

CHIPPING BARNET RESIDENTS' FORUM

MEETING HELD ON 16 JUNE 2009 ACTION NOTES

held at: Building 2, North London Business Park

*Chairman: Councillor Bridget Perry Vice-Chairman: Councillor Kate Salinger

*Denotes Councillor Present

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
1.	<p>Mrs Windsor</p> <p><u>Raised an issue at the last meeting:</u></p> <p>Concerns regarding speeding traffic at the junction of Totteridge Lane and Barnet Lane. She asked whether traffic lights could be installed at this site.</p>	<p>Neil Richardson (written)</p> <p>It was understood that the request for traffic signals was suggested in order to improve pedestrian safety at this location for those wishing to cross the road as opposed to a speed limiting measure.</p> <p>Transport for London were responsible for the maintenance of all traffic signals within the Borough and their criteria for justifying traffic signals - as they will ultimately fund them, includes some mandatory factors such as vehicle speed and vehicle and pedestrian volumes. At this particular location, the criterion that the proposed/new location must have an accident rate equal to or greater than the average signal junction in the Borough is not met as accident rates here low.</p> <p>Therefore at this time there was no justification in considering a signalised pedestrian crossing, however Officers would continue to monitor the location should this situation change.</p>	
2	<p>Mr Ashwood</p> <p>Why have the Auditors failed to pay off the Council's accounts for the past three years? What is the content of the recent letter sent to the Borough Treasurer by the auditors?</p>	<p>Clive Medlam (written)</p> <p>The Appointed Auditor was unable to sign off the Council's recent Statement of Accounts due to prior Accounts not having been signed off by the previous Appointed Auditor. This was due to the unresolved</p>	<p>Jonathan Bunt</p> <p>The Annual Audit & Inspection Letter is being reported to the Council's Audit Committee on 29 June 2009 and the papers can be found on the Council's website.</p> <p>Mr Ashwood has been sent a copy of the report</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	Mr Ashwood noted the response and reiterated his request for a copy of the letter sent to the Borough Treasurer by the Auditors	query relating to the sale of the Barnet Football Club ground. This has now been finalised and all of the Statement of Accounts up to 2007/08 have been signed off by the respective parties	
3	<p>Mr Ashwood</p> <p>The council has £320 million in reserves. What projects are ear marked for this funding, what is the extent of their costs, and when are they due to be paid?</p> <p>Mr Ashwood put a supplementary question as to why the reserves have dropped from £320 million.</p>	<p>Clive Medlam (written)</p> <p>As at 31 March 2008, the Council held a total of £36m in reserves not £320m and the reasons for holding these funds vary. The Council has a general balance of £17.4m to cover unforeseen circumstances that may occur and as one of the mitigating actions for potential financial risks. It also holds specific reserves totalling £18.6m for defined purposes, for example capital projects, to meet the cost of service restructures and future software and licensing costs.</p>	<p>Jonathan Bunt</p> <p>The Council's reserves were not £320m, in fact they increased from £24m in March 2007 to £36m as at March 2008. The £320m reflects the level of cash balances held by the Council at a point in time and is very different to its level of reserves. The cash balances are made up of a number of sources including its reserves but also Council Tax and business rates income, grant income, funds for future capital projects that have yet to be required etc.</p>
4	<p>Mr Ashwood</p> <p>Even if the capital invested in the Icelandic Banks is repaid, will there be a loss of income in respect of interest payments, and if so, how much?</p>	<p>Clive Medlam (written)</p> <p>At this stage there is no loss on the deposits placed with Icelandic banks and, until the final terms for repayment are agreed, it will not be possible to determine whether there has been any loss and, if there has been, how much that is.</p> <p>At the meeting</p> <p>In response to Mr Ashwood's challenge that there had been no loss, the Chair suggested that he should, if he wished, take the matter further with Mr Medlam.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
5	<p>Mr Ashwood</p> <p>He understood from information supplied under the FOI that Cabinet Resources Committee made the decision to invest in Icelandic Banks. If this is the case, why was the blame put on just one officer?</p>	<p>Clive Medlam (written)</p> <p>Cabinet Resources Committee is responsible for approving the Council's Treasury Management Strategy, which is done annually in March. This then provides the framework for officers to conduct the treasury management activity, i.e. placing deposits with approved counterparties and undertaking prudential borrowing. Cabinet</p>	
		<p>Resources Committee did not explicitly decide to place funds on deposit with Icelandic banks but gave authority to officers to place funds with any counterparty that met the approved criteria within the Strategy. An officer resigned from the Council after it was identified that deposits had been placed with organisations which did not meet the approved credit criteria.</p>	
6	<p>Mr Ashwood</p> <p>Where is the income from renting out King George Trust land going to? He says that it is not being paid to the Trust. He gives the example of rent from the riding stables over the past 12 years and rent from Film London for use of the car park in Barnet Lane.</p> <p>Mr Ashwood challenged that any income should go to the Council and that it should go straight to the Trust.</p>	<p>Peter Cridland (written)</p> <p>Income from pitch lettings within the George V Trust is credited to an individual cost centre with the Council's Accounting system SAP. There was no rent from the riding stables as it was run as a Council Service for the period of time that the land was within the trust. This situation was recognised as inappropriate (as this was not an open space use) and the land was taken out of the trust and swapped for a similarly sized and valued portion of open space land. The income from film lettings goes to a Communications budget. It should be noted that even if that income went to the trust cost centre, it would</p>	
		<p>still not improve the income position such that it covers all of the costs associated with the maintenance of the Trust land and the pavilion</p> <p>At the meeting</p> <p>In respect of Mr Ashwood's view about where income should be paid, the Chairman suggested that he contacts Mr Cridland directly.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
7	<p>Mr Ashwood</p> <p>Why is the Council insisting on using and paying for Councillors to chair the residents' forums? It is his view that chairing could be carried out effectively by officers and that this would cost the taxpayer less.</p>	<p>David Seabrooke (written)</p> <p>Councillors are the decision-makers and most of the community would expect to see their elected Councillors visibly leading the Forums and to have the chance to engage with them.</p>	
	<p>Several residents gave their view on this issue and it was their consensus that the allowances paid to Councillors particularly those who were paid special responsibility allowances, were too high. However they acknowledged that these allowances were within the public arena for anyone to scrutinise.</p>		
	<p>One resident suggested that Councillors should not be paid for the job. They should be able to take time off work in lieu of Council business.</p> <p>Another resident noted that there were no Liberal Democrat Chairmen.</p>	<p>At the meeting</p> <p>In response to the issue of Liberal Democrats not chairing meetings, Councillor Perry said that this was decided on the basis of incumbent majority party being able to appoint to these positions.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
8	<p>Mr Ashwood</p> <p>Mr Ashwood has evidence that the responsibility for maintenance of the pavements and highways in Crocusfield and Meadow Close fell to the Council and not Barnet Homes as they were adopted in 1975. He wishes to know why</p>	<p>Paul Bragg (written)</p> <p>In order to clarify the confusion - Crocusfield has not been adopted and is the responsibility of the Council's Housing Department. Meadow Close is adopted highway and as such is inspected along with other adopted roads. The Highways department is currently reviewing the Highway inspection function and will be introducing a new way of operating the inspection regime. The way in which inspections will be carried out will radically change and</p>	<p>Nicola Cross</p> <p>Officers were aware and in receipt of a document dated 1976. Legal officers were investigating and Nicola undertook to chase up progress and feed back in the Action Notes as to whether Crocusfield had in fact been adopted.</p>
	<p>residents have been misled in the past as to responsibility, and he asks when these roads will be repaired?</p> <p>Mr Ashwood reported that the home of a local elderly couple was recently flooded due to the poor state of repair of the roads.</p>	<p>as part of the review the adequacy of the inspection frequencies for each category of road has also been undertaken. This is all with the intention of improving the service and ultimately ensuring that the highway network is maintained in a safe condition for the benefit of all users of the highway. Arrangements have been made for an inspector to visit Meadow Close before the date of this meeting and all identified intervention level defects will be addressed by issuing appropriate instructions to our contractor.</p>	<p>Paul Bragg</p> <p>Feedback on inspection of Meadow Close and any measures to address defects.</p>
9	<p>Mr Ashwood</p> <p>Why did Barnet Homes attempt to overcharge leaseholders on the Quinta Estate by 75% for repairs?</p> <p>After acknowledging the response, Mr Ashwood said that it was his view that Barnet Homes were inefficient and wasted money.</p>	<p>Kevin Turnpenney (written)</p> <p>Leaseholders are provided with an estimated cost of the work in advance as part of the statutory consultation process. They then receive a revised actual cost of the work after its completion.</p> <p>Fourteen blocks were represented as part of the application to the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal (LVT) from the Quinta Drive estate. It is the case that one of the blocks did receive an estimate which was 70% in excess of the actual cost. The other 13 blocks received estimates that were between 5 and 50% over the actual cost. It should be noted that the estimates contain provisional and contingency sums.</p> <p>This issue is still subject of the LVT process and at this stage we are unable to advise further</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
10	<p>Mr Ashwood</p> <p>How and why was the extra £12 million incurred in respect of the additional cost of the bridge at Mill Hill?</p>	<p>Dan Ash (written)</p> <p>The Aerodrome Road Bridge and Road project was the subject of a detailed public report to Cabinet Resources Committee in May which provides a full background to the project and project costs.</p>	
		<p>This includes issues around the management of the project and the unforeseen additional works and consequent costs involved, particularly in relation to the diversion of utility installations and the extent and design of works required by Network Rail.</p> <p>The report also clarifies that officers are working closely with the main contractor to reduce the final costs and achieve completion as early as possible. This report is available on the web or in hard copy upon request.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
11	<p>Mr Ashwood</p> <p>It is Mr Ashwood's view that there have been vast increases in Members' Allowances over the past three years. He asks the Council to justify these increases.</p> <p>Mr Ashwood disputed the figures given in the written response and disputed that the Independent Remuneration Panel gave advice to Councillors regarding the level of allowances.</p> <p>Mr Howard agreed with Mr Ashwood that the 5% rise did not reflect the far higher increases of possibly more than 20% in the responsibility allowances for chairmen etc.</p> <p>Mr Ashwood referred to a current Councillor of the borough who was now elected as an MEP.</p>	<p>David Seabrooke (written)</p> <p>Councillors' allowances are set on the advice of the Independent Remuneration Panel and are in place to enable people from all walks of life to be a councillor.</p> <p>A councillor's basic allowance in 2006/07 was £8,500 and in 2009/10 has been set at £9,974, an average annual increase of 5% of over 3 years.</p> <p>At the meeting</p> <p>Councillor Salinger confirmed that the Councillor in question was foregoing her Councillor allowance</p>	<p>David Seabrooke</p> <p>To supply information on the current levels of allowances, including responsibility allowances and the rate this has increased over the past three years.</p>
	<p>Mr Howard acknowledged that the written answer was correct in so far as it went, however he requested that the full extent of the increases in allowances be put into the action sheets for information.</p>	.	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
12	<p>Mr James Topham</p> <p>Residents along Church Hill Road are extremely concerned about the increased and dangerous speeding along the road and at the recent spate of road accidents since the removal of the speed tables by the Council and TfL in April 09. Mr Topham says that five crashes have been reported in the past five weeks which includes injuries to pedestrians and the driver of a car in a separate incident. Residents are calling for traffic calming measures</p> <p>Mr Topham was unhappy with the written answer as this had not move on from the one he had been given some weeks earlier. He, and other residents at the meeting, including Penny Proctor and Mr Hope, said that the research methods used by the Council were flawed and in particular, the sightlines from</p>	<p>Neil Richardson (written)</p> <p>A number of highway improvements were identified along Church Hill Road for buses, pedestrians, and general traffic.</p> <p>A summary of the proposals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The removal of the raised tables to improve ride quality for buses as well as general traffic. · The introduction of 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) near pedestrian crossing points and junctions to improve sight lines. · The replacement of the mini roundabout at the junction of Rushdene Avenue with a standard give way. · The introduction of a zebra crossing opposite St Mary's Road adjacent to the green, and improvements to the bus stop layouts. · General minor improvements to existing bus stops along the route to improve accessibility. 	<p>Nicola Cross</p> <p>Will recommend that officers carry out further consultation with residents and the Police and that feedback will be provided by the next meeting.</p>
	<p>both directions approaching the zebra crossing were obscured and that its position was dangerous. Residents indicated to officers where it would be better to site the crossing – in the area of Parkside Gardens near to the playground and café – which would afford a better sightline. It was the consensus that traffic speeds had increased since the road humps had been taken out and that when officers were checking speed, they</p>	<p>Speed of vehicles in Church Hill Road</p> <p>To monitor the speed of vehicles before and after the implementation of the scheme, the Council organised speed surveys at four locations along Church Hill Road located near Parkside Gardens, St Mary's Road, Cedar Avenue, and little Grove.</p> <p>The survey at each location lasted for a week and were carried out in November 08 and May 09 (at the exception of the location near Cedar Avenue which was carried out last week).</p> <p>The result of the 85th percentile speed "before and after surveys"</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>Were very visible in their jackets, which prompted drivers to slow down. Residents were also angry as they alleged that the area was not patrolled by the Police.</p> <p>Several residents suggested that a 20 mph speed limit should be introduced in this area and although the Chairman had felt that these measures did not work, it was the understanding of one resident that that there were national proposals to introduce 20mph limits in some areas.</p>	<p>indicates that speeds along Church Hill Road ranged on average between 29mph and 37mph with the higher values being reached very early morning and the lower values during the daytime. The 85th percentile is the speed at which 85 percent of vehicles are travelling at or below and is a nationally used benchmark used to assess what design parameters or traffic control measures might be considered. There was not a major change in speed during the day, which averaged changes of ± 1 mph, however there was slight increase in the westbound direction at Cedar Avenue of 2.5mph. Note that out of the 6500 vehicles travelling in each direction the number of vehicles exceeding 41mph has increased from 45 to 65 at Parkside Garden , from 7 to 18 at St Mary's and has not changed near Little Grove. A high increase was noted at Cedar Avenue, where the increase was from 83 to 156.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
		<p>The above results suggest that whilst the removal of the humps has not led to an overall increase in speed throughout the day, the number of vehicles travelling faster than 41mph at night has increased in some locations.</p> <p>30 mph signage In light of the survey result presented above, council officers are recommending the introduction of vehicle activated signs to address the ongoing issues observed during the day and the slight increase observed at night. Once approved, the signs will be introduced as quickly as possible.</p> <p>The new zebra crossing The point of visibility of the zebra crossing on the southbound approach has been noted. An assessment of this issue made at the design stage concluded, that the position of the buildout in relation to the alignment of the parking bays, together with the warning pedestrian sign erected on the approach were sufficient. A final safety assessment of the site has just been carried out and once the findings are presented, the issue will once more be reviewed for completeness.</p> <p>The accident that happened on the morning of Wednesday 3 June</p>	
		<p>The information gathered regarding this accident indicates that the driver who caused it, had failed to follow the curvature of the road. Whilst not confirmed, the early report suggests that the driver who was coming back from a night shift had lost concentration and failed to notice the slight change in direction of the road hitting a stationary vehicle with full force and pushing it onto the footway.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
		<p>At the meeting</p> <p>In response to residents' allegations that this area was not patrolled by the Police, the officer present at the meeting confirmed that there were regular patrols and regular monitoring. He said that he personally has flagged up the issue of speeding but that the Police could not patrol this area all the time. He said that residents did not like the road humps but that speed cameras could not be installed until certain criteria had been met and this was that a fatality had occurred. In respect of prosecutions he advised that the Police concentrate on speeding offences as it was easier to prosecute these cases. He outlined why. He referred to the measures take in respect of mini moto and quad bikes and the success in addressing speeding of these vehicles,. He confirmed that Church Hill Road was a hot spot and was therefore regularly monitored and he also had concerns that the removal of the traffic calming measures had not been followed up with alternative provision.</p>	
13	<p>Mr Howard</p> <p>1. Has the Council started work on the New Barnet Town Centre strategy and when will the public be consulted?</p> <p>2. What is the time table for the strategy?</p>	<p>Martin Cowie (written)</p> <p>Yes, work began on the strategy in April this year.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>3. Will it have regard to the comments of CABE (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment) in their ASDA and Tesco responses and will the Council be consulting local community groups as part of the preliminary study?</p> <p>4. How long will the preliminary study take?</p> <p>5. Will it have regard to the new retail strategy for the Borough?</p> <p>6. When will the draft report be published and will it be subject to public consultation before adoption?</p> <p>7. Will it be in time to influence the imminent planning application from Tesco for their Victoria Road site?.</p>	<p>Initial stakeholder engagement in relation to the scoping of the strategy has recently taken place. Key local amenity groups and representatives and landowners have been approached to seek views on some of the issues, opportunities and objectives of the study.</p> <p>The Council will adopt a strategy for the town centre by the end of the year.</p> <p>It was intended that a draft report will be ready for consultation with the community in September. It will be subject to public consultation prior to adoption.</p> <p>The emerging strategy will inform consideration of major planning applications in the local area.</p> <p>At the Meeting Martin Cowie said that the Council would consider any planning application made by Tesco and were encouraging them to engage with the Council to develop a strategy which would be in place before any major scheme came forward. The Council were committed to producing a preliminary study by the end of the year, subject to community involvement. The submission of any Tesco application prior to the strategy coming into being would be premature. There was clear policy guidance to ensure the right decisions were made. A boroughwide survey was nearly complete and a report would be released as part of the Local Development Framework to formulate a strategy for retail across the borough.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
		In response to Mr Howard's concerns that the large supermarkets were likely to 'muscle in' on the empty shops now existing in town centres as there was no strategy in place, Martin Cowie re-affirmed that the Council had a robust UDP, Local Plan and the Mayor's London Plan for guidance. He referred to the Asda planning application and the fact that the retail impact assessment put forward by that company was not robust. He outlined his reasons for this view.	
14	<p>Mr Howard</p> <p>1. When will the public be consulted over the New Barnet Town Centre Strategy?</p> <p>2. What is the time table for the strategy?</p>	<p>Martin Cowie (written)</p> <p>Officers aim to go out to consultation on the Draft Town Centre Framework and Options in late summer/early autumn</p> <p>The Council aimed to have the Town Centre framework adopted before the end of 2009.</p>	
	<p>3. Will it have regard to the comments of CABA (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment) in their ASDA and Tesco responses?</p> <p>4. Will it have regard to the new retail strategy for the Borough?.</p>	<p>The strategy will consider all relevant information submitted in relation to major planning applications in the locality. The views of key organisations such as CABA and the GLA are important to ensure the approach adopted is comprehensive and deliverable.</p> <p>All the town centre strategies being prepared over the course of the next year will have regard to the strategic retail policies being formulated as part of the Local Development Framework</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
15	<p>Mr Howard</p> <p>The Police have informed us that there have been changes in the Road Traffic Acts whereby the whole of the Metropolitan Police area has been designated a Civil enforcement Area thereby handing over enforcement to the Local Authorities.</p> <p>Most Local Authorities have accepted responsibility for enforcing the Road Traffic Acts where appropriate. We understand that Barnet has not accepted the responsibilities. Will the Council please advise us who is the enforcing body for such responsibilities in Barnet?</p>	<p>Nick Bell (written)</p> <p>The London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act 2003 created a new power which allows London Boroughs and Transport for London to take on responsibility for enforcing minor traffic offences involving drivers disobeying certain traffic signs. Examples include yellow junction boxes, banned turns and one-way streets. If the powers are adopted, responsibility for enforcement is removed from the police. In addition, enforcement under the new arrangements can only be carried out by CCTV.</p> <p>The Council has considered the new powers, but as adopting them would remove the powers from the Police and the borough is only partly covered by CCTV, it was felt that leaving the powers with the Police would be appropriate for the time being.</p> <p>Due to a misunderstanding, the Metropolitan Police recently advised officers that enforcement should be stopped across the whole of the Greater London area (excluding the City). Following legal advice, the police have subsequently changed this advice and are continuing to enforce in those boroughs, including Barnet, where they remain the enforcement authority.</p>	<p>Nick Bell</p> <p>The Metropolitan Police remain the enforcement authority for moving traffic offences on roads in Barnet, with the exception of the A1, A41 and A406 which are roads managed by Transport for London (TfL). On these roads, TfL are the enforcement authority. Further discussion is taking place between the Council and the Police to clarify the situation in relation to the borough roads.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
16	<p>Mr Dix</p> <p>Given that the council has yet again failed to meet its corporate performance objective to “stimulate high quality democratic engagement”, under the heading “More Choice Better Value”, what steps are the Council going to take to address this shortfall. In particular, how does the Council intend to improve the quality of democratic engagement with the residents of New Barnet?</p> <p>At the meeting, Mr Dix gave various examples of how the Council was failing to engage the public, in particular the lack of publicity for the Leader Listens events and that the website for these meetings had not been updated since December 08</p> <p>In response to Councillor Salinger’s explanation of the remit of the Leader Listens events, he said that these did not address the issue of engagement. He also referred to the Civic Network and that this had last been updated in August 2008. Mr Dix said that the written response was dismissive and that the Council could not engage properly, particularly with the elderly population who had no access to the internet.</p>	<p>David Seabrooke (written)</p> <p>The Council has performance indicators for this as follows:</p> <p>Percentage of people who feel that they can influence decisions in their area (National Indicator 4) 2007/08 - 36% 2008/09 - 37.5% (2008/98 target – 38%)</p> <p>Percentage increase in resident satisfaction with opportunities for democratic engagement (Local indicator) 2007/08 - 26% 2008/09 – 29% (2008/09 target was 35%)</p> <p>Both indicators show improvement from 2007/08 levels to 2008/09, but have fallen short of the Council’s ambitious targets. Comparative data from 150 authorities in England is available and this indicates that Barnet’s score is exceeded by 26 other councils (of which 7 are London Boroughs). The maximum English score is a satisfaction rate of 56% (Coventry MBC) or 47% in London (achieved by LB Lewisham).</p> <p>The Council is running the Leader Listens scheme in which the Council visits a selection of local areas at a venue which affords people easy access, which answers residents’ questions and takes away specific action points. The Council also operates the Civic Network, which is an opportunity for all community representatives to come together and engage with each other and the Council. The Council has invested in taking part in social networking websites and have set up</p>	<p>David Seabrooke</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To update on the lack of publicity for the Leader Listens events and the Civic Network, including the out of date information on the website. Feedback on how information is communicated in respect of Forums and Leader Listens. <p>Chris Palmer</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> An update also on how the Council engages with those members of the public with no access to the internet. Feedback on the concern raised by a resident about the requirement to divulge personal information as part of her being invited to consult with the Council.

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>Mr Howard highlighted the difficulties in finding out what is happening without having access to computers and that the Council was whittling away residents' rights to have their say for instance, by restricting the time a person can speak at Planning meetings to 3 minutes.</p> <p>It was Mr Massey's view that events boroughwide were not unified and that Barnet, being a collection of disparate small towns was not reflected in the way the Council was being run.</p> <p>On a related issue, a resident complained that she had been invited to participate in a consultation exercise by the Leader of the Council, but had been subjected to a 'third degree' grilling about her personal details. She did not respond</p>	<p>whereilive.org as a way to capture and respond to local people's thoughts about living in Barnet.</p> <p>Details of Councillors and the surgery sessions are published to households in Barnet First magazine and on-line. There are three residents' forums, Area Environment sub-committees and Planning sub-committees. There are set procedures for local residents to speak at area planning meetings and many others.</p> <p>In relation to major planning applications, the Council consults residents on in developing the strategic plan for each locality and on individual planning applications when they arise.</p> <p>At the meeting Councillor Salinger answered questions in regard to the Leader Listens events and said that these were by invitation only to those residents within the Ward the Leader was visiting or to people within the particular remit of an event, e.g. a Faith meeting.</p> <p>Officers undertook to investigate this claim and ventured to suggest that this form might have emanated from a quango employed by the Council.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
17	<p>Mrs Helen Massey</p> <p>Residents met officers on 24.2.09 to discuss their concerns about the conservation areas in High Barnet. The turnaround of the 34 bus at High Barnet church was seen as a stumbling block to improving that junction and Mr Finney advised that he would ask Highways to explore with TfL the options for turning the bus at the hospital or at the Arkley Hotel. Has there been any contact?</p> <p>At the meeting Mrs Massey said she felt that the response was not helpful and she asked that this issue be revisited by officers.</p>	<p>Nick Bell (written)</p> <p>Several options for altering the junction have been put forward, but most of them require the banning of certain traffic movements which would displace traffic onto other roads. From a traffic perspective, taking the 34 bus up to the Arkley Hotel or to the hospital would add to congestion on Wood Street and would only be justified if there were a demand for this service from passengers. Various discussions have taken place with London Buses who are also currently considering diverting the 307 bus route from the Arkley Hotel to the hospital. There is limited stand space at the hospital and it could not accommodate both the 307 and 34. The 307 would be the preferred route to serve the hospital given the link this service provides to Enfield.</p>	<p>Nick Bell</p> <p>The concerns expressed by Mrs Massey have been noted, but as explained in the response to the forum, options for changes at the junction are not without problems. The response given to the forum demonstrates that we consider the needs of the community, not just the technical aspects, in that the potential impact on residents as a result of making changes is one of the key issues highlighted. The Council is not indifferent to the ideas put forward by residents - the suggestions made have been explored, and it is because of the work we have done in looking at them that the potential problems have been identified. Whilst we welcome comments and suggestions from the public, the Council does need to consider the needs of all residents and road users and can only proceed with proposals where there are clear benefits and no unacceptable adverse impacts. Mrs Massey has written a more detailed request following the meeting and a response to this will be sent to her directly.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
	<p>Mr Massey outlined the historic reasons for the through traffic at High Barnet and said that Highways only looked at the engineering aspects and not taking the community into account. He said that there was Council and TfL indifference to the ideas put forward to solve the problems particularly with the issues surrounding the No. 34 bus.</p>	<p>In terms of the Barnet church junction, the 34 bus route is only part of the issue. Although the 34 is the only bus route which is scheduled to terminate at the church, various other routes also use the turnback facility to address problems with late running buses and the facility is also used for rail replacement buses. The only alternative route for these buses to turn round would involve residential roads and/or Stapylton Road. This is unlikely to be acceptable to residents, the Council or to London Buses.</p>	
18	<p>Mr Gordon Massey</p> <p>Would the Council advise when the long promised review of the CPZ in High Barnet will take place?</p> <p>At the meeting Mr Massey said that the issue of parking in the whole of High Barnet should be taking into account, not just within the area of the CPZ boundary.</p>	<p>Gavin Woolery-Allen (written)</p> <p>The Council has the Chipping Barnet CPZ Review programmed for the end of June 2009. This will initially entail a questionnaire being delivered to all properties within the CPZ's boundary, with general questions asked about parking and the CPZ to determine the community's satisfaction with the CPZ and how it works for them. After the closing date for the return of the questionnaires (3 weeks after delivery) the Council will analyse the feedback with a view to highlighting and acting upon any issues which are significantly raised by the community.</p> <p>At the meeting</p> <p>In response to Mr Massey's concern about taking a holistic approach regarding parking in High Barnet, Councillor Perry said that the initial consultation was just the first step in respect of parking within the whole of that area.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
19	<p>Mr Gordon Massey</p> <p>I have twice asked Parking Control, by email, to confirm that the new arrangements for renewing parking permits mean that anyone renewing by telephone or internet prior to expiry of the old permit will effectively be paying twice for any period of overlap. Could I have a response please? Mr Massey welcomed the response given.</p>	<p>Florence Reece (written)</p> <p>Parking Control can confirm that when a new permit is purchased it starts from the next consecutive day from when the old permit runs out. This is set up on the computer system that is used for Parking Control.</p>	
20	<p>Mr John Gardiner</p> <p>Could we please have a progress report on the future of the Market, with particular reference to the work taking place on the original St Albans Road site</p>	<p>Peter Cridland (written)</p> <p>The Council are hopeful that the market can return to the St Albans Road site, which has had some work done on it, which could facilitate the return, but it will require Mrs Walsh's co-operation.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie/Peter Cridland</p> <p>To update residents on when the market would be returning to its permanent site.</p>
		<p>At the meeting</p> <p>Martin Cowie informed residents that Mrs Walsh was undertaking tarmacing the site and the Council was liaising with her about a move back. The situation was not ideal but the Council were trying to support Mrs Walsh by allowing her to use the Stapylton site for a little longer.</p> <p>In response to a question later at the meeting Martin Cowie confirmed that the Council would be seeking an alternative operator should plans with Mrs Walsh fail to develop.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
21	<p>Mr Howard</p> <p>The GLA planning Committee last week were told that the future of Brent Cross (and the other three locations) as a super hub was to be abandoned because neighbouring boroughs were opposed to them.</p> <p>The committee were told that plans are now being drawn up for smaller developments across several suburban towns. The GLA is moving away from four super hubs to a constellation of town centres, reinforcing existing patterns of economic activity.</p> <p>Is there a secret agenda to make New Barnet one of the constellations? If yes when will the public be consulted?</p>	<p>Martin Cowie at the meeting</p> <p>Informed residents that Brent Cross had been raised as a possible 'super hub', but that there had yet to be any consultation on this and other proposals. There would be a lot of opportunities in the future for residents to get involved in the consultation process.</p> <p>Martin Cowie said that New Barnet was recognised as a town centre in the UDP and has been designated in accordance with national guidance. He said that New Barnet would not be a growth hub but that in the future, there may need to be a reclassification as to what the Council currently classified as a Town Centre.</p> <p>Martin Cowie said that Barnet very much hoped to influence the direction of the New London Plan but that it would take two more years before its adoption.</p>	
	<p>Mr Hope asked when the Council would be reassessing its aspirations in respect of looking for steady growth in town centres.</p> <p>Mr Ashwood referred to the Dollis Valley Estate where regeneration had been instigated in 2003 and that six years later nothing had been done.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie said that it was part of the Local Plan to reassess how to deliver the question of development. He said that historically housing targets had never been achieved. It was also necessary to deliver quality schemes.</p> <p>Martin Cowie said that Dollis Valley was not being ignored and that this was part of an ambitious renewal programme across the borough. He said that there was an issue of capacity and that this estate was next on the list.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
22	<p>Mr Green</p> <p>The GLA's deputy major for planning has abandoned the 'four super hubs' project for Outer London in favour of a town centre improvement scheme for outer London focussing on, in his words, "a constellation of town centres, reinforcing existing patterns of economic activity". Bearing in mind Barnet Council's past record of encouraging supermarket development in New Barnet – despite the gross unsuitability of such developments to the area's existing Victorian road network and suburban character I am greatly concerned that the Council may continue to erroneously classify New Barnet as either a 'growth area' (cf. the Local</p>	<p>The response regarding super hubs has been responded to in 21 above.</p>	
	<p>Development Framework Core Strategy - 10.06.08) or a 'town centre' (cf. Vibrant & Viable Town Centres - 25.03.08). Given that New Barnet does not meet any of the criteria for a town centre – except for retail space provision (solely due to the fact that it contains a Sainsbury's supermarket) – can local residents have a categorical assurance from Barnet Council that it will not be mislabelled as a "town centre" in either the GLA's plans, or the council's (presumably soon-to-be) forthcoming Local Area Framework?</p>		

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
23	<p>Mr McKenzie</p> <p>Please could the Forum tell me when the ASDA Gas Works planning application will be decided.</p> <p>And whether the Council is currently in dialogue with Tesco over their supermarket plans for New Barnet?</p>	<p>Martin Cowie (written)</p> <p>The local planning authority is seeking to report the planning application to a Planning and Environment Committee in July. All residents who have written in wishing to speak at committee will be notified'.</p> <p>At the meeting</p> <p>Martin Cowie said that the date of the planning meeting was likely to be 1 July 2009.</p>	
24	<p>Mr Newton (late written question)</p> <p>In order to facilitate the redevelopment of Meadowside in Holden Road, a "temporary" 8 a.m. to 6.30 p.m. parking restriction/single yellow line was added (in the vicinity of lighting columns 24 and 25) to the existing similarly timed restriction on the north side of the Holden Road/Tillingham Way junction.</p>	<p>The original response to Mr Newton's enquiry was that the temporary restrictions were no longer required and that arrangements were being made for their removal.</p>	<p>Lynn Bishop</p> <p>Update requested on the removal of these restrictions</p>
	<p>The Meadowside development has been completed for around two years and I should be pleased to learn whether there is any reason why the "temporary" parking restriction has not been removed.</p>	<p>The original response to Mr Newton's enquiry was that the temporary restrictions were no longer required and that arrangements were being made for their removal.</p>	
25	<p>Mr Ashwood</p> <p>Referred to the previous action notes and said that in respect of Ravenscroft School he had researched information from the Land Registry and Herts County Council. He asked who locked up the gates that had been installed.</p>		<p>Lynn Bishop</p> <p>A response as to who locks up these gates.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Update (and by whom)
26	<p>Mr Howard</p> <p>Referred to the impending meeting in respect of the Asda application. He again reiterated that a venue large enough to accommodate the public should be used.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie</p> <p>Assured residents that the Council would be able to cater for a large public turnout.</p>	
27	<p>Mr Dix</p> <p>Referred to the issue of a traffic assessment in respect of the Asda application and was concerned about the approach the Council was taking.</p>	<p>Martin Cowie</p> <p>Mr Dix concerns were noted. Martin Cowie said that there were ongoing traffic assessments right up until the report was written. He said that sensitive documents could not be released prior to the report as this could give applicants the chance to appeal before the case was even made.</p>	
28	<p>Mrs Miller</p> <p>Referred to the response in the last action notes regarding a specific directorate for Leisure, Health and Fitness. She said that in the current climate of obesity etc there should be a person in charge who was an expert in the field of fitness and health and it should not be left to the contractor to manage.</p> <p>Mr Dix said that the Council had no clear strategy for leisure and that this was a disgrace. He said that the facilities in Barnet were the most expensive in the area and gave the poorest provision.</p>	<p>Jill Stansfield</p> <p>Informed residents that the Council had decided to use the skills and expertise from various areas including the Children and Young Peoples' Service, the PCT and other professionals. The issue of the management by Greenwich Leisure was a contract matter let through the Council's procurement procedures in the same way as any other contract. They were engaged for their business expertise.</p> <p>Jill Stansfield said that the policy had been set by Councillors upon the advice of staff with expertise within this field. Members make their own decisions on policies and that this was not within the remit of officers.</p>	
	DATES AND VENUES OF FUTURE MEETINGS	<p>28 July 2009</p> <p>2 September 2008</p> <p>15 October 2009</p>	<p>Chipping Barnet Library Stapylton Road, EN5 4QT</p> <p>Coppetts Wood School Coppetts Road, N10 1JS</p> <p>Danegrove School, Windsor Drive, EN4 8UD</p>

The meeting finished at 8.30 pm

Officers Present:

Jill Stansfield

Lead Officer

Martin Cowie

Nicola Cross

Executive Director for Communities

Head of Planning and Development Management
Environment

Metropolitan Police

Democratic Services

Pauline Bagley

Councillor Richard Cornelius was also in attendance.

**FORTHCOMING PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE
AND SUB-COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

(meetings usually start at 7.00pm)

AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE: - ALL TO BE HELD AT HENDON TOWN HALL,
THE BURROUGHS, NW4 4BG

Chipping Barnet

Democratic Services Contact: Pauline Bagley, Tel: 020 8359 2023

Hendon

Democratic Services Contact: Paul Frost, Tel: 020 8359 2205

Finchley and Golders Green

Democratic Services Contact: Nazyer Choudhury, Tel: 020 8359 2031

Forthcoming meetings:

Finchley & Golders Green

18 August 2009

Chipping Barnet

18 August 2009

Hendon

18 August 2009

Public requests to speak at Area Planning Sub-Committees on planning applications

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

Public requests to speak at Area Planning Sub-Committees on matters other than planning applications

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 Area Planning Sub-Committees

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

• **AREA ENVIRONMENT SUB-COMMITTEES:**

Hendon Town Hall, NW4 4BG

Chipping Barnet

Democratic Services Contact: Stephanie Chaikin, Tel: 020 8359 2019

Finchley & Golders Green

Democratic Services Contact: Nick Musgrove, Tel: 020 8359 2024

Hendon Democratic Services Contact: Jonathan Regal, Tel: 020 8359 2012

Forthcoming meetings:

Finchley & Golders Green

Chipping Barnet

Hendon

1 October 2009

1 October 2009

1 October 2009

Public requests to speak at Area Environment Sub-Committees

Written requests to speak on issues on the agenda must be received by the Democratic Services Manager by 10.00am on the 2nd working day before the day of the meeting.

Public requests to ask questions at Area Environment Sub-Committees

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

PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Hendon Town Hall, MW4 4BG

Democratic Services Contact: Maria Lugangira (tel: 020 8359 2761)

Public requests to speak at Planning & Environment Committee

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

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

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

Public requests to ask questions at Planning & Environment Committee

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

Forthcoming meetings:

29 July 2009, 26 August 2009