# FINCHLEY & GOLDERS GREEN RESIDENTS FORUM ACTION SHEET 26 OCTOBER 2009

held at Avenue House, 17 East End Road, Finchley NW3 3QE Forum Officers' Action Notes

\*Chairman: Councillor Dean Cohen Vice Chairman: Councillor Jazmin Naghar (\*denotes Councillor present)

	Subject	Response	Action
1	Litter bin outside the Unitarian Church, Hoop Lane		
(a)	Can the regularly overflowing litter bin be cleared on a weekly basis as the current emptying of this bin is rather haphazard?	The Council was aware of the problem from previous site inspections. The Town Centre Support Crew had been instructed to ensure that the litter bin and surrounding bench area were serviced as required. The Support Crew's daily route ensures that this location can be inspected on a daily basis.	No further update required.
(b)	Can the Council continue to inspect the litter bin on a daily basis?	The Support Crew will continue to monitor the location.	There have been no further problems at this location, and regular monitoring continues. (Dave Ward, Street Cleansing and Ancillary Services Manager, 020 8359 5137)
2	East Finchley Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)		
(a)	Residents were unhappy with the parking proposals because it affected traders in the high street and customers coming to visit the area because they had to keep putting tickets on their cars. What will the Council do to address these concerns?	Following the review of the East Finchley CPZ and the advisory letter to residents regarding the outcome of the review and proposed actions, the Council had received a significant number of responses expressing concern with our conclusions. Depending on the origin of the correspondence, the concerns were varied but the Council need to ensure that its conclusions and intentions do meet the needs of the local community.	In response to all subjects raised relating to the East Finchley CPZ proposals:-  Further investigation in to the concerns and issues raised has been undertaken, and as part of this process the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport have met with a broad range of representatives of the East Finchley community.

	Subject	Response	Action
		Therefore, further analysis of the received representations would take place and the Council's original conclusions revisited before making a decision or not.	As a result it has been decided that we will no longer be pursuing the original proposals for changes in the area regarding the hours of operation, or creating new zone boundaries.  Additionally it does not envisage proposing any other suggested changes to the hours of operation that have
(b)	It is my understanding that the first consultation only had 600 people responding which is only one in six residents. Does the parking design team feel this is representative	Following the review of the CPZ, a total of 689 questionnaires (representing a 17.2% response rate) were received expressing the views and concerns of residents and traders about the CPZ.	been suggested as a result of this review.  As previously mentioned, the Council are keen to engage with the community to determine the best outcome and we are grateful for the valuable comments that have been received in various
(c)	of the area? What is their response?  Do they think this gives enough evidence to make the suggested changes,	Analysis of the questionnaires returned from the community showed that although various	formats as part of this process.  See response above.
	and why? Why is there not going be further consultation and a more in depth analysis? We fully understand as residents and traders our apathy in not responding to this survey has got us into this position, but its does not mean that now residents and traders are showing they are against the proposal we should be ignored. We would like the statutory consultation put on hold, we would like a public meeting where residents and traders can voice their concerns and we would like some direct input on what changes are implemented if any are deemed necessary. Can this happen?	differing comments were received relating to the CPZ and its operation, certain issues were highlighted when the responses were broken down in certain areas of the CPZ. For example, while the Council's letter of 21 August 2009 advised that 30.5% of respondents of the one-hour CPZ had parking problems – this is a figure which represents the whole of the one-hour CPZ, which covers a wide area. In fact, when focussed on the area we referred to as Area B which is in close proximity to the Underground station and High Road, 44.8% of respondents advised that they had parking problems. The nature of the responses led the Council to believe that there were certain parking pressures being encountered by residents and led to the decision to propose changes to the hours of the CPZ.	

	Subject	Response	Action
		Following the review of the East Finchley CPZ and the advisory letter to residents regarding the outcome of the review and proposed actions, the Council had received a significant number of responses expressing concern with its conclusions. The concerns were varied, and the Council were currently considering the best way forward given the number and nature of the responses.	
		Meetings such as the Residents Forum help to gauge the feelings of the community, and would inform the work the Council currently undertaking to ensure that our conclusions and intentions meet the needs of the local community. Until the additional analysis work was completed, the Council would not proceed with the statutory consultation. The Council was keen to engage with the community to determine the best outcome for the community.	
(d)	Why does the Council wish to change the sensible current CPZ?	The Council decided to undertake a rolling review of its CPZs in 2005. Also there had been some requests from residents through petitions to change parts of the CPZ.	No further update required.
(e)	Residents were concerned that the CPZ:  * harmed local businesses;  * questionnaire did not give a mandate for the Council to go-ahead with the proposals;  * was a Council moneymaking exercise ('the hidden agenda');  * lacked clarity in what the proposals were trying to achieve;	The Council's Acting Highways Manager noted these concerns and would ensure that the Council takes into account the needs of the local community when deciding how to move forward.	No further update required.

	Subject	Response	Action
	<ul> <li>questionnaire had leading questions that would had led to a yes answer;</li> <li>only parking problem was near the Phoenix Cinema;</li> <li>did not help the disabled who would be considerably financially worse off; and</li> <li>did not give easier parking without restrictions.</li> </ul>		
(f)	Can Cherry Tree Road return to a 2-3pm restriction rather than an all day restriction?	The Council's Acting Highways Manager to respond.	Following further analysis of the East Finchley CPZ proposals and the subsequent views expressed by the community the Council do not envisage making any changes to the hours of operation of the CPZ.
(g)	Would the Council take account of the petitions it received before making a decision?	The Council's Acting Highways Manager answered that the Council would take into account all representations including those raised at the Residents Forum and petitions before it put forward proposals for statutory consultation.	No further update required.
(h)	Can the Council confirm that trials would not be introduced for the CPZ?	The Council's Acting Highways Manager stated that the Council had no intention to trial any CPZ.	No further update required.
(i)	Can the Council confirm that all residents and businesses received the questionnaires?	The Council's Acting Highways Manager apologised to those residents who considered they had not received the hand- delivered questionnaire and would check our records to see if there is evidence of area(s) being omitted from the review exercise. The Council would investigate the complaint.	No further update required. (Neil Richardson, Acting Highways Manager, 020 8359 7525)

	Subject	Response	Action
3	Parking at the redeveloped Finchley Memorial Hospital		
(a)	How many car parking spaces are proposed for the redeveloped site?	216 parking spaces have been provided on-site for the proposed Finchley Memorial Hospital redevelopment.	No further update required.
(b)	Was the Greater London Assembly (GLA) or Transport for London (TfL) limiting the amount of parking spaces?	The Council are awaiting formal comments from the GLA and TfL.	No further update required.
(c)	Had a response been received from the GLA or TfL to the consultation?	There has been no formal response from the GLA or TfL.	There has been an initial Officer's response from TfL but the Council are awaiting a formal response. The GLA has still not responded.
(d)	Can parking spaces be provided in the green area at the north of the site?	The Head of Planning and Development Management to respond.	The planning application is currently being considered and proposes 216 of spaces on the site. The land to the north will be used as open space and as a local amenity.  (Martin Cowie, Head of Planning and Development Management, 020 8359 4514)
(e)	How many spaces were provided to disabled? Does this conform to the amount required by the UDP?	The Acting Director of Environment and Operations to respond.	Traffic and Development are currently carrying out a detailed analysis of the planning application that has been submitted for Finchley Memorial Hospital. Once this
(f)	How many spaces were allocated to the 412 staff? Was staff parking included in the 216 spaces?	The Acting Director of Environment and Operations to respond.	analysis is complete, highway comments and recommendation will be sent to the Planning Department as part of their formal consultation
(g)	The current on-site parking is free with no impact on local residents. Can the Council confirm whether NHS Barnet would continue to not charge for these spaces?	The Acting Director of Environment and Operations to respond.	process. At this stage, Traffic and Development are unable to prejudge the outcome of the analysis but can provide the following points of fact:  e) A total of 216 parking spaces are proposed as part of the application with 8% of these spaces designated for disabled use. f) Further clarification is being sort from the applicant on the issue of staff parking.

	Subject	Response	Action
			g) Existing on-site parking is free and the current proposal does not include parking charges. (Lisa Wright, Principal Engineer, 020 8359 3049)
4	Brent Cross redevelopment		
(a)	How many car parking spaces are proposed for the redeveloped site?	The proposed parking for the redevelopment was set out on pages 248-250 in the 20 October committee report. In summary there were some 11,700 non-residential parking spaces proposed, including the existing permitted 7,600 spaces at the shopping centre which would not be increased.  All parking would be provided in accordance with the policies in the Barnet UDP or the London Plan, with caps applied to certain land uses and sites, such as the proposed employment and residential development and the Tesco site. The full details were:	No further update required. (Mervyn Bartlett, Transport & Regeneration Manager, 020 8359 3052)

Use	Standard
Residential	PDP and up to 2,000 units capped ratio 1.0
	2,000 – 4,000 capped ratio 0.95
	4,000 - 5,000 capped ratio 0.8
	5,000 - 7,500 capped ratio 0.7
Retailing and related uses and Leisure	7,600 spaces (No additional parking
within Brent Cross East zone	applied for)
Other Retail and related uses	1 space per 75 – 50sq.m
Other Leisure	1 space per 22sq.m
Employment (B1 – B8)	1 space per 300sq.m (Cap at 1,000
	spaces)
Hotel	1 space per 2 bedrooms, plus 1 space per
	5 seats for conference facilities
Community Facilities	1 space per 3-5 staff
Private Hospital	1 space per 2-4 beds
New and Existing Mainline Station	Parking only for disabled passengers and
	staff, and pick up and set down
Rail Freight Facility	120 car parking and 40 HGV spaces
Other Uses	In accordance with the London Plan

	Subject	Response	Action
(b)	What steps are the Council taking to prepare a more sustainable, viable and socially acceptable scheme for the Brent Cross Area? Having regard to the fact that: i) Transport for London does not accept the transport proposals and had not signed off the Heads of Agreement; ii) The North London Waste Authority had no definite proposals for the Geron Road site; and iii) The Leader of the Council does not consider the proposed development to be viable for a number of years.	The Planning and Environment Committee report published on 6 October 2009 sets out the latest position in relation to the Brent Cross Cricklewood planning application. Consideration of the application was deferred on 20 October to a special Planning and Environment committee meeting to be held on 18/19 November.	The planning application was approved at the special Planning and Environment Committee on 19 November subject to there being no direction by the Mayor of London or call-in from the Secretary of State and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement.
(c)	Residents were concern about:  * a waste incinerator provided that the North London Waste Authority may not require;  * the Council's possible conflict of interest as it was a major landowner in the area;  * the Council's ability to determine such a large application following the chaos caused at the previous rescheduled meetings;  * transport links in the surrounding area; and  * the developers may pull out of the redevelopment following stage 1 that comprises the commercial aspect of the redevelopment.	The Head of Planning and Development Management responded that most of these concerns were answered in the committee report to the Planning and Environment Committee on 20 October.	No further update required. (Martin Cowie, Head of Planning and Development Management, 020 8359 4514)

	Subject	Response	Action
5	Street drinking ban in Cricklewood	•	
(a)	A ban on street drinking could be introduced in Cricklewood as there are huge problems with street drinkers. Councillor Monroe Palmer had initially requested a Barnet-wide ban on street drinking, but this was rejected by Committee.	The proposal for an area-limited alcohol free zone in Cricklewood has been discussed and the police are currently putting together an evidence-base to highlight the need and clearly delineate the area to be covered.	No further update required.
	Residents want to know: i) how will the street drinking ban be implemented and the timetable for doing so? ii) will notices go up saying it is an Alcohol Free Zone?  The Police want a ban as it gives them the power to move street drinkers on.	The evidenced proposal is scheduled to be completed in the next 2-3 weeks and will then be considered under the established governance and decision-making procedures of the partnership (if approved this will take no less than 12 weeks from the time of the finalised proposal having been submitted).  It is a statutory requirement that notices are displayed clearly showing the extent of the zone.	
(b)	Can residents be involved in the process?	The Council's Community Protection Group Manager to respond.	The process involves a four week notice period whereby all licensed premises and residents affected by any proposal would have the opportunity to comment. Representations received would then need to be considered by the Council.
(c)	Can Kara Way be included in the no drinking zone?	The Council's Community Protection Group Manager to respond.	The extent of the zone will be dependent on a number of factors. For example, where the evidence tells us disorder and nuisance are occurring and any considerations of displacement.  (Paul Lamb, Community Protection Group Manager, 020 8359 7491)

	Subject	Response	Action
6	What are the current and future plans for the building of social housing, especially for families, in the Borough?	In 2008/9, there were 424 affordable housing completions within the Borough of Barnet, 286 of these were rented homes. In 2009/10, it is expected that 308 affordable housing completions will be delivered, 162 will be rented. A further 839 in 2010/11 (rented 498), 783 (605 rented) in 2011/12 and 447 in 2012/13 of which 303 will be rented. In total the Council plans are to deliver 2377 affordable homes of which 1568 will be social rented homes for the period 2009-13. Over 75% of the social rented homes will be family homes of 2 or more bedrooms.  Registered Social Landlords have secured £117.6 million of investment from the newly formed Homes and Communities Agency for affordable housing in Barnet for the period 2008-11.	No further update required. (Nicola Bird, Regeneration and Development Manager, 020 8359 4862)
7	Can the Council treat and/or water the dying Ginkgo tree outside Tesco in Ballards Lane, Finchley N3?	The issue will be investigated by the Council's Aboricultural Services team and a response given in the follow-up action sheet.	The Ginkgo tree outside Tesco was inspected and found that it was not dead. The Council will reassess its vitality in the Spring.  (Andy Tipping, Principal Arboricultural Officer, 020 8359 7838)
8	Can the pedestrian route from the bus stop on Tilling Road to Claremont Road be sign posted?	The Council's Acting Highways Manager to investigate.	The location has been reviewed and I am please to say that improved signage has been identified and is currently being introduced. (Neil Richardson, Acting Highways Manager, 020 8359 7525)
9	Can the Council ensure that Montclare, the owners of the Hendon Football Club site, clear the site?	The Head of Planning and Development Management responded that the Council expected Montclare to clear and board up the site.	The squatters have now been cleared from the site and the site has been hoarded and made secure. There does not appear to have been any return by the squatters since completion of the hoarding on 13 November.  (Philip Stanbridge, Principal Valuer, 020 8359 7349)

	Subject	Response	Action
10	Who can impose fines on individuals littering?	Prosecutions may be undertaken by the police or by local authorities. Private individuals can also prosecute. Cases are heard in the local Magistrate's Court, who have the power to impose fines in the event of a guilty plea or finding. As an alternative to taking those who litter to Court, a local authority can appoint officers to issue fixed penalty notice fines to people they catch dropping litter.	No further update required. (Paul Lamb, Community Protection Group Manager, 020 8359 7491)
11	Street notices  Can the Council erect street notices like in other London Boroughs stating fines for littering and dogfouling? Can Council street officers impose these fines on individuals?	The Council work with the police dealing with anti-social behaviour such as grafitti, litter, dog fouling and fly-tipping.	Signs both fixed and temporary can be and have been erected where problems exist.  See response to issue 10 regarding fixed penalty notices. (Paul Lamb, Community Protection Group Manager, 020 8359 7491)
12	Presentation at next Residents Forum – Core Strategy (Direction of Travel)	The Council were holding a 6-week consultation from 5 November to 17 December 2009.	Noted.
13	Draft of the North London Waste Plan (NLWP) was being consulted upon from 14 October to 26 November.	Views were sought on draft waste plan.	Noted.

The forum, which had started at 6.30pm, finished at 8:15pm

# **Officers Present:**

Jeff Lustig – Director of Corporate Governance Jonathan Tunde-Wright – LEAN Project Lead Neil Richardson – Acting Highways Manager Jonathan Regal – Democratic Services Officer Victoria Blyth – Community Engagement Officer

Date of next meeting: 23 November 2009 at St Michael's Church Hall, The Riding, off Golders Green Road, London NW11

# PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE AND SUB-COMMITTEE MEETINGS (meetings usually start at 7.00pm)

# **PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

Hendon Town Hall, The Burroughs, London, NW4 4BG

Democratic Services Contact: Maria Lugangira, 020 8359 2761 or email

maria.lugangira@barnet.gov.uk

Date: 9 December 2009

# 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 2<sup>nd</sup> working day before the day of the meeting.

<u>Public requests to speak at Planning & Environment Committee on matters other than planning matters</u> Written requests to speak on matters other than planning applications must be received by the Democratic Services Manager by 10.00am on the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 7<sup>th</sup> working day before the day of the meeting.

# AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Finchley & Golders Green - Hendon Town Hall, The Burroughs, London, NW4 4BG

Democratic Services Contact: Stephanie Chaikin - 020 8359 2019 or email

stephanie.chaikin@barnet.gov.uk

Date: 2 December 2009

Hendon – Hendon Town Hall, The Burroughs, London, NW4 4BG

Democratic Services Contact: Paul Frost - 020 8359 2025 or email paul.frost@barnet.gov.uk

Date: 2 December 2009

# Chipping Barnet – Hendon Town Hall, The Burroughs, London, NW4 4BG

Democratic Services Contact: Pauline Bagley - 020 8359 2023 or email pauline.bagley@barnet.gov.uk

Date: 2 December 2009

# AREA ENVIRONMENT SUB-COMMITTEE

Chipping Barnet – Hendon Town Hall, The Burroughs, London, NW4 4BG Democratic Services Contact: Stephanie Chaikin – 020 8359 2019 or email

stephanie.chaikin@barnet.gov.uk

Date: 24 February 2010

# Finchley & Golders Green - Hendon Town Hall, The Burroughs, London, NW4 4BG

Democratic Services Contact: Nick Musgrove - 020 8359 2024 or email nick.musgrove@barnet.gov.uk

Date: 30 November 2009

Hendon – Hendon Town Hall, The Burroughs, London, NW4 4BG

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

Date: 24 February 2010