

CHIPPING BARNET RESIDENTS' FORUM

MEETING HELD ON 16 SEPTEMBER 2008 ACTION NOTES

held at: Danegrove School, Windsor Drive, Barnet EN4 8UD

*Chairman: Councillor Bridget Perry Vice-Chairman: Councillor Caroline Margo

*Denotes Councillor Present

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Margo

PRESENTATION ON THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (LDF)

At the beginning of the meeting, Martin Cowie, Head of Planning and Development Management gave a presentation on Barnet's LDF Core Strategy – Issues and Options. The key issues raised in the presentation included:

- An opportunity for residents to provide feedback about the future shape of the borough and how the Council managed change. It was also an opportunity for residents to influence some important decisions.
- An explanation on planning for the future of Barnet over the next 15 to 20 years.
- How the proposed LDF would look like.
- How the Council proposed to identify big issues in Barnet.
- The current position.
- The next steps.
- How residents could 'Have their Say'.
- Advice on feedback.
- The five main themes:
 - Growing successfully
 - Delivering infrastructure
 - Meeting Housing aspirations
 - Planning for vital and viable town centres
 - Planning sustainable growth
- There would be further consultation in the Spring of 2009 with proposals being submitted to the Government Inspector for an 'Examination in Public' which would test the soundness of the document.
- The whole process would last around one and a half years in total.
- Link <http://www.barnet.gov.uk/index/council-democracy/consultations/planning-consultations/core-strategy-consultation.htm>
- E mail: forward.planning@barnet.gov.uk

Issue Raised	Response at the Meeting	Update (and by whom)
<p>1. Margaret Giller raised the issue of narrowed pavements in Churchmead Close due to encroaching perimeter fences of houses. She asked whether these extensions to perimeters been permitted by the Council. If not, could enforcement take place.</p>	<p>On the north side of Churchmead Close, there was no public footpath and on the south the footpath varied in width from nothing to 60cm. Officers could suggest a meeting on site with the help of a map to identify if and where there had been an encroachment.</p>	<p>Mark Cooper</p> <p>No further update</p>
<p>2. Ms Giller then referred to the grass cuttings which were never removed after verges etc have been cut. She asked whether it was part of the contract to remove these cuttings. If not, the issue of self seeding needed to be addressed as it had led to dangerous self seeding in the pavements.</p>	<p>Mike Freestone reported that the area had been visited recently and no problems had been identified. However, he reiterated that a visit could take place.</p>	<p>Meetings have taken place between residents and the Council and various work has been carried out. The issue of encroaching perimeter fences was being investigated.</p>
<p>3. Ms Giller understood that there was a schedule of street cleaning for the area but this was not carried out. A cleaning van was seen at the end of July (approx). No cleaning was carried out, and the van left. She asked whether the Director could assure residents that cleaning was carried out and that the work was monitored.</p>	<p>The area was swept and inspected during week commencing 25th August 08 and was next due for attention during week 3 in September. The Street Cleansing Manager has asked that the area street scene supervisor inspect on a regular basis; the East Barnet town keeper was also going to be checking for litter 3 times per week.</p>	<p>Dave Ward (Street Cleansing Manager)</p> <p>No further update</p>
<p>4. Mr Gardiner raised the issue of a recent postponement of a licensing hearing and asked: a) Could it not have been known, or at least anticipated, that such late provision of relevant documentation would prompt an appeal for more time from at least one of the interested parties. His papers, sent by special delivery, were dated 5th August for the hearing on the 14th August.</p>	<p>Officers agreed that it should have been anticipated. The Agora application was the first to be dealt with by the Council under the Gambling Act provisions, and unfortunately, due to an administrative misunderstanding, the requisite period of notice was not given, so that there was no alternative but to accede to the applicants' request for the hearing to be adjourned. Apologies were extended to all parties concerned for this. A new hearing date [3</p>	<p>Nick Musgrove/Debra Allday</p> <p>No further update.</p>

<p>He asked officers provide a figure, estimated if need be, of the total cost of the postponement, broken down into internal transfer payments between council departments and payments to outside individuals and organisations.</p>	<p>November] has been arranged. The only costs expended would be postage charges in the region of £55.</p> <p>Councillor Kate Salinger confirmed that a minimal amount of Councillor time had been wasted and she outlined the reasons.</p>	
<p>5. Mr Gardiner, in referring to his previous question, asked when the anticipated planning application would be considered.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie undertook to obtain an answer to this question.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie</p> <p>To feed back to Mr Gardiner</p>
<p>6. Mr Hinds, manager of Waitrose had the following issue raised in his absence: He asked why there was going to be a 50,000 sq ft Asda and Tesco being built in new Barnet. It was his view that there was already a new Sainsburys in new Barnet and that customers felt there was no need for the Tescos or Asda developments. He said that residents were also worried about the adverse impact to the traffic in the area.</p>	<p>Asda and Tecso would not necessarily be developing stores in New Barnet. Both supermarkets have been preparing plans for mixed use developments in the area but these have not been endorsed in any way by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Recently Asda submitted a planning application for their proposals but it had not been registered as complete due to the absence of an Environmental Statement. Their planning consultants have indicated that this would be provided in the coming weeks but unfortunately they have not been more specific than this. Officers did not know if/when Tesco may make a formal submission.</p> <p>Clearly in assessing any large mixed use development incorporating a supermarket, matters concerning its retail impact and affect on the highway network were fundamental considerations and would be examined very carefully having regard to national, strategic and borough wide planning policies and local opinion.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie/Dave Prince</p> <p>No further update.</p>

<p>7. Mr Ashwood asked why was there inadequate notice given in time and publicity regarding the Council's intention to exchange land on the King George Playing Fields. He asked whether it had been published in the Barnet Press.</p>	<p>Mr Ashwood should note that the Cabinet Resources Committee Resolution of 2 September 2008 was to "complete the land swap, subject to the outcome of the advertising pursuant to Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972, and the approval of the Department for Children, Schools and Families, the Charities Commission, and the National Playing Fields Association."</p> <p>The advertising had not yet taken place, but would involve placing an advert in the local press, which would invite comment. The advertising and any comments resulting from that advertising would be considered by the relevant area environmental sub-committee.</p> <p>Local residents with known interests were written to in late June or early July with notification of the Council's intentions. Mike Freestone outlined the current health and safety issues which had rendered the sports field to little or no use. The purpose of the land swap was to attain better sports outcomes.</p>	<p>Peter Cridland/Chidi Agada</p> <p>No further response.</p> <p>Jill Parmenter</p> <p>Property officers are aware of the freehold issues raised by Mr Ashwood regarding the land exchange on the KG Playing Fields. An amended advertisement will be put into the Barnet Press shortly explaining the proposals</p>
<p>8. Mr Ashwood felt that the Council was not spending its money wisely and asked for explanations on the way the following expenditure had taken place: (a) £1.4 million on computers when the Council could go into partnership with Carphone Warehouse, who give away laptops free of charge.</p>	<p>The lap tops were selected as part of an evaluation process and then significant price negotiations were undertaken such that according to the OGC the price per unit negotiated by LBB were the best as seen by the OGC for four years. The reason the Council didn't get free lap tops from the Carphone Warehouse was that these were conditional on the customer taking network packages. This would have been unsuitable for the purchase by the Council as the network provision would not be required and had not met the technical requirements.</p>	<p>Mark Webber</p> <p>No further update</p>

	<p>Mike Freestone added that the provision of new computer equipment was just one of the measures being taken by the Council to become more efficient, others included 'hot desking' and reducing accommodation costs. The provision of new equipment enabled this to happen. He outlined how this was achieved.</p>	
<p>9. Mr Ashwood asked why £14,000 had been spent on televisions for some Council offices.</p>	<p>A sum of money had been spent on audio video equipment and these were not solely for Council offices. The majority of the screens purchased were in the areas used for conferencing and meetings to enable greater visibility of the presentations being given.</p>	<p>Stephen Shawcross</p> <p>No further update</p>
<p>10. Mr Ashwood referred to the repairs effected to certain garages and new lamps being installed on the Dollis Valley Estate, when it was due for demolition.</p>	<p>In respect of the new lamps: The Council had entered into a PFI Contract for the provision of the street lighting service which commenced in April 2006. Under a PFI style contract the Council transfers the risk in the lighting columns to the contractor. As the columns in Dollis Valley Estate were some of the oldest in the borough the contractor had concluded through a risk assessment process that these should be replaced in the early stages of the contract provision in order to reduce his risks and to ensure that the existing life expired columns do not pose a danger to the public.</p>	<p>Richard Bergman, Senior Engineer, Street Lighting. Tel:020 8359 3034</p> <p>With regards to the lighting on the Dollis Valley estate there are no immediate plans to stop maintenance or replacement as the are no immediate plans for demolition. We need to replace and repair as needed to satisfy the residents concerns over safety and to protect our residents from any potential hazards. When firm timeframes from demolition are available then maintenance regimes will be revisited.</p>

	In respect of repairs: As part of the repairs and maintenance service, Barnet Homes had a duty to undertake repairs to garages. This also included those on regeneration estates. Where residents or a member of Barnet Homes staff report a garage repair is required, Barnet Homes will instruct their partnering contractors, Connaught plc to attend and carry out the most appropriate repair, ensuring quality and value for money.	Elliot Sweetman No further update
11. Mr Standing raised the problem with dog fouling in Oak Hill Park, including the playing field area. He asked what action would the Council take to resolve this.	The Park Keeper located on site addresses owners whose dogs were found to be fouling the park. In cases where they did not have poop scoop bags these were provided, and advice given of the bye-laws requiring owners to pick up after their dogs.	Jenny Warren No further update
12. Mrs Nash asked whether East Barnet Road, from Brookhill Road to the mini round about at Longmore Ave, could have parking only on one side of the road. It was becoming very congested and dangerous for the locals because it is a bus route and large vehicles use this road as well. Most properties had off street parking, therefore she asked whether all these vehicles were in respect of commuters. It was Mr Howard's view that the trend of conversion of family dwellings into flats exacerbated the traffic issues.	This section of East Barnet Road had been investigated as part of a wider study on parking related issues in the New Barnet area. Initial investigation suggests that there would be a benefit in introducing waiting restrictions along this section that would prevent parking taking place at least during day. However, the way forward in dealing with the identified issues of concern in the New Barnet area overall was yet to be decided and at this stage, it was not considered that this particular issue should be progressed in isolation as any action taken needs to have consideration to any possible impact on adjacent roads. It was anticipated that a decision on the area study may be reached by the end of the year. Mike Freestone outlined the issues in respect of learning from parking restrictions and said that it was important to get the balance right.	Chris Chrysostomou No further update

<p>13. Ms Silverstone asked for two issues to be raised in her absence: (a) Why will there be no crossing installed at New Barnet station?</p>	<p>The following written responses were given: (a) The reason that a pedestrian crossing or an island in York Road is not considered appropriate is due to the poor sightlines at the location. It would not be safe to give pedestrians priority over traffic at the location as the road geometry does not allow enough reaction time for drivers to react adequately to the situation. Contrary to first impressions, in such cases it is safer to raise pedestrians' awareness rather than giving a false sense of security by providing a crossing.</p>	<p>Neil Richardson</p> <p>Officers are still awaiting feedback from Network Rail and continue to chase for a response.</p>
<p>(b) Eight cycle racks have been installed in York Road, which were being underused. Why is there an intention to increase this facility when the current provision seems adequate?</p>	<p>The borough had recently contacted Network Rail in order to discuss the possibility of relocating their boundary fence to provide a footway along the eastern kerb line. This would allow pedestrians to walk up the hill to a point where visibility is much improved and would serve residents commuting from the south of the station. It should be noted that the talks between the borough and the Network Rail were at an initial stage and that there was no guarantee that the train operator would agree to relocating their fence. (b) Regarding the provision of cycle facility around the station, and given the popularity of the racks on the western side of the station, the Council was considering replicating the provision of cycle racks on the eastern side (Approach Road) to encourage more people to cycle to the station.</p>	

<p>14. Mr Darren Mehta asked the following questions:</p> <p>(a) He asked what the Council was doing to address speeding cars going along Russell Lane, N20. He also asked about pavement parking at Cambridge Close, making it difficult to turn right.</p>	<p>The volume of road traffic, including pedestrian numbers, and the number of recorded personal injury accidents at any location played a large part in determining whether any investment should be made pursuing possible traffic measures such as a crossing facility or speed reduction measures, as resources should be diverted to those locations where there were known accident or speed records.</p> <p>There was an agreed process that determined whether any action should be considered, and officers would consider carrying out surveys to access traffic speeds and pedestrian movements. However, it would be beneficial if Mr Mehta could advise if there was a particular section of Russell Lane that he was referring to.</p>	<p>Neil Richardson</p> <p>Officers are still awaiting confirmation from Mr Mehta as to where in Russell Lane he has a particular concern with.</p>
<p>(b) When would there be road surfacing of the bottom end of Russell Lane</p> <p>(c) Mr Mehta said that there were no recycling facilities for the tenants of the new flats in Osidge Park. He asked what action would the Council take.</p>	<p>The remaining section of Russell Lane would be included for condition assessment later this year as part of next year's planned maintenance programme. Subject to meeting the criteria, funding availability and committee approval, this road might be included in next year's programme. Meanwhile the Council's reactive maintenance team will inspect the road and keep the highway in a safe condition.</p> <p>The Council's service providers have pursued this with the managing agents with a view to setting up a site visit to arrange recycling facilities. This issue would be further pursued. Mike Freestone undertook to inform Mr Mehta about the date arranged for the site visit.</p>	<p>Gangan Pillai</p> <p>No further update</p> <p>Mike Freestone The Council's recycling contractors originally received a request for recycling facilities from a resident in January 2007. They contacted the managing agents for the site (Peverel OM) and left</p>

		<p>messages asking the agents to return their call. No response was received. Since that time there have been several attempts to contact the appropriate representative of the managing agents, but with no success. The Council intends to write to Peverel OM to ask them to clarify who Officers should work with on this issue.</p>
<p>15. Mr Dix referred to the under provision of quality public access swimming pools/sports facilities in Chipping Barnet. He asked what the Council's strategy in this area was. He felt that the Council was missing out on legacy opportunities as an outcome of the 2012 Olympic Games being held in London. It was also Mr Dix understanding that Barnet charged the highest prices in Great Britain to go for a swim and to hire a badminton court. He read out evidence based comments on Sport England Sports Facilities Calculator and the Amateur Swimming Association guidelines regarding, in their view, the shortfall in public swimming facilities in Barnet. Mr Branch referred to the poor state of Church Farm Swimming Pool, and he outlined his concerns.</p>	<p>A written response from Julian Mauger stated: The Council did not consider the Borough to be ill-provided in any area as regards leisure centres and particularly pools. The Council considered opportunities for improving leisure and other facilities as part of its wider asset management strategy. Martin Cowie said that he expected that the same points made by Mr Dix would be fed into the LDF consultation document. He said that there would be a borough wide survey on leisure provision and the LDF would identify strategies to ensure that mechanisms would be put in place to address any shortfalls.</p>	<p>Mike Freestone</p> <p>To feed back to officers on the comments and views made by residents in respect of leisure provision and the view that Church Farm pool was in a poor state of repair.</p> <p>Julian Mauger Has contacted Mr Dix regarding details of his evidence. A response was awaited. Meanwhile Mr Dix has been given information on upcoming initiatives.</p>
<p>Maria Nash emphasised the need that all leisure facilities should accommodate wheelchair users and other people with special needs. She said that she had experienced a lack of working hoist equipment and in some cases the absence of staff to use this provision.</p>		

<p>16. Mr Dix referred to three properties in New Barnet – 7 to 11 Victoria Road and 15 East Barnet Road – which have become dilapidated. He asked whether the Council would take action to force the owner to either demolish these buildings or bring them back into use.</p>		<p>Nick Lennox Area Building Control Manager (Eastern),</p> <p>An inspection has taken place at 7-11 Victoria Road. The scaffold is in place and the hoarding is in good order, at this time there is no further action available to the Council.</p> <p>With regard to 15 East Barnet Road the demolition has not started yet. Nick Lennox has spoken to the applicant today who advised that he had made a demolition application on 30/06/08 under the Building Act but in the current climate it might not go ahead for a while. However when they do decide to proceed they will let the Council know.</p>
<p>17. Karen Miller asked whether the Council was intending to hold any form of public consultation on the two supermarket proposals for New Barnet, and if not, why not.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie confirmed that there would be consultation but that there had only been a submission by Asda at the current time and that this application was incomplete. There was no information as to if/when Tesco would submit and application. He said that the Council was intending to consult on the Asda proposals, therefore it was obligated to consult on any Tesco application. If the two applications were submitted at the same time, the Council would hold a Development Forum. Martin Cowie said that consultation would be widespread; he outlined the probable extent of any consultation. He added that in addition to public consultation, the Council had to</p>	

	take into account the UDP, planning briefs and guidance before an application could be considered at committee. Martin Cowie said that should the Council refuse an application, a final decision could be taken out of its hands should the applicants refer it to the Planning Inspector for determination.	
18. Mr Howard said that he had been informed by Martin Cowie that the Borough was not backing the document that had been used in the	Martin Cowie outlined the brief for the Gas Works site and he undertook to forward this to Mr Howard.	Martin Cowie To forward the brief to Mr Howard.
discussions between Asda and the Council regarding the development of the Gas Works site in New Barnet. He asked whether this meant that the Borough had no written basis for discussing what was required by the Borough when speaking to developers about developing the only major site in the area identified in the 1991 and 2006 UDPs. Mr Howard raised a concern that there would be timing constraints between the submission of any applications and public consultation.	Less work had been undertaken with Tesco and it remained unclear as to whether they would be submitting a planning application. Martin Cowie referred to the document produced by Asda and said that this was an attempt by the organisation to provide justification for their scheme. He said that a borough wide town centre strategy was being prepared and New Barnet would be included in the document. The Asda document was produced to assist discussion during the re-application stage. A borough wide town centre strategy would assist in identifying challenges and constraints, but the Council already has established policies to determine applications. He added that there was no guarantee that either scheme would come forward as a planning application. In response to a question from Ms Giller, he outlined the Council's views on both proposals and that the strategy would set out all concerns raised by residents. The strategy should be available early in the new year. In respect of timing constraints, Martin Cowie reiterated that the Council already had in place robust planning policies to consider schemes prior to consultation. He advised Mr Robb to approach Asda direct in respect of their document.	

<p>19. Mr Howard said that the Council had recently published a second edition of the Boroughs Three Strands Policy. This document emphasised the growth potential of the Borough and high lighted New Barnet as a growth area. This document did not appear to have been approved or authorised for use by the Council, Cabinet or formal committee.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie said that the document was an emerging approach and the latest was an updated version of the 2004 document previously adopted by the Council.</p>	
<p>He asked whether this meant that the redevelopment of village and town centres such as New Barnet was to be encouraged by the Council and left to the private sector to undertake without Council or residents involvement.</p>		
<p>20. Mrs Henderson raised a concern at the excessive vehicle speeds in the vicinity of the crossroads, along Margaret Road/Victoria Road. She has witnessed two accidents within a year. She understood that speed humps have been removed, and asked what did the Council do to control speeds.</p>	<p>Sgt Carter outlined the police activity taking place in that area, which included attempts to educate speeding drivers. He said that a traffic survey was being undertaken and that any measures would be recommended to the Council for action.</p>	
<p>21. Mr Robb referred to street cleaning in New Barnet, Victoria Close.</p>		<p>Dave Ward (Phone: 020 8359 5137)</p> <p>Victoria Close is swept / maintained & inspected in neighbourhood sweeping schedule every 4 weeks, the last visit was made during week commencing 20th October. The street cleansing manager will visit this road following next scheduled sweep to inspect quality.</p>
<p>22. Ms Nash referred to various vacant sites around the borough.</p>	<p>Ms Nash was informed that residents could let the Council know where these sites were. However they did not belong to the Council so their use was outside the Council's control.</p>	

23. Mr Magnus referred once again to his request for the Council to adopt the pathway at Hadley Common. He read out a letter to the attendees who confirmed that the Trust had only the resources to maintain the woods and the view that the pathway was historically the Council's responsibility.	Mike Freestone said that the Council could show no evidence of any responsibility for the pathway and would welcome such information if the Trust could provide it. Meanwhile, as a starting point, a survey was being carried out as to the level of use the path had.	
24. A resident asked whether there were any development plans in respect of the Spires.	Martin Cowie said that he understood that the owners, driven mainly by Waitrose, had suggested some expansion. He said that the Council were fully aware of other local issues such as the future of the market and that these would need careful consideration.	
25. Road works at Station Road/Lytton Road	Mike Freestone confirmed that the recent works were carried out by Thames Water and that these had been completed.	
26. A request from Mr Parker regarding specific proposals regarding cycling provision.		Mike Freestone To send documents to Mr Parker
DATES AND VENUES OF FUTURE MEETINGS	6 November 2008 8 January 2009 17 February 2009 17 March 2009	Chipping Barnet Library Building 2, NLBP Danegrove School, Windsor Drive Chipping Barnet Library

The meeting finished at 9.05pm

Officers Present:

Mike Freestone

Martin Cowie

Chris Chrysostomou

Sgt Carter

Pauline Bagley

Councillors MacDonald, Rams, Brian Salinger and Kate Salinger were also in attendance

Lead Officer

Head of Planning and Development Management

Environment and Transport

Metropolitan Police

Democratic Services

PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Barnet House, 1255 High Road, Whetstone N20

Democratic Services Contact: Jonathan Regal – 020 8359 2012 or email jonathan.regal@barnet.gov.uk

Public requests to speak at Planning & Environment Committee

Written requests to speak on planning applications should be notified to the relevant Area Planning Officer by 10.00am on the 2nd working day before the day of the meeting.

Public requests to speak at Planning & Environment Committee on matters other than planning matters

Written requests to speak on matters other than planning applications must be received by the Democratic Services Manager by 10.00am on the 2nd working day before the day of the meeting.

Public requests to ask questions at Planning & Environment Committee

Any request to ask a question (exact wording) on the work of the Committee must be received by the Democratic Services Manager by 10.00am on the 7th working day before the day of the meeting.

Forthcoming meetings:

29 October 2008, 26 November 2008, 22 December 2008