

FINCHLEY & GOLDERS GREEN RESIDENTS FORUM
6 January 2010 (Cancelled Forum) and 27 January 2010 (Rescheduled Forum)
ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED AT THE FORUM MEETING

	Issue Raised	Response
1	<p>"More than 200 residents have signed a petition to date against the FOCTWP plans for the Pavilion for in Cherry Tree Woods, N2.</p> <p>At the previous Residents Forum (23.11.09), our Principle GreenSpace Manager, Ms Warren, stated that in the absence of another viable scheme she would prefer accept the FOCTWP proposal rather than remove the pavilion to make way for green space.</p> <p>Given this is her preference, would Barnet Council work with the community towards developing another viable scheme for the pavilion that is more fitting with metropolitan open land and that keeps the original character of the building, specifically a conservation or wildlife education building (similar to the facility in Highgate Woods)? This would provide an amenity that fits with the open space thus adhering to Barnet's Unitary Development Plan 2006, Chapter 5, s. 5.3.10."</p> <p>Dr Linton</p>	<p>At the Residents Forum referred to it was advised that Cherry Tree Wood Pavilion has and continues to be marketed on the Council's website, with enquiries received on a weekly basis. Please see the following link: http://www.barnet.gov.uk/commercial-property. Consideration would be given to a viable scheme that is put before the Council. However the Council has no funds or resources to contribute to any scheme which needs to be self financing. Regarding the use of the pavilion building it would require an estimated £150k plus to repair/refurbish and subsequently any viable scheme would need to take this into consideration.</p> <p>Reinstating the pavilion back as changing rooms would not cover the outlay costs within the life of the building, with an expected income of just £2,400 per season. Other issues would include the disruption to local residents due to parking by 30 football players and officials on a Saturday and Sunday.</p> <p>A conservation or wildlife education building similar to Highgate Wood would face greater issues with self-financing as it would require staff to man the centre on an on-going basis. Such a centre would have little demand in Cherry Tree Wood which is under 5 ha. compared with Highgate Wood with some 28 ha and which contains much more facilities, including a very popular cafe.</p> <p>The pavilion is being marketed for re-development and the Council welcomes any business proposals for consideration. The Council is not marketing the building as a joint venture, but will consider and support comprehensive business</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		proposals that are fitting for the wood.
		<p>Facilities in parks such as café's can make a significant contribution to the appeal of the park for all users, often creating focal points and promoting positive community use of a park, safeguarding it's role as an important asset in the community for the future.</p> <p>(Jenny Warren, Greenspaces Service Manager, 020 8359 7803)</p>
2	<p>Cycling issues</p> <p>(a) With rising obesity levels placing an increasingly expensive burden on the NHS, levels of CO2 in the atmosphere threatening to cause a global catastrophe and increasing levels of congestion on our roads making it necessary to spend millions on road improvements – why is the Council still doing almost nothing to encourage cycling in the Borough? Specifically the Council appears to have no intention of spending its cycle facilities budget this financial year. So far this financial year no more than about 16 cycle stands have been or are planned to be installed.</p> <p>(b) When areas like North Finchley are considered for additional cycle stands no comprehensive scheme is put in place. Why is this?</p>	<p>The budget for installation of cycle stands is a small part of the support given to cycling in the Borough. In 2009/10 this includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Cycle training (including audits of routes to schools) – £114.5k; ❖ Cycle route improvements Waterfall Walk – £115k; and ❖ Provision of cycle stands – £10k. <p>It is anticipated that the £10k budget for cycle parking will be fully spent this financial year. This is expected to allow installation of about 40 stands. To date locations have been identified for 25 of these, with investigations ongoing for the others.</p> <p>We know that some cyclists would like to see provision of formal cycle parking stands at regular intervals throughout town centres. However providing formal cycle parking conveniently close to all potential destinations for cyclists would have a considerable impact on the town centre environment and especially on pedestrian movement.</p> <p>Cyclists who cannot find a convenient cycle stand tend to</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>(c) When road improvements are carried out, on for example the A1000, the safety and convenience of cyclists and pedestrians take second place. Why is this? (John Silvertown)</p>	<p>park informally, using other street furniture to secure their cycles, for short visits. Where this happens a lot it can be an inconvenience to pedestrians and formal cycle parking, planned to minimise this impact, will be desirable. However, where the demand for cycle parking is not great, this type of occasional informal parking can provide a flexible solution that has a lower impact than the widespread provision of cycle stands.</p> <p>In general we try to reduce street furniture clutter when carrying out footway improvement schemes, and sometimes this leaves little scope for informal cycle parking. We are now carrying out reviews of cycle parking in parallel with these improvements. In addition other areas are highlighted from time to time. North Finchley was separately highlighted as an area that could benefit from increased provision and a review identified some locations where space and other considerations would permit provision of additional stands. The resident commented on some of these locations on behalf of Barnet Cyclists, and suggested other locations. Currently stands are planned for installation at some of the proposed locations in North Finchley and other suggested locations will be considered towards the end of the year if other demands on the budget permit.</p> <p>Without specific examples it is difficult to comment, however the A1000 is a strategic route through the borough for different types of transport, as well as serving a number of the borough's town centres. As such the Council has to balance the needs of a wide range of road users. The safety and convenience of cyclists and pedestrians is taken into account when developing improvements, but on a road such as the A1000 maintaining general traffic movement must also be afforded a high priority. (Jane Shipman, Senior Engineer (Environment and</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		Operations), 020 8359 3056)
<p>3</p> <p>Salting the Borough's roads</p> <p>(a) How much does Barnet Council pay for its salt for spreading on roads? (see http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/opensecrets/2009/12/the_price_of_salt.html)</p> <p>(b) How many grit bins are there in the Finchley and Golders Green area? When were these locations last reviewed?</p> <p>(c) How frequently over the recent snowfall were the bins checked and replenished in the Finchley and Golders Green area?</p> <p>(d) How much salt did the Council place in grit bins / was available for use by the public, or at other locations for public use in the Finchley and Golders Green area? <i>(Daniel Hope)</i></p>		<p>£28 + Vat per tonne for buying salt</p> <p>There are approx 320 grit bins in the borough (101 of those in Finchley and Golders Green area) , 38 of these are in town centres. These locations were last reviewed in 2006.</p> <p>No records are kept separately for each grit bins but in general the grit bins were filled a minimum on 4 occasions since the start of the season at the beginning of November 2009. There may be bins that were filled more times. In previous years it was only necessary to fill the grit bins twice, at the beginning of November and in January.</p> <p>A total of at least 400 tonnes of salt was used to refill the grit bins in the Borough. This would cover 20 million square metres at a coverage rate of 20g/sq.m (Chris Chrysostomou, Environment and Operations, 020 8359 7200</p>
<p>4</p> <p>Brent Cross Cricklewood</p> <p>After the Planning and Environment Committee on Thursday 19 November 2009 in respect of the Brent Cross Redevelopment:</p> <p>(a) Has the Section 106 been finalised and agreed?</p> <p>(b) Have all the heads of terms agreement been agreed and signed?</p> <p>(c) Has a full planning permission been granted? If yes on what date?</p>		<p>The S106 has not been finalised. The earliest it is anticipated that this could be finalised is the end of March 2010. Work is continuing on the Heads of Terms principally in respect of the affordable housing review mechanism.</p> <p>No planning permission has been granted, as the application is of strategic importance it needs to be referred to the Mayor of London and Government Office for London. It is</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>(d) Has the Council formally advised the Mayor for London that permission has been granted so he can consider whether to call in the scheme?</p> <p>(e) Has the Secretary of State been advised that permission has been granted so that he can consider whether to call in the scheme?</p> <p>(f) If the answer to (d) or (e) above is No when will the relevant persons be notified?</p> <p>(David Howard, Chair of the Federation of Residents Associations in Barnet (FORAB))</p>	<p>anticipated that the application will be referred to the Mayor of London and the Government Officer for London in February 2010.</p> <p>(Nicola Capelli, Principal Planner – Major Projects & Heritage Unit, 020 8359 4104)</p>
5	<p>The Decisions of Council's Cabinet meeting on 22 November 2004 stated under Agenda Item 8 on Pages 13 and 14:</p> <p>8. THE “THREE STRANDS” APPROACH (Report of the Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Development – Agenda Item 8)</p> <p>In presenting his report the Cabinet Member asked that an amendment be made to the appended summary of the Three Strands Approach by the addition of the following words after line 5 on page 126: “On-street’ parking permits will not be issued where lower than the revised deposit draft UDP 2001 ‘off-street’ parking standards are agreed for a development.”</p> <p>Accordingly, and for the reasons set out in the Cabinet Member’s report, Cabinet</p> <p>RESOLVED – That subject to inclusion of the above-mentioned amendment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Three Strands Approach be approved as the Council's key strategy for guiding future regeneration, development and planning in the Borough over the next ten years and that PEG (Protection, Enhancement and Growth) underpins the future Local Development Framework and its core strategies when it replaces the Unitary Development Plan. 2. The process to develop the Three Strands Approach and PEG be formalized through the Local Development Framework statutory 	<p>The Core Strategy refers to a parking regime that balances reducing car use while recognising that many residents will continue to travel by car. This provides our strategic LDF approach on car parking. The Development Management Policies document will provide more detail on car parking standards and policies for the Borough. This document will be launched this year. The current approach to the issuing of parking permits in connection with new developments in controlled parking zones generally follows the strategy and amendment agreed by Cabinet in 2004.</p> <p>(Lucy Shomali, Head of Strategy (Planning and Housing), 020 8359 4749)</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>process, coordinated through a member steering panel led by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Development.</p> <p>Please would officers advise how the decision concerning the issuing of 'On Street' parking permits is being addressed and taken forward within the Local Development Framework and the "Core Strategy - Direction of Travel" document in particular." (Robert Newton)</p>	
6	<p>How long does the Council anticipate it will take it to change the details on www.leaderlistens.com from the last leader to Councillor Hillan? Does the Council have ownership and administrative access to this domain and the associated twitter feed? Has Councillor Hillan committed to using the blog and, unlike the last Leader, allow people who don't 100% agree with her to comment and question the Leader? (Daniel Hope)</p>	<p>The communications team and the Council controls access to the blog. How Leader Listens operates in the future, both meetings and the blog, is being reviewed by the new Leader of the Council. The Leader is committed to publishing her expenses online on a monthly basis. (Chris Palmer –Media Relations– 0208 359 7408)</p>
7	<p>Please detail all of Barnet Council's advertising and sponsorship income for the past two years and any costs incurred to achieve it. (Daniel Hope)</p>	<p>It is not possible to allocate an accurate cost incurred in achieving the income set out below:</p> <p>09/10 (Q3) Municipal sponsorship £6,534.64 Advertising – it is not possible to obtain the details of all advertising income across the entire Council for the period requested.</p> <p>08/09 Municipal sponsorship £14,993.54 Sponsorship of Barnet DVDs £6,500.00</p> <p>08/09 Advertising arranged by the former Communications Department amounted to £900.00. Other departments may have arranged advertising individually. (Vanessa Gearson – Communications Manager – 020 8359 7961)</p>