended a PSPO (a local order under antisocial behaviour legislation) which bans drinking in the street in the Finchley Central area - other areas in Barnet have seen great improvements after implementing PSPOs. In addition, lighting could be improved in this area, which many residents agree with - however TFL have stated they are satisfied with the current lighting. Please see the following petition which explains my argument: http://tiny.cc/pc305y</p> <p>I have emailed the Barnet Community Safety Team multiple times, and I believe others have too, but I have had no response. I'd be grateful if somebody could raise this issue on my behalf, as I stated earlier, I am unable to attend.</p>	<p>The matter of anti-social behaviour around the vicinity of Finchley Tube Station was referred by the Community Safety Team and the Neighbourhood Policing Team the Community Safety Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference (CS MARAC) on 24th April.</p> <p>At that meeting it was agreed that a Working group (Task and Finish Group) would be convened to oversee an action plan focused on addressing and responding to the multiple issues being raised by the local community and partners. These include the street drinking, begging and littering taking place in the locality concentrating around the Finchley Central Tube Station.</p> <p>An action plan is in place, and linked to which, six key individuals have been identified as being directly involved in the anti-social behaviour. The Neighbourhood Policing Team are already taking action and criminal justice proceedings are already taking place in relation to a number of those six individuals.</p> <p>The Task and Finish Group will coordinate a range of interventions in the vicinity including engagement and outreach work, preventative and enforcement actions. The group will also consider progressing the</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>Petition: Introduce a Public Spaces Protection Order in Finchley Central Lead Petitioner: Mr Griver Signatures: 70</p> <p>We the undersigned petition the council to Introduce a Public Space Protection Order which bans drinking in public spaces in the Finchley Central area, similar to the ones introduced recently in High Barnet, Childs Hill, Burnt Oak and Edgware.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised by residents and businesses, particularly around Station Road and the entrance to Finchley Central station. People sometimes loiter in this area, drinking in the street or using recreational drugs and making the public feel uncomfortable by shouting, harassing them, or otherwise behaving in an antisocial manner. Local Police are well aware of these behaviors', and recommend a PSPO.</p>	<p>suggested PSPO subject to further assessment and consultation with the Council's legal services and elected members.</p> <p>It is noted that the end date for the petition is the 9th July 2019. Until the petition is concluded any enquires regarding this matter can be made by emailing BarnetCST@Barnet.gov.uk.</p>
2	<p>Submitted by: Peter Hale Received: 24 May 2019</p> <p>Bishops Avenue / A1000 junction proposals 2017</p> <p>Proposals were drawn up in 2017 for a scheme to improve safety at the junction of Bishops Avenue with A1000. Consultation responses on the scheme were negative. Safety for pedestrians and motorists is an ongoing problem at this junction, is a revised scheme being drawn up?</p>	<p>We are currently working on options to improve safety at the junction of Bishops Avenue and High Road. One option being considered is the introduction of a new controlled crossing with traffic signals. Transport for London (TfL) are the traffic authority responsible for traffic signals in London and we have engaged them to investigate the feasibility of promoting this option. Haringey Council will be included in discussions, and residents and businesses will be consulted before any final decision is made. The timelines are heavily dependent on TfL.</p>
3	<p>Submitted by: Peter Hale Received: 24 May 2019</p> <p>Pedestrian crossing point East End Road – see attached photo sheet</p> <p>A dropped kerb with tactile paving was installed on both sides of the road at same time as zebra crossing was installed 50 metres away? When I previously questioned this installation I was told that it had been requested. The crossing on the north side is now being misused as vehicle crossover. Both pavements are narrow and are compromised by these dropped kerbs, please reinstate the pavement.</p>	<p>Whilst there is crossing to the west of this location, in the form of the signal controlled facility outside the Five Bells Public House, there is a strong case for people wanting to cross before this / closer to Stanley Road, as Cromwell Close leads to an alleyway that gives access to Abbots Gardens, then on to Brim Hill and a number of streets beyond that, which creates a pedestrian desire line away from the controlled crossing. Therefore an informal crossing point was installed and the position of this crossing was dictated by the existing dropped crossings for the driveways of the houses on East End Road.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
4	<p>Submitted by: Peter Hale Received: 24 May 2019</p> <p>Dangerous road surface – see photo sheet A1000 / Squires Lane junction northbound At the traffic signals in the cycle lane sunken cover with sharp edges is a safety hazard for cyclists, This road hazard has been reported on previous occasions over 2 years with no action.</p>	<p>The Council originally understood that the sunken service cover on the A1000 High Road on the approach to the Squires Lane junction, was the responsibility of Thames Water. However, Thames Water has now advised that it is not their asset, and as such a works order has been raised to the Council’s highways contractor for a replacement cover to be installed. These works are programmed to be completed by 13 June 2019.</p>
5	<p>Submitted by: Peter Hale Received: 24 May 2019</p> <p>Countdown system High Road / Fortis Green Please can you give an update on progress (previous response given F&GG Forum 6/9/18 item 8)</p>	<p>As we advised last year a borough led scheme incorporating a filter signal and pedestrian countdown proposal was shelved, owing to limitations on the funding available especially as traffic modelling would be necessary. The proposal remains one that will be reconsidered for future funding in future, but is not currently being progressed.</p> <p>TfL had indicated that modelling of the junction would not be necessary simply to introduce pedestrian countdown signals. Normally pedestrian signals show a green man as an invitation to cross but then that light goes out, and subsequently shows the red man, although there is still time available to complete crossing. The pedestrian countdown system provides an additional indicator of the time remaining to cross. These can provide greater assurance for pedestrians that they still have time to complete crossing. We asked TfL if they could give us an indication of the costs of introducing pedestrian countdown on its own. They advise that this would be in the region of £15k-£20k or possibly less if it turned out that re-cabling was not necessary.</p> <p>We also do not have a currently funded scheme to address provision of pedestrian countdown signals in isolation.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>If the Forum consider that this location requires immediate attention, then there is the option of the issue being referred to the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee, where funding to progress items could be granted.</p>
6	<p>Submitted by: Peter Hale Received: 24 May 2019</p> <p>Draft Barnet Domestic Crossover policy – Has this policy now been adopted? Where can reference to the policy be found?</p>	<p>The Barnet Domestic Crossover Policy was adopted on 1 April 2019, following agreement at Environment Committee in September 2018.</p> <p>A copy of the policy and further information can be found on the Barnet website:</p> <p>https://www.barnet.gov.uk/roads-and-pavements/apply-have-your-kerb-lowered</p>
7	<p>Submitted by: Daniela Boyce – Chair Lodge Lane N12 Residents Association Received: 28 May 2019</p> <p>Issues of Security - There's an abandoned car full of arms in car park and drug dealing. There's been No communications between police and residents regarding this – we found via North Side School</p> <p>Action requested To help improve communication to residents - we have set a up a residents association to do this. Up to now, none of our councillors have responded with information or advice on this. We need to be informed of issues like these so we can be vigilant and safe.</p>	<p>Officers attended the location and the vehicle in question has been removed. With regard to keeping up to date with the latest crime prevention advice I highly recommend the OWL system.</p> <p>The Barnet Safer Communities Partnership invested in the OWL (Online Watch Link) system to help keep the community updated with the latest crime prevention advice from the police and Neighbourhood Watch. To start receiving updates (via website or App) on crime prevention and safety advice specific to the local area, from Barnet Neighbourhood Watch and the Neighbourhood Policing Teams, please visit: https://www.owl.co.uk/. An officer from the Community Safety</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		Team will be contacting Ms Boyce directly to provide guidance as to how to sign up to OWL.
8	<p>Submitted by: Daniela Boyce – Chair Lodge Lane N12 Residents Association Received: 28 May 2019</p> <p>Issue – 20mph speed limit on Lodge Road When is it being imposed?</p> <p>This is urgent. Daily verbal abuse means that a narrow single lane traffic road is a rat run in rush hour for 2 way traffic and it is unsafe to walk on the pavements outside our houses.</p>	During the Statutory Consultation process a number of objections were received. These objections have been resolved and the scheme will be implemented over the Summer.
9	<p>Submitted by: Lorraine Thomas Received: 29 May 2019</p> <p>When can I expect to receive responses to my clarifying questions from the March Residents' Forum? At the March Forum, it was also suggested I would be sent the overall LB Barnet Committee structure. I've found the overview, but not the hierarchy that the Forum suggested exists.</p>	This has now been responded to
10	<p>Submitted by: Lorraine Thomas Received: 29 May 2019</p> <p>Community Safety</p> <p>Who is responsible for maintenance and security of geography due for development neighbouring Brent Terrace, namely Clarefield Park, Claremont Open Space, the green triangles (plots 53/54)? The areas fall into what is Brent Cross South and for plots 53/54 Brent Cross North.</p> <p>Despite agreements apparently being signed, the developers Argent Related and L&Q are claiming they are not responsible. There has been rapid and considerable decline in the area from the point of works commencing including digging, removal of hedgerow, trees and some barriers. Problems include extensive graffiti, much increased fly tipping, groups loitering, drug</p>	<p>The areas that fall within the development zone will become the responsibility of the delivery party when the respective development begins. This is already evident in the Claremont Industrial estate where Argent Related have started to take ownership of units, clearing and securing the area. Until the time development starts the responsibility for maintenance and security remains the same as it previously was. The BXC project team is working through the iPMO with development partners and council departments to establish a single point of contact for issues in the area as they arise within the area.</p> <p>The works related to hedgerow removal by L&Q's contractor on plots</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>paraphernalia in the parks and on the streets, (stolen?) mopeds being dumped, damage to property. Whilst some of this is a neighbourhood policing matter, at the moment, there is no named contact willing to take responsibility to introduce proactive rather than reactive measures</p>	<p>53/54 have now been rectified with the hedgerow re-planted in the area it was removed.</p> <p>In terms of vandalism and anti-social behaviour Argent Related have been in discussion with the council to ensure a regular line of communication to the police for when these matters arise. This includes extending invites to local police to attend community engagement events to discuss these issues and explore ways of resolving.</p> <p>In addition, we have assigned a Community Safety Officer to open an action plan and investigation into concerns raised and to coordinate proactive measures to tackle fly tipping, littering and dumping of vehicles in this vicinity.</p> <p>As part of this action plan the Community Safety Team have tasked our Environmental Crime Enforcement Officers to undertake fly tipping and littering patrols in the area and enforce upon any person not disposing of their waste correctly.</p>
11	<p>Submitted by: Lorraine Thomas Received: 29 May 2019</p> <p>How are Barnet Homes held accountable by LB Barnet and Members? Are there named housing or neighbourhood managers, and how are these engaging with communities in which they have properties? Not all neighbouring homes are Barnet Homes and there does not appear to be a mechanism for other residents to engage with Barnet Homes. As a result, I've assumed there is a mechanism via Members holding the leadership of Barnet Homes to account, The background to this is a request was placed for a named contact for the Brent Terrace area. This has not even been acknowledged after around 10 days. Brent Terrace is a mixed community with a minority of Barnet Homes properties. However, there have been a number of incidents that, rather than residents raising repeated formal complaints, need to be addressed in a holistic way. Some issues are more nuisance and could be addressed by written</p>	<p>Barnet Homes, a subsidiary of The Barnet Group (TBG), have a 10-year management agreement in place with the Council for the provision of housing and housing related services for the Council's circa 14,000 tenanted and leasehold properties to support the Council's Housing, Tenancy and Homelessness Strategies. In addition to this and under the same agreement, Barnet Homes are responsible for providing the council's statutory housing options service. In accordance with the management agreement, there are robust governance arrangements in place to ensure that the objectives of the agreement are being achieved which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of a Barnet Homes annual delivery plan for approval by council officers and locally elected members

Issue Raised	Response
<p>notices, but some include aggression and violence.</p>	<p>through the Housing Committee. This plan is subsequently monitored throughout the year through a contract management framework which includes council officer challenge, Barnet Homes Ltd Board and LBB Housing Committee oversight.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Barnet Homes Ltd Board, consisting of mainly non-executive members, including some council residents, provide oversight that Barnet Homes are meeting the objectives in the annual delivery plan and 10-year management agreement • The Barnet Group Board, consisting of mainly non-executive members and two locally elected members, provide oversight that Barnet Homes are meeting the strategic objectives of the council <p>Regarding the specific request relating to Brent Terrace and engagement with residents in the area who are not Barnet Homes tenants, the suggestion for a holistic approach is a sensible one and our neighbourhood team provide this function. The neighbourhood housing officer for the Brent Terrace area is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Neil Edwards – 020 8359 2258 (neil.edwards@barnethomes.org)and the Housing Manager for the area is: • Mrs Michelle Davies – 020 8359 6153 (michelle.davies@barnethomes.org) <p>Barnet Homes apologises if any residents have been unable to contact our Neighbourhood Housing Team. Please contact one of the above members of staff to discuss the issues raised at the residents' forum and we will take appropriate measure to investigate the matter further.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
12	<p>Submitted by: Theresa Musgrove Received: 29 May 2019</p> <p>How is it possible that very senior planning officers working for Barnet/Capita are allowed to leave their posts and immediately work as consultants working for local developers and submitting plans on their behalf to former colleagues</p>	<p>The Council has no restrictions on career choices made by former employees, however, where there may be a conflict of interest, measures are put into place. In terms of the Planning Service, any application which involves a former member of staff is counter-signed by a Manager.</p>
13	<p>Submitted by: Theresa Musgrove Received: 29 May 2019</p> <p>Recently on social media there has been circulated footage of a man in an unstaffed library openly watching pornography on a public pc, and behaving in a grossly unacceptable way in full view of other library users - and passers by on the street. After reporting this to a Labour councillor, I understand new filters will belatedly be put in place to try to prevent this happening. Why did it happen at all, and does this not prove that you did not have in place adequate safeguarding arrangements for unstaffed - or indeed staffed - libraries?</p>	<p>There is an annual 'Security Health Check' of all systems by an independent 3rd party who test network and system vulnerability. This was performed explicitly for the Libraries network in February 2019 and no issues were reported in this area.</p> <p>Tuesday 21/05/19 CSG IT became aware of a rumour that inappropriate content could be viewed from public PC's in the libraries. Technical network checks were undertaken and no adverse findings were found but a physical site visit by IT staff confirmed the access could be achieved.</p> <p>Further technical checks were undertaken on the Websense Appliance used to filter accessible content and the configuration was almost identical that the devices used within the Corporate network with content being blocked as expected. A call was logged with the supplier of the Websense Appliance.</p> <p>The issue was resolved on Friday 24/05 by blocking inappropriate internet traffic at via an alternative method and</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>over the weekend the team re-applied the settings on the Websense Appliance, providing two layers of content blocking. As a consequence reviewing the content filtering is working as intended will become a routine check for all libraries.</p> <p>All library customers log in to computers using their library card and PIN and thus use can be tracked when required.</p> <p>PCs in libraries are always sited where they can be seen and restrictions are in place to ensure that adults do not use computers located in areas designated for children and teenagers.</p>
14	<p>Submitted by: Theresa Musgrove Received: 29 May 2019</p> <p>The roads and pavements almost everywhere in the borough are still in an appalling state. I enclose a photograph of local paving where it is absolutely clear that contractors have merely replaced a nominal number of paving slabs, leaving the vast amount of broken ones in place. This was many weeks ago, and nothing further has been done; the pathway remains a health and safety risk. Why is no one checking that these jobs are fully completed, and are jobs being billed as complete when they are not, as in this case, in which case this is surely a fraudulent claim?</p>	<p>This matter was raised by you at Environment Committee on 4th June, a response provided, and you asked additional questions.</p> <p>If you have queries about specific roads this can be dealt with by the Area Committees.</p> <p>The response provided at Environment Committee is copied below:</p> <p>Annual condition surveys are undertaken on the Council's Highway network and the results of the 2018 survey identified a measured improvement on the footway network over the last three years. The annual surveys are conducted to identify lengths of the network which are potentially in need of more detailed investigation or treatment and the data is used to prioritise a works programme using a risk based approach.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response																		
		<p>Highways are inspected cyclically for safety, and orders issued to Conway Aecom (CA) as part of the reactive maintenance process. It should be noted that cracked paving, whilst unsightly, does not necessarily represent a hazard. It is estimated that we issue 10,000 jobs to CA annually. To report concerns on individual footways or roads please use this link https://www.barnet.gov.uk/roads-and-pavements/report-problem-road-street-or-pavement</p> <p>The Council's Highways service provider carries out monthly checks on approximately one in 10 of all work orders issued to CA and on all work over a value of £300. This is to ensure that the works are being completed as instructed and to specification. The table below shows the results of these checks for the period between July 2018 and February 2019. Where it is identified that the highways contractor has not completed the works to the required standards, they are required to undertake remedial works at their own cost.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1301 1018 2152 1209"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quality of work audits</th> <th>July</th> <th>Aug</th> <th>Sep</th> <th>Oct</th> <th>Nov</th> <th>Dec</th> <th>Jan</th> <th>Feb</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>failure rate</td> <td>10%</td> <td>21%</td> <td>7%</td> <td>9%</td> <td>7%</td> <td>7%</td> <td>5%</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quality of work audits	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	failure rate	10%	21%	7%	9%	7%	7%	5%	6%
Quality of work audits	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb												
failure rate	10%	21%	7%	9%	7%	7%	5%	6%												
15	<p>Submitted by: Theresa Musgrove Received: 29 May 2019</p>																			

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>Bearing in mind the recent tragic local case of a young child killed after running into traffic, what measures does the council intend to take to safeguard children entering Victoria Park from the main Long Lane entrance, once contractors start building flats in the park, on the site the Tory councillors sold for development? The same question of safety will apply after the building work is done, and residents with their cars will be accessing the flats in the park at this already dangerous spot, with children running into the park, expecting to be safe from any such risk.</p>	<p>Such an unfortunate accident is tragic.</p> <p>There are existing refuge islands near the two entrances to the Park on Long Lane to enable people to cross the road safely. Also, as part of the planning permission for the proposed development the council has approved a Construction Management Plan. This includes a requirement to safely manage traffic/pedestrian movements at the proposed site entrance.</p> <p>The proposed development comprises 6 self-contained flats with 6 car parking spaces. Hence, the number of vehicle movements from the site is expected to be low (2-3 cars during peak hour). In addition, the Council will ensure that the new access meets current visibility and safety standards.</p>
16	<p>Submitted by: Theresa Musgrove Received: 29 May 2019</p> <p>Why does the council's contracted building enforcement refuse to come out and inspect health and safety risks posed by reckless building work on a narrow public highway, here in Finchley Central? Is this not part of their contractual duties?</p>	<p>No location details have been given so the question is unclear.</p> <p>The Council does not have a contracted team for this purpose as health and safety at work, which can include the highway, is regulated by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). It is the duty of the HSE to prevent work-related death, injury and ill health. Any concerns over reckless building work practices should be reported direct to the public body.</p> <p>http://www.hse.gov.uk/contact/concerns.htm</p>
17	<p>Submitted by: Theresa Musgrove Received: 29 May 2019</p>	<p>This project to review and update the Local List is nearing completion following extensive survey work carried out by volunteers and officers. It has been a lengthy exercise not having</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>Part of the contractual obligation of Capita's 'partnership' with the council was a requirement for them to update the historic buildings listing.</p> <p>Six years later this has still not been done, and only after repeated questions have been raised by some residents and Labour councillors is this even near being put in place, yet we have seen many historic buildings destroyed in the name of development.</p> <p>Why has Capita been allowed to ignore its obligation for so long, and has any financial penalty been paid in view of the failure to deliver this within a reasonable time frame?</p> <p>Why now are you proposing that local volunteers do all the hard work for this instead of the contractors that have already been paid to do this?</p>	<p>been carried out since 1986. The existing list contains some 1600 entries and this is to be supplemented with around 400 new nominations. Each building or structure on the draft list (both existing and new nominations), has been surveyed individually, recorded and photographed. The project was led by a community interest company, but has been a collaboration between local volunteers, council officers, Historic England, local amenity and heritage groups, and councillors from both the main parties. The draft list will be the subject of consultation in the summer with the owners of the buildings.</p>
18	<p>Submitted by: Mr Levy Received: 30 May 2019</p> <p>Golders Green Library Rear Garden</p> <p>The rear (patio) garden of Golders Green Library used to be made accessible in clement conditions during summer opening, but has been closed for several years due to unsafe steps and no budget to repair them.</p> <p>At the January 2017 Forum I asked for a costing for the works needed to re-open this garden, so I can propose this for an Area Committee grant. I was promised a response from Officers within two months, but this is still awaited despite subsequent reminders and Governance Service chasing it up. Please may we have a response now?</p>	<p>The library service does not have any current plans to develop the garden area at Golders Green Library. This was investigated some time ago and found to be prohibitively expensive. An updated quotation has been requested.</p>
19	<p>Submitted by: Ian Dunn Received: 30 May 2019</p> <p>Why has work gone ahead within the North Finchley SPD boundary before the “co-ordinated & comprehensive approach” masterplan was developed as described in 8.2 to 8.12 below, and before the Partnership Panel was convened?</p>	<p>The Council has been working to complete an agreement with a development partner so that the aims and objectives of the North Finchley SPD can be delivered. Until such an agreement is in place, the Council cannot stop planning applications coming forward in the area.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>8.2 In accordance with Local Plan and London Plan policies and as informed by the Council's evidence base, capacity assessments, and stakeholder consultation, the Council considers that North Finchley has significant growth potential for additional residential development as well as retail, leisure, workspace and community uses.</p> <p>8.3 In order to achieve the significant growth potential which will secure North Finchley's regeneration a coordinated and comprehensive approach is necessary.</p> <p>8.4 A coordinated and comprehensive approach will ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the appropriate quantum and mix of development will be delivered • development is phased in an appropriate manner and timescale • required social and physical infrastructure to support development is in place at the required time • improvements to public realm throughout the SPD Area are made • the town's car parking management strategy meets local needs • there is a coordinated approach to funding infrastructure needs. <p>8.5 The Council's approach to the regeneration of North Finchley will be to work closely with all local businesses, stakeholders, landowners and local communities. This will be required of applicants and developers of sites, supported and when necessary facilitated by the Council.</p> <p>Planning</p> <p>8.8 The SPD details the Council's policies and requirements and provides a spatial framework for stakeholders, including landowners and developers, positively to respond to.</p> <p>8.9 Whilst the Council recognises that development itself may come forward in a phased manner, it will require that proposals are part of a comprehensive approach in order to avoid piecemeal proposals that are prejudicial to the overall vision.</p> <p>8.10 Where proposals are for significant developments in the SPD Area, the Council will want to see these brought forward accompanied by an overall masterplan with associated planning application(s), to demonstrate they are part of and/or contribute to the comprehensive regeneration approach.</p> <p>8.11 Potential applicants are advised to consult with the Council as early as possible to ensure that the form and nature of planning application(s) will facilitate and not prejudice the comprehensive approach. At this stage the Council does not prescribe a preferred planning applications strategy. However, the Council would welcome outline or hybrid applications setting the overall context for development in the town centre, within which detailed applications could be accommodated.</p> <p>8.12 All planning applications will be considered against the adopted Local Plan and London Plan and any other relevant material considerations, including this SPD.</p>	
20	<p>Submitted by: Ian Dunn Received: 30 May 2019</p> <p>A review of Barnet's Historic List is underway and near completion, but this was supposed to be a borough-wide consultation and review. The review has gone ahead without publicity and the Grand Arcade has missed out on local listing despite 669 people signing a petition to save it</p>	<p>The local list review was a borough-wide consultation exercise. The review was publicly advertised, including a press release seeking nominations and an article in the July 2017 edition of Barnet First magazine seeking volunteers, which is distributed to all households in the borough. Barnet Council did not receive a nomination for the Grand Arcade to be included on the list and therefore was not</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>from demolition. Where was the public consultation and why have Merton Council 'locally listed' a building by the same designer when Barnet Council and Historic England did not even know the year of build or the designer. The designer was T. Spencer Rutter of Avondale NW10. Built in 1937 at the same time and in the same style as the Gaumont. Historic England also stated in their SPD consultation letter that the Arcade should be retained. Why was this ignored?</p>	<p>considered by the selection panel.</p>
21	<p>Submitted by: Ian Dunn Received: 30 May 2019</p> <p>With 669 names on the petition to save the Grand Arcade from demolition, will the council recognise the petition on Change.org and act accordingly to protect the building from demolition? It is noted that the former telephone exchange near the Malt & Hops has been given an article 4 direction, why has the art deco Grand Arcade been completely abandoned by this council? The St Kilda War Memorial was protected with half that number of names. The council and Mayor of London may remind themselves of recent investment in the arcade. Why invest when the intention was to demolish it?</p>	<p>The Grand Arcade was not nominated for inclusion on the list and therefore was not considered by the selection panel. Many other buildings in north Finchley have, however, been nominated for inclusion, to supplement those already on the Local List in this area. Any future development in north Finchley will be determined in accordance with Barnet's Local Plan policies and the North Finchley Town Centre Framework SPD.</p>

Contact: Tracy Scollin, Governance Service, Assurance Group, London Borough of Barnet, NLBP, Building 2, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP.

Tel: 020 8359 2315, Email: f&gg.residentsforum@barnet.gov.uk.

Future meeting dates:

Thurs 5 September, 7pm

Weds 8 January 2020, 7pm

(venues tbc)

Items must be submitted to the Governance Service (f&gg.residentsforum@barnet.gov.uk) by **10.00am on the 5th working day prior to the meeting.**

This page is intentionally left blank