

RE CONTRACT REVIEW MEMBER WORKING GROUP – MONDAY 26TH JUNE 2017 – Call for Evidence Submissions

Name	Statement
MB	<p data-bbox="555 319 741 344"><u>28 March 2017</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 424 1536 450">I am not happy with all of my Local Borough's services being outsourced to Capita.</p> <p data-bbox="555 496 1783 521">I feel it is unethical to use a third party outsourcing Giant who does not have any affiliation to our area.</p> <p data-bbox="555 568 1554 593">Capita is a private company making a fortune, doing a lousy job (in many instances).</p> <p data-bbox="555 639 1010 665">Please can you log my dissatisfaction?</p>
SM	<p data-bbox="555 716 741 742"><u>28 March 2017</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 821 1447 847">I am also a resident of the Golders Green Estate and have been since 1980.</p> <p data-bbox="555 893 1756 919">I absolutely agree with MB regarding Capita and would request that you also note my dissatisfaction.</p>
PJ <i>Group would like to make verbal submissions</i>	<p data-bbox="555 971 719 997"><u>11 April 2017</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 1077 1995 1137">Following invitation by our local Cllrs Nagus & Gill, find attached our points for the forthcoming meeting of Tuesday 25th April 17.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1150 1341 1176">Please acknowledge receipt of this communication & attachment.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1189 1995 1249">Also, kindly notify us of the time this meeting will commence, so we may attend & where permitted, verbally present the issues raised.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1262 1536 1287">Trust the attached is sufficient & suitable to enable our attendance at this session.</p>

Name	Statement
	<p style="text-align: center;">Points Relative to Capita Contract Review [11th April 17]</p> <p>Having been requested & invited by our local Cllr Ms N. Narenthira to contribute and raise issues on this subject, we forward our observations & perceptions to convey where issues <u>do not</u> reside to our general acceptance.</p> <p>Anyone perusing this information is cautioned, we make these comments on behalf of the wider local community and without prejudice, frivolity or maliciousness, but from observing & having genuine concern for the overall services received and the noticeable shortfall being detected on a regular & consistent basis.</p> <p><u>Generally, we feel the services or value Barnet is receiving, permitting or accepting from Capita Business Services, for Colindale, Burnt Oak & West Hendon wards is far from acceptance & well below the minimum threshold.</u></p> <p>We highlight various examples to support this perception & comments.</p> <p>1.Highways & Pedestrian Safety on Highways [Unacceptable Footpath Safety]</p> <p>Raised by; JL, KP, PP, PJ & JM</p> <p><u>Services or stewardship to residents in the indicated wards in our opinion, is extremely poor & well below the expected minimum standards.</u></p> <p>Issues that were raised over 18.0 months ago directly with AT, have not been investigated or considered, neither have we received suitable explanations as to why things are delayed or even what is holding up a plausible response from being generated.</p> <p>Matter we refer, is “Dangerous Kerb Edgings” & “Protruding Tree Roots”, issues that were reported as far back as October 2015, then again around June of 2016 & finally in November 2016 at the Hendon Residents Forum.</p> <p>An explanation was provided to our query at that forum, but no noticeable remedial action has been observed to some of the worst or dangerous locations.</p>

Name	Statement
	<p data-bbox="555 268 1928 300">Trips & falls occur on a regular basis, but only some victims take the time or effort to report or claim compensation.</p> <p data-bbox="555 341 1944 408">We are aware of one such serious accident, where the victim needed repeated hospital treatment for a considerable duration before the injury could be eventually cured.</p> <p data-bbox="555 450 1995 517"><u>From such simple examples, one feels Capita Business Services are failing to provide value for money for the residents of Colindale, Burnt Oak & West Hendon.</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 558 1989 625"><u>Furthermore, Capita Business Services are failing to provide commensurate or expected “professional guidance” to their employer [Barnet Council] or the residents of the above stated wards.</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 737 1541 769">2. Planning & Regeneration [Unacceptable Gusting, Turbulence & Local Flooding]</p> <p data-bbox="555 810 904 842">Raised by; PJ, PP, KP, JL & JM</p> <p data-bbox="555 884 2033 986"><u>Looking at the services provided by Capita Business Services, we are of the opinion issues are failing to be interrogated thoroughly or rigorously enough, with insufficient attention to wider implications, thus resulting in services well short of the minimum standards.</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 1027 1966 1129">When assessing or approving large developments & complexes, one feels sufficient attention <u>has not</u> been afforded to “Safety Comfort in the Public Domain”, primarily <u>unacceptable levels of turbulence & gusting,</u> caused by the new developments particularly along the Edgware Road [A5] frontage.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1171 2033 1273">This matter was raised at the Hendon Residents Forum of 22nd March 17, further to which a “Document of Understanding” is currently being compiled to prompt the council to genuinely investigate this matter and where necessary take the commensurate correctional actions to calm this unacceptable phenomenon.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1315 1845 1347">We are also aware of another inconvenience caused by the lack of due diligence by Capita Business Services.</p>

Name	Statement
	<p data-bbox="555 236 2047 336">That issue being flooding & property damage caused to certain residential properties in [The Greenway-NW9] resulting from “Surface Water Run Offs”, flowing from some of the recent new developments due to the increased ground levels at those locations.</p> <p data-bbox="555 379 1783 411">Specific details can be obtained from residents affected & residing on “The Greenway” for that matter.</p> <p data-bbox="555 454 1995 518"><u>From such simple examples, one feels Capita Business Services are failing to provide value for money for the residents of Colindale, Burnt Oak & West Hendon.</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 561 1995 625"><u>Furthermore, Capita Business Services are failing to provide commensurate or expected “professional guidance” to their employer [Barnet Council] or the residents of the above stated wards.</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 740 1010 772">3. Parking Problems & Inconvenience</p> <p data-bbox="555 815 902 847">Raised by; JL, KP, PP, PJ & JM</p> <p data-bbox="555 890 1977 954"><u>Services or stewardship to residents in the indicated wards in our opinion, is extremely poor & well below the expected minimum standards.</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 997 2002 1061">Community is encountering serious problems with insufficient parking controls, primarily the effects of the new residents from the recently constructed developments.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1104 2033 1204">When planning was granted this matter should have automatically been addressed by “Locking In” in the developers to ensure the parking created on those sites was to be for the specific & exclusive use of those residents and not for sale, lease or rent to external parties.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1248 1989 1311">The situation we now have, residents of those developments are not parking there due to the <u>prohibitive costs</u> levied by those developers and using the roads & streets that are meant for the houses on those streets.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1355 1984 1386">Colindeep Lane, Colin Park Road, Manor Way & Court Way being streets most affected by this inconvenience & influx of</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>additional vehicles.</p> <p>Customers attending the Gym & Fitness Centre operating out of the “Zenith Complex”, create untold misery for the residents of those very same streets not only with increased vehicular numbers, but with noise, inconvenience & disruption caused during the quiet times, especially in the early morning or late evening periods.</p> <p>Parking problems on Rushgrove Avenue is yet another example.</p> <p>With the closure of the “Home Base site”, that has pushed commercial parking onto Rushgrove Avenue [PCO Rental situation] now creating parking mayhem on that street.</p> <p>This situation has resulted in complaints & petitions to resolve the problem, which speaks volumes on what or who has caused this situation, due to insufficient consultation, foresight or preparation.</p> <p>Over the years, parking has become a major issue in our locality, but no one is willing to investigate this in a holistic manner, least of all the department that is in place to address such issues-Barnet Planning which principally Capita Business Services.</p> <p>This problem is the tip of the proverbial “ice berg” we predicted, when we raised concerns relative to the various planning applications mooted under the “Colindale Re-generation Plan”, we told then & do so again now that parking, if not managed properly will cause a problem, but were soundly ignored by the council & planning department, namely Capita Business Services.</p> <p>Once the Peel Centre & Rookery Way development are completed and occupied, those vehicles will most certainly gravitate towards Colindeep Lane, Colin Crescent, Rushgrove Avenue & Sheaveshill Avenue and things will become even more impossible for residents in our part of Colindale, all caused, created, dismissed & presided by Capita Business Services.</p> <p><u>From these simple examples, one feels Capita Business Services are generally failing to fulfil their basic operational remit & thus failing to provide value for money.</u></p> <p><u>Furthermore, Capita Business Services are failing to provide commensurate or expected “professional guidance” to their employer [Barnet Council] or the residents of the above stated wards.</u></p>

Name	Statement
	<p data-bbox="555 308 1055 336">4. Planning Enforcements [ENF/1247/16]</p> <p data-bbox="555 379 902 408">Raised by; JL, KP, PP, PJ & JM</p> <p data-bbox="555 451 1977 517"><u>Services or stewardship to residents in the indicated wards in our opinion, is extremely poor & well below the expected minimum standards.</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 560 2018 625">Example quoted was reported in October of 2016 and a holding response received, but since then despite various inquiries for an update, last time in November 2016 & March 2017, nothing has been received to date.</p> <p data-bbox="555 668 1720 697">This is just one matter and we are aware of many other transgressions in the surrounding locality.</p> <p data-bbox="555 740 2045 805">Having reported blatant & overt transgressions or irregularities, if officials of the stated department are unwilling to consider or act expeditiously upon these prompts, what issues are they expending their time on?</p> <p data-bbox="555 849 1906 877">The council's "barnetfirst" issue 69 in March 2017, proudly proclaims that 1,600 cases were investigated in 2016.</p> <p data-bbox="555 920 1944 986">A more revealing or informative statistic would be to understand how many complaints were logged in the period of discussion & how many cases were positively resolved.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1029 1995 1094"><u>From such simple examples, one feels Capita Business Services are failing to provide value for money for the residents of Colindale, Burnt Oak & West Hendon.</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 1137 1989 1203"><u>Furthermore, Capita Business Services are failing to provide commensurate or expected "professional guidance" to their employer [Barnet Council] or the residents of the borough.</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 1278 1128 1307">Recommendations, Comments & Observations</p> <p data-bbox="555 1350 2040 1378">From the above, any reasonably minded individual can figure out, <u>residents of the less affluent wards are not receiving value</u></p>

Name	Statement
	<p data-bbox="555 236 2018 300">for money from Capita Business Services in the current format of engagement and issues need to be re-appraise to ensure better value is achieved for Burnt Oak, Colindale & West Hendon going forward.</p> <p data-bbox="555 344 2029 480">It is not unreasonable, to expect council officials in specific positions of authority or particularly those charged with defining & monitoring performance remits of external suppliers such as Capita, put in place credible and commensurate checks, balances & monitoring systems like the right KPI's, gateway assessments Etc, thereby ensuring the expected performance is being <u>delivered impartially, consistently & regularly for all the wards & residents of the borough.</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 525 2033 624">Furthermore, this expectation <u>must or cannot</u> vary from location to location, but explicitly be consistent throughout the entire borough, irrespective of ward localities or the perceived affluence of that ward-Meaning Burnt Oak, Colindale & West Hendon being afforded identical levels of attention, facilities & consideration as Whetstone, Totteridge or Finchley.</p> <p data-bbox="555 668 2011 732">From cursory observation, <u>one feels this is not the case</u> and that is why the various examples are provided to highlight this disparity of service or facilities.</p> <p data-bbox="555 777 1951 841">Take Burnt Oak or West Hendon localities which have been permitted to decline due to “General Disrepair & Lack of Maintenance or Up Keep” to such an extent, <u>one does not want to willing visit those areas.</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 885 1339 911">Colindale is fast approaching this level of decline & unacceptance.</p> <p data-bbox="555 957 2024 1056">In our perception, the plush areas have the council's full resources allocated to maintain Whetstone, Totteridge, & Finchley wards looking pristine, well maintained & acceptable, whilst others are struggling to achieve a minimum acceptable standard.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1101 1413 1126"><u>This noticeable disparity of service must not be permitted to continue.</u></p>
AS	<p data-bbox="555 1173 719 1198"><u>12 April 2017</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 1244 1379 1270">I have been asked to submit my views on the above contract with Re.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1316 1274 1342">I have been consulted on a number of planning applications.</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>Barnet planning has been inconsistent in planning procedure. Changing procedure mid way though application process.</p> <p>Barnet planning has made serious errors in consultation process. Consultation processes have been flawed.</p> <p>Barnet planning has not been aware of serious errors and has had to rely on Barnet residents to inform them of errors and flaws in procedure.</p> <p>Residents have, with good reason, no confidence in the competence of Barnet Council to consult correctly on planning applications.</p> <p>Residents have, with good reason, no confidence in the competence of Barnet Council to enforce planning conditions attached to approved planning applications.</p> <p>Barnet planning has failed on numerous occasions to consult correctly.</p> <p>Barnet planning as failed on numerous occasions to enforce planning conditions and has breached its own planning conditions.</p> <p>Barnet Council is currently under investigation for breaching its own planning conditions.</p> <p>Barnet planning has demonstrated a complete lack of competence and in carrying out its duties and responsibilities in planning procedures.</p> <p>All the above statements are true and correct and can be supported with evidence from recent planning applications, where correct procedure has not been followed and planning conditions breached.</p> <p>Examples</p> <p>Ref: 16/6579/FUL 931 High Road N12 Block of 6 flats built in Highwood Avenue N12 without proper consultation. Site address on application shown as 931 High Road and not Highwood Avenue.</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>Breach in planning conditions - including an illegal bay window - planning permission then granted retrospectively.</p> <p>Agreed landscaping plans - condition of mature ever green trees to be planted at boundary - breached.</p> <p>Health and safety breach closing off pavements for months with no pedestrian walk way - endangering pedestrians lives.</p> <p>Incorrect markings on pedestrian crossing potentially endangering lives.</p> <p>Council notified but left incorrect markings in place for approx a year, knowingly endangering pedestrians.</p> <p>The council allowing the developer to breach health and safety by allowing an approx 20 metre high 'mountain' of rubble to be dumped along the garden boundary of Highwood Avenue for over a year. Breaching health and safety. Reported to Environmental Health but no action taken.</p> <p>Breaching planning condition by erroneously issuing parking permits to residents of this development then continuing to issue permits after being aware of the error in knowing breach of condition. The Council is currently under investigation for this particular breach in planning condition. This investigation has been ongoing for approximately 16 months yet the Council has still not started withdrawing permits - demonstrating lack of competence.</p> <p>There is written and photographic evidence supporting all the above.</p> <p>Here are some further examples relating to other planning applications.</p> <p>16/4787/PNO Solar House North Wing Only a few neighbours consulted with on this change of use application from office to residential. Period for consultation closed on 25 August 2016 but notified of approval on the morning of 26 August 2016. Therefore demonstrating that approval had already been given. In my opinion, the consultation was a sham as approval had already been given.</p> <p>16/5639/FUL Solar House South wing Only consulting within 50m radius of site in error. Changing rules relating to disclosure of public comments without notifying residents - this contradicted the application notice letters sent to residents on 25/1/17. Incorrect information relating to number of speakers allowed at planning committee. Planning officer stated incorrectly that residents could not have an objector plus a Councillor speaking on their behalf at committee meeting which was incorrect.</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>Leaving little time for objectors to prepare for the committee meeting. These are just a few examples there are many more errors on this application.</p> <p>Safari club ref 16/6579/FUL A minor application which was consulted on further than major applications. Council acknowledged that planning officer used incorrect data and therefore consultation area was wider than it should have been - wider than the Solar House (major application) above.</p> <p>17/0947/HSE Single storey rear extension (Amended Site Plan) 939 High Road London N12 8QR</p> <p>Incorrect location plan document uploaded Application breaches agreement on previous application on this development which prohibits any further development on these properties.</p> <p>These are just a few examples of errors and breaches by Barnet Council. There are many more. In each case, it has been residents who have informed the Council of its error/breach otherwise these would have gone unnoticed. There is written evidence to support all the above.</p> <p><u>Please see Appendix A for photographic submissions</u></p>
RL	<p><u>17 April 2017</u></p> <p>I have concerns regarding the Re Contract as it presently stands. My concerns are:</p> <p>1: There is a particular problem with Planning Enforcement, specifically where some developers appear to be able to demolish sites that have been previously listed. The council's planning team's performance at a recent public enquiry into the Milesplit Hill cemetery proposals was reportedly so shambolic that the council gave in and allowed the enquiry to find against the council. This is disgraceful, especially since there are now very serious consequences locally to Mill Hill's conservation area as a result.</p> <p>2: The borough no longer has its own legal team and now shares the Harrow Borough legal team.</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>3: Much of the work of the Performance and Contract Management Committee is done in private so it is not generally possible to know what if any challenges are being made by the committee to Re and Capita.</p> <p>4: Motions to bring more transparency to the work of the committee have been regularly defeated, presumably on party political lines.</p> <p>5: JD, as an interested member of the public, appears to place Capita and Re under far more scrutiny than the committee appear to.</p> <p>6: What steps will the council take to restore lost public confidence in its ability to hold Capita and Re to account?</p>
GD	<p><u>18 April 2017</u></p> <p>My views relate to planning and resource issues in particular but also perhaps have a wider relevance. I am concerned about conflicts of interest in the outsourced activities. It seems to me, from that the outsourcing process means that the very officers conducting business on behalf of residents and the council are very likely in fact to be associated or even employed by the self-same company or company sub-divisions that are likely to benefit from the work that is being generated, and at Barnet residents expense. This type of situation seems wide open to potential misuse and abuse.</p> <p>For example in the new evaluation of our garden allotments rents have been increased by a huge amount and we are being charged exorbitant surveyors fees which no doubt are being drawn by Capita. Also, for planning reviews, individuals may be virtually working on both side, like poacher and gamekeeper at the same time.</p> <p>So there is clearly potential here for conflicts of interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By officers supposedly working on our behalf, by also taking advantage to generate revenue for the parent company. - By officers reviewing planning applications in which the parent company or colleagues may have a financial, professional or advisory interest. - By officers conducting and reviewing “internally” the performance of other divisions of the parent company. <p>In brief, I would like to be 100% convinced that Barnet Council activities are working entirely and only for the benefit of all residents, and there not to be the conflict of contracted organisations with their own internal financial agendas.</p>

Name	Statement
	I would be grateful if these views could be made known to the relevant committee members, and taken into account at the meeting and in the review.
<p>ND</p> <p><i>Would like to make a verbal submission</i></p>	<p><u>18 April 2017</u></p> <p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>Resident views raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barnet planning staff / CAF Team • Discrepancies in planning applications from the public • Counter fraud • Planning audits • Views on service improvements <p>Please see Appendix B for the resident's full submission. <i>(It could not be copied into this schedule due to the format it was submitted in).</i></p>
<p>JD</p> <p><i>Would like to make a verbal submission</i></p>	<p><u>18 April 2017</u></p> <p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>Resident views raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transparency • Output specifications • Commitments • Performance • People • Conflicts of interest • Finance • Summary / Views on service improvements

Name	Statement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Commitment Comments <p>Please see Appendix C for the resident’s full submission. <i>(It could not be copied into this schedule due to the format it was submitted in).was submitted in).</i></p>
Name Supplied	<p><u>18 April 2017</u></p> <p>We find it very difficult to state which part of the Council our comments should be aimed at. The difficulties described in more detail below could be the fault of The Council, Capita or Re and we see accountability being confused, with most staff we deal with not knowing their authority or indeed who they need to get in touch with to resolve problems that often go across the silos. Again some of the comments below are our perception, but perception is our reality. Maybe they are instructed to make the whole process as difficult as possible to save the Council having to perform. We trust that you will not simply cast aside these comments which are sincerely meant to be constructive in the interests of helping the Council to equip itself to better serve the people in the Borough.</p> <p>Above all the Council and its staff (whether its own or those of your outsourcing partners) needs to adopt a “can do attitude” throughout. Too often we feel that we are treated by people who will do the bare minimum to get by. Rarely do we see a pro-active response when we initiate an issue that requires action. We have a “Focus Group” which the council could pro-actively use to discuss its ideas, but no Council initiatives have been brought to us. In fact our communications have been all one way. If we know the questions to ask, we may get answers if we chase you hard for responses. In any business I have worked for it has been a basic courtesy to respond to requests from clients within a defined timescale and to send at least a holding response, within say 48 hours of receipt of a written communication. In some instances the Council does send an automatic response but this is rarely followed up with a valuable statement that the problem is being addressed and what action will be taken by whom and by when. The standard e-mails sent from for example Planning do not reference the Planning Application number in the subject line; they simply say “udm13 or udm71” which if you are only interested in 1 particular planning application is not perhaps a problem but when you are dealing with 10s if not 100s as we do, it is not helpful.</p> <p>There should be a publicly available list of projects by ward with the status updated regularly and we would happily display this so residents could see that you are taking action on matters that concern them and that their issues have not fallen</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>down into some very deep hole. With technology today, it would be very simple to deliver such information on-line and this would improve your citizen satisfaction ratings immeasurably and save Councillors, Officers and members of the Public, hours and hours of time chasing around to find out the progress on resolving issues and thus freeing time to deliver results.</p> <p>An example of an apparently dysfunctional Council is from last summer when we wanted to take over a piece of the Highway just off the Broadway. We had to get a street licence, a Temporary Events Licence, “stop-up” the road, suspend several parking bays but none of the individual departments we spoke to in the Council, knew who their counterparts were for us to talk to or the process for us to follow to solve our issues holistically as without one of the entities happening none of the other actions were worthwhile and the event could not be run. It was like pulling teeth but fortunately we are very resilient not to say determined. In another example we know of a lady who wished to establish Farmers Markets in the Council owned Bunns Lane Car Park on every other Sunday morning when said Car Park is empty. She tried so hard to get the relevant people in the Council to talk to her and tell her what she needed to do, that she gave up, which is actually a shame because it has denied local residents a useful amenity and the Council some extra revenue.</p> <p>The same piece of Highway is where we wish to establish our ‘Town Square’ and although we have funds it has taken 2 years from concept to now, where we hope the recent consultation exercise initiated by the Council can give us the green-light to finally deliver the project. Getting the right people in the Council to engage with us has been to say the least stressful and some funding has nearly been withdraw as the project has appeared to stall.</p> <p>In fact we do not think that many officers (including Commissioners, Capita & Re staff) actually understand the role of community groups. Variously we feel that they think of us as a nuisance and definitely not on the same side, perhaps even bruising their professional egos. We see that your Contract Review covers Strategic Planning and in this regard we can say that nobody from the Council has approached the us to discuss what we feel is Strategic within our designated area. This is woeful.</p> <p>Your Highways team do not consider us as a statutory consultee (which we are on Planning Applications) and we could provide well considered input on any highways changes they may be considering but we are not consulted.</p> <p>In terms of Planning and Development Management we have seen many serious performance issues the worst of which is probably the handling of the application 14/8161/FUL at Milespit Cemetery where the original reasons for refusal where not appropriate and gave rise to an appeal, which the Council was totally incompetent in defending. You will have a copy of the Appellants 17 page letter highlighting errors in the procedures followed by Barnet Council, thus opening the door for the</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>appeal to succeed. This debacle has significant consequences for the future of other Green Belt sites in the Borough and beyond. We trust that the Council will take adequate measures to ensure that such errors cannot happen again.</p> <p>While on Planning we see the following recent issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . We are expected to review Major Applications often with hundreds of documents within a 3-4 week period. The individual documents are often poorly described in the index to the Application on your planning portal! o The date for submission of comments on the Hasmorean Application 16/ 6662/FUL, was originally 6th December and we worked hard to provide our response by this due date. We heard by rumour that it had been extended to 6th January and it remained open until end January, allowing many largely irrelevant (in planning terms) responses from people not living in the area. o We all need to be clear on the timelines for minor & major applications (there must be a difference that acknowledges the relative size of the application that needs to be reviewed) and at the moment it seems as though no particular pattern is being followed. . We know of at least one applicant who paid for the “fast-track” service but his application was not reviewed for over 2 months from registration and it was a trivial application for a chimney flue at A3 premises. This nearly resulted in this business abandoning his plans to open his restaurant in the area. 16/6529/FUL refers. . Enforcement seems to be very poor and hit or miss. Here I use a personal example where following much chasing the Council quite arbitrarily decided not to perform the enforcement prescribed by the Planning Inspectorate at No 93 Milespit Hill. As a result the overlarge summer house is still in situ and we are overlooked by the neighbouring property as they have only a thin opaque film applied to the roof-light and it can be opened freely as it is not screwed down as prescribed by the Inspector. H/01516/09 refers Appeal Reference APP/N5090/A/11/2148739 <p>Enforcement also generally seems to be poor in terms of pavement parking (where no spaces are specifically designated) and for example where bins are left on the street on days other than those prescribed as collection times. We have been in dialogue now for over a year with your Street-Scene team about the state of our Town Centre and while a new waste collection process is to be implemented (timed bag collections rather than bins and the introduction of commercial recycling) it is taking a very long time to be implemented and this is not helped by constant changes of staff.</p> <p>An alleyway behind Boots the Chemist in the Broadway was deemed many months ago to require attention by your Environmental Health team, but no improvements have been made and the site is still a health & fire risk hazard. We understand that this is private property but you have to have the means to clear it and require payment for your efforts from the landowner and that he/she provides a permanent solution (a locked gate across the alleyway for example) to stop it</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>being used for anti-social behaviour in future . Doing nothing and not communicating with interested parties is not acceptable; this problem will not simply go away.</p> <p>I have to also comment here on our dealings with the Council over the 80 Daws Lane Site. It was declared a Community Asset with your consent in 2013. An Asset Transfer was requested but you kindly said you would work in partnership with the community to build the new facility. Project personnel and an architect were duly appointed and surveys commissioned. Well the first two architects were removed from the project as they failed to listen to the brief for the new building and when they did attend meetings from Cardiff they clearly had done little/nothing to move the project forward on their actions from the previous meeting. The third architect (from Liverpool we understand) was more professional and did listen but during the period of nearly 2 years your project team had almost doubled the cost of the building with over-priced features, contingency on top of contingency plus inflation expectations without any regard as to how the funding could possibly be raised to meet these new costs. It was as if the costs were not relevant and maybe that is normally their modus operandi, but in this project the lion's share of the costs are ours to find and we could not allow them to escalate! Frankly we wondered what their agenda was as it certainly was not working in partnership to deliver a great outcome. We called a halt to the project having taken external professional advice as to what the reasonable costs should be for a 10,000 square foot building, which were still in line with our original expectations. We have now agreed that the site will be transferred to us under a 125 year lease as approved by the ARG Committee in December 2017, but actually we have lost nearly 2 years in this project. We trust that the Council did not pay for the poor efforts delivered.</p> <p>During the above discussions the Council tendered for partners to run the local Library. We were successful in our bid and were declared as the Council's preferred partner in early December 2016. We opened as the Library operator on 6th April, but we did so, on a "Tenancy at Will" agreement hurriedly put in place to allow us to take over the site as the Council had failed to commission the drawing up of the appropriate lease. Further an interest-free loan offered as part of the tendering process for £8000 over 8 years has resulted in a 16 page loan agreement needing to be negotiated. Between your lawyers and ours and adding in our personal time to review this document and presumably considerable effort from your own project team in reading the succession of drafts it has definitely cost much more than £8000 to write this agreement! Although we are open, the Council's failure to present appropriate legal documents to us in February as promised has meant that we have not been able to commit to procuring all of the additional items we need to offer the added-value services and activities we put into our business plan for this operation and accordingly are having to run fast to catch up and really should we be committing ourselves to considerable expenses before all of the t's are crossed and the i's dotted. You talk about a "partnership" but we are sceptical in our belief that as a Council you really know how to behave, throughout the organisation, in such an arrangement.</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>I said at the start of this missive that I could not readily ascribe blame to any part of the Council, but overall responsibility and accountability must remain with the Council.</p> <p>Can I remind you that at this end we are all volunteers and we are trying hard to help you deliver the very best services to the residents. Your staff need to respect that everyone's time is valuable even if it is donated to the cause.</p> <p>Please take one message from this document and that is that you need a significant culture-change in the staff employed by the Council and in those who work for you through the variety of partner organisations. They all need a positive attitude and a strong understanding that they are here to serve the public. Culturally let alone contractually this is more difficult for private sector employees to adhere to! You also need continuity in your staffing not revolving doors as is evidently a current issue and whoever is doing the job needs to know the local area well and understand the local issues. They need to engage more in face to face two-way dialogue with local people rather than being seen as a faceless entity that doesn't communicate with its public on local issues which might seem minor but to those concerned they are of significant importance.</p> <p>I trust that my comments will be taken as constructive and result in improvements in Council services not retribution. Doing it right, first time will save millions!</p>
DG	<p><u>19 April 2017</u></p> <p>As a resident of Hendon, I have had concerns regarding planning activities in the area...</p> <p>Developers locally have misrepresented plans and built beyond what they have been permitted. Even when these issues are highlighted by residents who are suffering harm the council has not adequately enforced. In one example in Edgeworth Avenue, a developer working on a building opposite took the council's decision to the planning inspectorate and "won" subject to conditions which have not been met. When I contacted the inspectorate they said it was Hendon Planning responsibility to chase and enforce. When I spoke to Hendon planning they said it was not their responsibility unless someone brought to their attention inspectorate decision and the case as far as they were concerned was closed. This is not joined up at all....</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>The general impression is that Barnet are too stretched to cope with planning applications, let alone enforcement and developers feel they can get away with anything, for example demolition without an order as in Station Road Hendon and Vaughan Ave recently. Also building work going on all day on Saturdays.</p> <p>At a recent town hall council meeting, the council leader said that data collected by the council indicates that there are no issues with planning. Residents who care about their area would beg to differ.</p> <p>Regarding Highways, the A41 junction has been a nuisance with tailbacks down station road since phasing changed, TFL have not done anything despite complains...</p> <p>Please would you take these matters into account.</p>
<p>MMS</p> <p><i>Would like to make a verbal submission</i></p>	<p><u>20 April 2017</u></p> <p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>Resident views raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contact with the Planning Service • Views and experience with the Planning Service, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Telephone service; ○ Barnet House; ○ Planning officers; ○ Email contact, and, ○ Access to Planning Service • Enforcement • Views on service improvements <p>Please see Appendix D for the resident's full submission.</p>
<p>MM</p>	<p><u>20 April 2017</u></p>

Name	Statement
	<p data-bbox="555 236 1547 272">Views and Comments for Member Working Group 25 April 2017</p> <p data-bbox="555 317 976 354"><u>Area of Concern: Planning (Re Ltd)</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 392 1879 429">I have used the planning Service since November 2014 to comment on applications on properties on my street.</p> <p data-bbox="555 467 1682 504">I have also attended planning committee meetings on four occasions to make representations.</p> <p data-bbox="555 542 1991 608">I write on behalf of the Vivian Avenue Residents Group who have made several objections to proposals for development along Vivian Avenue.</p> <p data-bbox="555 646 898 683"><u>71 Vivian Avenue NW4 3XE:</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 721 2042 863">The planning applications that I have had to deal with were from a professional developer who took steps to apply for extensions piecemeal and in my view, gave case officers, presenting officers at planning committee meetings and committee members the impression that what was proposed was not going to cause harm to the outlook and amenities of neighbours nor increase the density of the site to a distressing level.</p> <p data-bbox="555 901 1995 967">My dissatisfaction with the planning service centres around the lack of consideration for the objections of local residents who live on Vivian Avenue and the immediate surrounding roads.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1005 1800 1042">Much weight in the case officer report was given to the high number of supporters for the development.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1080 2011 1187">Many of my neighbours, some elderly and having lived in their properties for as long as my family has, were visibly shaken that the views of people who are connected to the applicant personally or professionally over-rode the views of residents who have to live next to the crowded development being built.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1225 2024 1367">We were also subjected to workmanship that was less than impeccable and my home was put at risk from an un-notified demolition. This demolition was claimed to be necessary but it is obvious to all the neighbours that the development might never have received planning permission if planners knew that a demolition was intended. This demolition also put the public at risk as there were no health and safety checks in regard to the presence of asbestos. We were also not protected</p>

Name	Statement
	<p data-bbox="555 236 1305 264">from the dust and debris while the demolition was in progress.</p> <p data-bbox="555 312 1977 373">The only thing that enforcement investigation did was to ask the developer to put in a retrospective application for a demolition and new build.</p> <p data-bbox="555 421 1993 481">Basically I was left to fend for myself and my property without any council intervention to check that proper permissions were in place and conditions discharged before building works were started.</p> <p data-bbox="555 529 1921 590">I am very disappointed with the planning service. This one experience with this development has exposed so many deficiencies in the planning service.</p> <ol data-bbox="607 638 2045 1350" style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A less than proficient assessment of the proposal, allowing conditions applied to previous approvals meant to protect the development from being used as a multiple occupancy building, to be cast aside. 2. Debate at planning committee meetings were superficial and did not address all objections raised. Precedents regarding other properties that were not allowed development were also not considered; neither was the presence of questionable support for these proposals. 3. There is no clear indication whether building control is checking the building that is progressing without planning permission. 4. There is no assurance from enforcement that the building is properly executed. 5. The developer is able to carry on building (at his own risk apparently) but it is peculiar that he has such confidence to continue bearing such huge costs; he must know he cannot be stopped? 6. The paperwork of the building and planning control processes appear not to be in place. The past history of the developer and his previous tactics to develop other properties was not heeded and the lack of consideration to this has led to some unusual lapses in the order of things. Build first without discharging conditions and despite voiding previous approvals; ask for permission later. 7. Communications with planning and enforcement officers was sparse; no one knows what is happening as regard to this application especially now that the application has been withdrawn from planning committee meeting for further investigation/consideration of new material facts. 8. Planning has not further responded in writing within 20 days to questions put to Residents Forum in 24 January 2017. A reminder sent on 23 March 2017 has still not produced any results. 9. Lack of protection of neighbouring residents to unauthorised building from the enforcement department.

Name	Statement
	<p data-bbox="555 236 1406 264">This case makes a mockery of the rules and regulations of planning law.</p> <p data-bbox="555 312 1928 373">That a lovely suburban house was allowed to be destroyed without warning and that an entirely new build is being constructed without requisite planning consent shows that something is seriously wrong with the system in Barnet.</p> <p data-bbox="555 421 896 450"><u>76 Vivian Avenue NW4 3XG</u></p> <p data-bbox="555 497 2033 558">This property has nine breaches that require investigation. Reported in June 2016 and up to today, there has been no action of any sort.</p> <p data-bbox="555 606 2040 772">The waste bins sit on the pavement and the car parking provision on the front forecourt has not been built. The flats were built (not according to approved plans) without discharging various conditions and this reveals the state and quality of enforcement here in Barnet. This should be a clear cut case. Contact the developer/owner and get the conditions discharged and the facilities built to ensure the public and the neighbour residents are not put at risk or inconvenienced by the development. The interest here for the developing company is to build and sell or rent out the flats.</p> <p data-bbox="555 820 1738 849">It is disgraceful that Barnet planning is failing and is not serving the residents of Vivian Avenue well.</p> <p data-bbox="555 896 1375 925"><u>We require consideration from the Working Group for Re planning:</u></p> <ul data-bbox="680 970 2040 1383" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="680 970 2040 1136">• Strict assessments of what developers and applicants are allowed to do. Planners must be aware of the intended goals for properties. If applications appear in rapid succession for a property, then it makes sense to question how extensive the development will be at end stage. It is disingenuous to say that the envelope of the building has been properly acquired when at each stage, the harm to the neighbours and locality is slowly but surely increasing. <li data-bbox="680 1184 2040 1315">• Scrutiny of supporting and objection comments for any development. It was very apparent for some proposals that the support for proposals was from persons who were personally or professionally connected to the applicant or his team. These are people with vested financial interests in the development and they do not live in the area. <li data-bbox="680 1362 2040 1383">• Strict adherence to conditions of approved applications when assessing new applications, especially if they are

Name	Statement
	<p>of the piece-meal variety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strict enforcement measures to deter people from breaching planning laws in the first instance. Currently, enforcement cannot protect the neighbours from harm from retrospective applications nor can it prevent planning breaches in the future. • Close any loopholes allowing developers/applicants to exploit the planning service for their own profit (leaving walls standing after un-notified demolition in order to save on notifications to relevant health and safety organisations or building control or own surveys to check for asbestos and for hoarding and defences to protect neighbours and the public). • Better communication from planning officers with the residents whose lives are being affected by untoward development. • Development that is balanced for all concerned – residents and developers. So much strife and problems can be avoided if the process is fair and transparent. The concessions made to neighbours are tiny (the most minor of amendments to roofs and extensions) whilst the benefit to the developer is maximum profit at the expense of the neighbours and locality. Garden grabbing and loss of our wildlife corridors are common features in every application now. • Planning committee members who declare connections to the applicants or their agents should not decide on applications as there is a serious conflict of interest. There is no method to address this issue as it is human nature to help an associate. It will be seen as an unfair advantage to the applicant. Please find a fair solution to this common scenario at every planning meeting. • More staff and better trained officers
PH	<p><u>20 April 2017</u></p> <p>I have previously raised this concern with the Highways department.</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>I would like Re. to look at the 'report a Problem' on the Barnet website to make sure that it is fully user friendly and provides a copy of the completed report which can be saved by the sender.</p> <p>When Re. respond to the receipt of the report, updating and reporting back to the sender, a copy of the report or at least a short description should accompany the reference number.</p>
AT	<p><u>21 April 2017</u></p> <p>I live in Southway N20 and have personally made representations over the last few years to Cllr. Cornelius about the poor and indeed dangerous condition of the street pavements; he came to have a look in 2014 and agreed they were in urgent need of attention, saying they were the second worse in the area. However despite a number of emails to him since (many unanswered), nothing has been done.</p> <p>More recently other Southway residents on making similar representations to the council, have had either no response or ultimately an unsatisfactory response.</p> <p>I became aware quite some time ago of the large sum of money that was allocated to Barnet for street improvements and have observed a number of local streets, whose pavements were in a far less parlous state than ours, where work was carried out and it thus remains a mystery as to why ours have not been repaired.</p>
CR	<p><u>21 April 2017</u></p> <p>From my experience services in Barnet have completely deteriorated since they have been privatised. The services are also of a very low standard compared to other boroughs., As you will see in my letter regarding trees I got no answer to a query for 3 months, and the letter re paving is self explanatory.</p> <p>Whilst writing I might add I am completely disgusted that Barnet Council are selling off part of the library in Chipping Barnet to a private company. The library was paid for by local people's council tax and central government taxes. The Council has no legal right to sell part of the library to a private contractor.</p> <p>The reason I have been delayed in sending these letters to you is that I had to visit my doctor and then the hospital today due to the injuries I sustained from the broken pavement mentioned in my letter. So the incompetence of Barnet Council is also costing the NHS more money.</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>Shame on you all and the councillors and the MP.</p> <p>Please see Appendix E(i) and (ii) for the resident's letters.</p>
SM	<p><u>22 April 2017</u></p> <p>I am writing to you after seeing the article in the local paper regarding the surfacing of roads in London Borough of Barnet and my disappointment that the deadline for submitting any questions had already passed!</p> <p>I am a resident on Southway, N20 and would like to particularly know why our road has fallen under the radar for any road resurfacing and new pavements unlike all the surrounding streets; Greenway Close, Lynton Mead and Ventnor Drive to name a few?</p> <p>Constant requests and empty promises have been received and I know that about two years ago Cllr Cornellius stated these works would be done as a matter of priority.</p> <p>Just to give an example the road directly outside my house between number 64 and 75 looks like a patchwork quilt of filled in potholes, we had to wait months yet again for a lorry to come and just dump some tarmac in a shoddy fashion (leaving large stones on the road). It's just not acceptable especially when we have just had a rise in the council tax we pay.</p>
FM	<p><u>22 April 2017</u></p> <p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>Resident views raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contact with Re services • Councillor contact with Re services • Neighbourhood experiences with Re services <p>Please see Appendix F for the resident's full submission.</p>

Name	Statement
<p>PA</p> <p><i>Would like to make a verbal submission</i></p>	<p><u>19 June 2017</u></p> <p>Letter received from resident</p> <p><u>Summary</u> Resident views raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re accountability • Client and Contractor relationship • Planning Officer Communications • Two examples of planning concerns <p>Please see Appendix G for the resident's full submission.</p>
<p>RG</p>	<p><u>20 June 2017</u></p> <p>I am forwarding my response to Mike Freer regarding a trailer in my neighbour's back garden. Permission was granted under a consent certificate 192 for a small caravan to be parked in the west corner of the garden.</p> <p>I am sending a separate photo. You can see from the photo for yourselves that this structure bears no relation to the consent given.</p> <p>Many letters between Mike Freer MP, Councillor's and Enforcement have done nothing about breaches incurred or about false statements made on application forms. The whole exercise to actually to get certain issues to Planning has been a total waste of time and energy on my part.</p> <p>Dear Mr.</p> <p>Thank you for sending the e.mail addressed to you by Mr.</p> <p>It is tiresome to have some of the questions answered and some evaded.</p> <p>No mention has been made of the application forms submitted by our neighbour prior to his consent being granted.</p> <p>We have raised this issue several times and the response to my latest e.mail raising the issue again was replied to by</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>He threatened to invoke the nuisance clause against me if I continued to write personally to Officers. Whatever happened to democracy? Whatever happened to Officers working for the public? Intimidating residents who are at their wits end over Officers compliance has to be highlighted. Barnet's reputation is suffering with every resident who is being steamrolled in the name of development. That is why I am writing to you in the hope that you will understand what it means to have to fight Officers in order to get some justice. It feels as if one is tilting at windmills. Hopeless!</p> <p>Mr. stated that there would be no earthworks. There were in fact two months of earthworks. He stated that this would not affect neighbours. 8 properties now look out onto the Structure. Everyone who walks past in WOS is affected. They can see the screen and part of the very high structure every time they pass by. We have endured 3 months of work (and it is still not finished) for a Trailer/ secondary home/ back garden development. He stated that there were no trees in the vicinity! His property borders on WOS. The Oak Tree with the TPO borders his fence. The Back garden development that now has paving, lighting and a separate entrance is for his mother. She has been dead for several years. If not for her then what is its real purpose? He has put up so much security around this structure including the 4m. High Fence that we are wondering what the true purpose really is? No one will be able to see it for trees when they reach maturity and anyone looking at it from the road will be seen. There are 4 cctv cameras under the eaves that have not been registered and there is no notice to inform people that they are there.</p> <p>We have no rights to privacy as the windows are clear glass and facing our property.</p> <p>This is a residential unit. It could be used by Mr. to bring in a second income. The Benefit to Mr. is that Barnet cannot even collect rates as it is supposedly a temporary structure !</p> <p>How clever Officers have been in utilising loophole after loophole to get it up and ready for use. Every response is that It is a caravan and comes under lawful development.</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>To submit forms that mislead is a criminal offence and may result in a fine or a prison sentence. The officers have not replied to these questions in all the correspondence about How they have been misled. They have chosen to ignore this. Anyone may fill in an application form and write whatever they like. No Barnet planning Officer will challenge them as demonstrated by Mr.....</p> <p>The base should have gone to Planning for consent as it had foundations and footings. It was constructed higher than his permission allowed. We have photographic evidence to prove this.</p> <p>The Oak Tree has concrete over its roots from the posts of the screen. It now has the weight of the trailer, paving and hardcore to contend with. All saplings and shrubs were removed from WOS in the construction of the screen. I watched the men hack everything in their way. I have photographic evidence to prove this. As it stands in the boundary, reducing branches to 4m away from the property and reducing the crown will destroy the tree. There will be nothing left!</p> <p>If officers had done a site visit before helping Mr.... to complete his form in order to obtain consent they might have understood that a huge structure in a back garden bordering on WOS and at its very entrance would not be a suitable site. They take no responsibility for having masterminded this whole operation.</p> <p>The Planning Officer accepted misleading evidence from Mr. and we have had to accept something that should never have been allowed in a suburban back garden. It looks like a trailer park and diminishes the neighbourhood. It has reduced the value of our property (we have been badly affected). Who will compensate us for our loss?</p> <p>Officers can use planning regulations to justify what they have done but the truth is that it should never have got consent in the first place.</p> <p>This is exactly the response that I expected from Officers who have no regard for the impact that developments may have on neighbouring properties. They follow regulations blindly using them as a shield for protection against residents like me. A 12m. Trailer has an impact! Barnet is now exploited by developers because they know that no Enforcement Officers will challenge them. They will</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>answer enquiries by Councillors and yourself making every argument plausible for you to accept. They omit certain elements of the correspondence as demonstrated here.</p> <p>They highlight the inadequacy of planning laws and do not support local residents against unscrupulous developers- support is non- existent. We are losing Barnet day by day. The developers rule.</p> <p>The truth stands in next door's garden. My neighbour got away with it with support from Barnet's Planning Dept.</p> <p>Barnet are the upholders of the covenants and according to the covenants no temporary buildings are allowed in the back gardens of the Estate - Only workshops and sheds with pitched roofs.</p> <p>Please could you consult the legal team about this because this should not be legally allowed to stay.</p> <p>Please see Appendix H for photographic submissions</p>
GB	<p><u>21 June 2017</u></p> <p>I am a Barnet resident who lives next to a building that is about to be demolished to make way for luxury flats. Over a period of a year this community has tried unsuccessfully to object to this development. The planning office run now by Re have worked hand in glove with these developers aiding them to push through their plans and have failed to remain neutral or to offer objectors any help or advice. The planning office clearly despises Barnet residents treating us with contempt. Working with Barnet and the developers but always against local residents to pull down as many buildings as they can and to sweep all objections under the carpet. I consider this conflict of interest a scandal which hopefully before long will be picked up by MSM.</p> <p>How can it benefit a borough to knock down serviceable buildings and to replace them with square boxes, or as in our case agree to 9 cars running up and down a back garden? Riding roughshod over genuine objections presumably because at some point Re will make a financial gain from these developers. Residents who pay these peoples' wages should know exactly the sums involved.</p> <p>The planning office in any borough should be neutral, there to advise and help both parties. Re is only interested in helping property organisations that operate entirely for financial gain. Luxury flats are not needed here. We have enough of them.</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>The way that Re operate, always promoting the interests of the developer and dismissing any and all objections by residents is partisan to say the least and should be challenged. I would like to see Re disbanded and a decent and honest Planning department take its place. I also object to being treated with such contempt by these people who pay lip service to "consultation" but who continue to ignore the opinions of local communities as a matter of course.</p>
<p>MO</p> <p><i>Will send a representative to make a verbal submission</i></p>	<p><u>21 June 2017</u></p> <p><u>Summary</u> Resident views raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dollis Valley Greenwalk • Trees and the infrastructure for residents • Barnet Copthall • Barnet Copthall/Allianz Stadium planning application <p>Please see Appendix I and Appendix J (i) and (ii) for the resident's full submission.</p>
<p>MH</p>	<p><u>21 June 2017</u></p> <p>Comments on the contract review for Re services. My experience has fallen into two specific areas and specifically 2 particular cases.</p> <p>1) Planning Services: as a member of the Finchley Society Planning Committee it is my remit to scrutinise all applications for East Finchley and I do this through the Planning Website. In particular I have been dealing with the application for 12-18 High Road, N2. A large number of drawings are posted on the website and this is the opportunity for the public to see and comment on the proposals. It is very difficult to find out which drawing is which as they either have inadequate, none or even wrong titles. The only way therefore to find a drawing is to open them all and then check. Currently there are 334 documents listed for this application. This becomes extremely important when trying to match the drawings listed on line to those listed as 'approved plans' in the officer's report to committee. It makes the whole process very difficult and obstructive.</p> <p>2) Highways Services: as a member of the working group of residents who met regularly with Oak Lodge School during the</p>

Name	Statement
	<p>recent construction of their new extension we have been concerned at the damage to the pavement and highway ongoing. We have tried to get some coordination between the new works required (crossovers to the school) services connections across the road, broken and dangerous pavement and damaged road surface. It is almost impossible to find out who might be contacted to discuss this. The highways department will only deal with a single numbered incident and their staff will not allow contact with the Highways officers. We managed finally to get a meeting with a representative from the Department to discuss a strategic approach to all our concerns. We have been denied contact with the representative ever since (emails not responded to; blocking of the telephone; etc) It is very clear that those left in the Highways department are themselves extremely frustrated at the lack of contact with the public. Additionally the fact that there is no overall strategic approach, with each separate element not coordinated together means that money is wasted with work being done in bits and pieces, then undone and done again, the work is done poorly and no-one appears to supervise any work done.</p>