

**FINCHLEY & GOLDERS GREEN RESIDENTS' FORUM
UPDATED ACTION SHEET
26 JULY 2010**

Held at St Michael's Church Hall, The Riding, Off Golders Green Road, Golders Green, NW11
Chairman: Councillor Dean Cohen (Apologies for absence)
*Vice-Chairman : Councillor Graham Old (In the Chair)
(*denotes Councillor present)

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
1.	<p>Review of North Finchley CPZ – Opposition to any changes to the residents' parking bays in Torrington Park. Dr David Gutmann Torrington Park Residents' Association</p> <p>In Dr Gutmann's absence, the Forum noted that Dr Gutmann was happy with the response given by officers.</p>	<p>The proposal, formulated as a result of the North Finchley Controlled Parking Zone review, was to convert some existing free bays to residents bays, general permit bays to residents bays and free bays to general permit bays in order to provide more residents parking bays overall.</p> <p>As a result of the statutory consultation necessary as part of the process to make the proposed changes, a number of comments including the petition with 21 signatures were received.</p> <p>Although a formal decision is yet to be made on this matter, having reviewed the comments made and the level of concern expressed it is anticipated that a recommendation will be put forward that the proposed changes should not now proceed. The formal decision on this issue is anticipated within the next month.</p>	No further action

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
2.	<p>Traffic Congestion in Golders Green Road and side roads:</p> <p>1. Suggestion of making the side roads off Golders Green Road eg. Woodstock Avenue, Highfield Avenue, Sinclair Grove or Golders Manor Drive one way to try and ease congestion.</p> <p>2. Narrow the pavements – Pavements outside Windsor Court are 4m wide. They could be narrowed by half and used either for an extra traffic lane or for parking.</p>	<p>Being a Town Centre it is expected that there will be a certain degree of congestion at times.</p> <p>Whilst the suggestions are appreciated any response as to their effectiveness or otherwise is theoretical as no investigation has been carried out and at present there are no plans to do so. Additionally the cost to implement any such measures cannot be justified as there is no evidence of what benefits could be achieved and no funding available to facilitate such changes.</p> <p>The Chairman encouraged residents to continue to bring their suggestions on traffic issues to the Forum.</p>	No further action

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p>3. Move the pedestrian crossing traffic lights by Highfield Avenue 10m north towards the North Circular Road and make them dual purpose. This would allow buses in and out of Highfield Avenue.</p> <p>Mr Sydney Nathan</p>		
	<p>Congestion in Sneath Avenue,NW11 : Resident showed the Chairman and officers a photograph of traffic congestion in Sneath Avenue, NW11 taken at 9.00am and suggested that Highways</p>	<p>The comments and photograph were noted.</p>	<p>Subsequent to the meeting it was brought to the attention of the Transport & Regeneration Manager that the matter had already been raised at the Area Environment Sub Committee held on 24 June and was under consideration by the Director of Environment & Operations. Following discussion on the 24 June it was determined that further engagement should take place with the community on the</p>

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	Officers investigate the matter.		possibility of introducing a one-way system in the area. This is anticipated to take place by the end of the year. The officer dealing with the matter is Themba Nleya who can be contacted as follows: Themba.nleya@barnet.gov.uk Mervyn Bartlett Transport and Regeneration Manager
	Brent Cross development – Congestion of Traffic: Resident questioned how the extra traffic created by the Brent Cross development could be accommodated on the already congested local roads. Ms Dorothy Badrick	The Transport and Regeneration Manager referred the resident to the report that went to Planning and Environment Committee last November which addressed this matter.	No further action
3.	1. At the Council meeting on 14th July 2010, the	The Mayor gave the following explanation at the Council meeting on 13 July 2010:- The Acting Democratic Services Manager's report appeared at item	No further action

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p>Mayor allowed item 5.3 (Supplemental Report of the Acting Democratic Services Manager) to be considered as an "urgent" item. Please state what the reason for urgency was.</p> <p>2. Please provide full details of the allowances all councillors will now receive following the changes introduced at the aforementioned meeting. Please show the full amount that each member is entitled to receive, whether or not they claim their full</p>	<p>5.3 on the Council Agenda. The item was set out on the published agenda and, as normal, individual papers under that item were circulated to Members and published as soon as they were available. Whilst the officers are satisfied that this meets the necessary requirements, a Member has raised a concern that it does not. For the avoidance of any doubt, I will take the item concerned at 5.3.1 – Item 5.3.1 Member’s Allowances, was taken as an urgent item. Problems with IT within the Council have contributed to delay in distributing/publication of the paper, but I am satisfied that Council need to consider the London Councils Independent Remuneration Panel report as soon as possible after its publication in May, particularly given that the next Council meeting is not until 14th September 2010.</p> <p>The full details of the Members’ Allowances agreed at the Council meeting on 13 July 2010 can be found at the following link:</p> <p>http://committeepapers.barnet.gov.uk/democracy/reports/reportdetail.asp?ReportID=9439</p>	<p>No further action</p>

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p>entitlement, and also show the figure they were entitled to receive before the changes.</p> <p>3. If any councillor has decided to forgo some of his/her entitlement, please state his/her name and the amount they will actually be claiming.</p> <p>4. Please confirm that if a councillor decides to forgo part of his/her entitlement this year, he/she will not be able to claw the payment back in subsequent years.</p> <p>Mr David Miller</p>	<p>The amount received by each member over the financial year is published annually and this will be published at the end of the financial year.</p> <p>Confirmed.</p>	<p>This question has now been received as a Freedom of Information request and is being dealt with accordingly.</p> <p>No further action</p>

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
4.	<p>'As the Council voted in March, only weeks before the election, to accept the usual pay allowance rate for councillors, how is it justifiable for councillors to vote again in July, with no proper consultation, for a new scheme which gives them huge rises in pay, in the midst of austerity measures for every other member of society, and shortly before the imposition in Barnet of cuts of several million pounds in spending on</p>	<p>The decision to amend the Member Allowances Scheme was taken by Councillors at the Council Meeting on 13 July 2010.</p> <p>Any resident wishing to put their views, ask questions etc, should contact their Ward Councillors either at their respective surgeries or via e mails.</p>	<p>No further action</p>

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p>essential services, numerous job losses and widespread pay freezes?' Mrs T Killick</p> <p>There was much critical discussion by residents on the issue of Member Allowances, councillors representation of residents views and the democratic process.</p>		
5.	<p>Traffic Management in Ravensdale Avenue, N12 Resident spoke about safety issues for both exiting vehicles and pedestrians emanating from a blind bend in</p>	<p>The road signs that were taken away were not Council signs but had been placed there illegally and so had to be removed. A new left turning arrow has been placed on the exit lane from the supermarket car park. Officers have also arranged for a new sign to be installed within the next 2 weeks westbound along Ravensdale Avenue close to Sainsbury's reinforcing the ban on the left turn into the car park, and are in dialogue with Sainsbury's who will be installing a road hump on their land to improve road safety at the car park entrance / exit point.</p>	

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p>Sainsbury's car park and asked the Council :</p> <p>1. To mobilise effort to work with Ravensdale Residents Association (RRA) and Sainsbury's to draw up and cost a scheme which will mitigate the current serious safety hazards relating to Sainsbury's North Finchley car park entrance/exit area.</p> <p>2. To decide on what measures, which fall on the public highway side of the building line, that can be immediately implemented by</p>	<p>The Council will continue to monitor the situation and work with Sainbury's and the Residents Association to improve road safety in the area.</p>	<p>1. London Borough of Barnet has since installed a sign to inform motorists of the prohibited left turn. Sainsbury's have also undertaken work improve signage within their premises. We are not aware of any concerns or complaints since. The Council are grateful to Mr Koura and fellow residents for providing the invaluable historical background as well as regular feedback regarding the effectiveness of measures.</p> <p>2. No further measures are planned at this stage.</p>

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p>the Council and to put a timeframe on the other measures.</p> <p>3. Commit to evaluate the impact of the measures implemented by consulting Sainsbury's and RRA after a mutually agreed period and in the interest of continuous improvement i.e. lessons learnt.</p> <p>4. Why did the Council act in what seemingly is perceived by many as "a cavalier approach" ?</p>		<p>3. It is normal procedure with any new scheme for LBB to allow for a 'settling-in' period, conduct periodic reviews and apply any 'lessons learnt' for any new measures as we continuously aspire to deliver better service to residents.</p> <p>4. We do not subscribe to the 'cavalier approach' view. The decision taken was in the interests of public safety and to uphold duty of care enshrined in highway legislation.</p> <p>Regarding the 'action without consultation' comment, there is no obligation on highway authorities to consult when illegal</p>

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p>What can be learnt to improve procedures regarding how a request for information resulted in action being taken without consultation ?</p> <p>Why did it take <u>21 working days</u> after being logged to receive an answer?</p>		<p>signs are being removed from the network. In any case, not only were the signs illegal but public safety was also compromised and therefore we believe judicious action was merited.</p> <p>The original request was received on 7 April 2010 and was acknowledged on the 8th. Ordinarily, a formal response would have been issued within 10 working days (i.e. by 22nd at the very latest). However, as we had just entered a new financial calendar, and were in the run-up to local and national elections, as well as dealing with legacy of the previous financial year's backlog occasioned by severe winter, resources were stretched at this particular time such that it was not until 7 days after the due date (hence 21 calendar days from the 8th of April) that we were able to formally respond. However</p>

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p>5. Why did the Council not adopt “a make before break” approach ?</p>		<p>though a response was delayed by 1 week, which is regrettable, we are pleased to inform residents the matter was already being dealt with internally at this stage. The relevant instruction to the contractor had already been issued and mobilisation was in progress. The 7 day delay is sincerely regretted as this is not the standard that we aspire to.</p> <p>5. ‘Make before break’ would imply prior knowledge of what the issues or problems were, which is not the case, otherwise any proposals put forward at this stage would have been speculative. It became imperative to provide a clean slate by dealing with the illegal signs (which should never have been there in any case) first, understanding the exact nature of the problem before suggesting remedial action. The new 'left turn arrow' marking was intended to assist in the interim.</p> <p>We did become aware of</p>

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p>A representative from Sainsbury's advised the Forum that since the removal of signage by the Council there had been a substantial increase in accidents.</p>		<p>motorists' failure to observe the existing albeit conspicuous advance signage at the junction of Ravensdale Avenue and Friary Road hence the decision to duplicate the instruction closer to the premises through the provision of a new sign. This has since been done.</p>
6.	<p>The Planning and Environment Committee is meeting this coming Thursday and has an item on Brent Cross on the agenda.</p>	<p>Brent Cross Cricklewood Planning Application 29 July 2010</p> <p>The report to the 29 July Planning Committee is necessary to extend the time allowed to agree the S106 and issue the planning permission. This is necessary as Recommendation 5 of the 18 & 19 Planning and Environment Committee gave a period of 6 months to issue the permission. It should be noted that the Secretary of State decision not to 'call-in' the application was not given until 16 June 2010 which was</p>	<p>No further action</p>

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p>One part asks the committee to extend by three months the deadline for agreeing the Section 106 elements. I understand this . The rest of the report makes a number of assertions regarding changes in national legislation and draws erroneous conclusions. It also includes 24 parts to the Section 106 agreement and which are the key documents in the planning permission.. 23 of these sections have been revised since the planning</p>	<p>more than six months from the date of the original committee decision.</p> <p>The report also updates the committee in respect of changes to national planning legislation since November (PPS3, PPS4 and the CIL legislation) but concludes that there is no change in circumstances that would justify a different conclusion to that reached by the 18th and 19th Committee.</p> <p>Minor and non-material changes to extend the period to submit some Reserved Matters applications is proposed to reduce the risk of the planning application expiring before the necessary approval are in place (Condition 1.2) but this will not extend the period for commencement of the development and all phase 1 critical infrastructure (pre-phase) plus a detailed delivery programme for phase 1 will need to have been approved before the development commences. The conditions are attached as Appendix 1 to the report.</p> <p>A third agreed draft of the S106 was placed on the Planning Register on 16 July 2010. The S106 is a large document with 27 schedules which contain the detailed drafting in respect of various provisions of the S106 – for example the constitution of the Transport Advisory Group, Transport Strategy Group and Consultative Access Forum and the definitions used in the agreement. The latest draft of the S106 is a background paper to the 29 July Committee Report.</p> <p>Planning and Environment Committee consider the Heads of Terms of any proposed S106 agreements. Approval of the full detail of the S106 is delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning and Development Management as long as the detail is in accordance with the Heads of Terms. Officers consider that the detailed drafting of the S106 (July 2010) accords with the Heads of Terms considered by the November</p>	

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p>committee last November and are mainly dated June 2010. There are no tracked changes nor a summary of changes made and there are hundreds of pages to wade through to find out what they are.</p> <p>Why the indecent haste to ask to PEC to approve the whole report? Why not a simple report asking the committee to grant a three month extension of time and defer the remainder of the report until the planning committee in November?</p>	<p>Committee.</p> <p>The Forum was advised that it was important that officers did not say anything to compromise the decision which had to be made by the Planning and Environment Committee on 29 July and that a full response to their concerns would be made by officers at that meeting.</p> <p>Residents were advised that they could attend the meeting and address the Committee if they had given the appropriate notice. Normal rules in this respect would apply on Thursday evening. Written representations should be sent to the relevant area planning officer or to the Assistant Director of Planning and Development Management who would put the representations before the Committee on 29 July 2010.</p>	

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<i>Mr David Howard</i>		
7.	<p>Child Hill Allotments</p> <p>1. The roadways throughout the site are in need of repair, please let us know when Barnet are able to do the work</p> <p>2. The perimeter fence needs to be replaced in many areas to protect the plots and plot holders, as the site has had items stolen from sheds and produce stolen from plots this year. Are Barnet prepared to carry out this work and if so, when?</p> <p>3. The water pressure is so low that it has</p>	<p>Work requests for allotments are normally forwarded to the Greenspaces Department where urgent works and repairs are actioned with immediate effect and additional works are placed on the allotments work list for consideration. As the allotments has a limited operational budget works have to be prioritised.</p> <p>1. A letter received from the Society requesting plainings to undertake the works to the road was acknowledged and information provided advising that road plainings would not be available until August.</p> <p>2. The request for a review of the fencing has also been logged for a site visit.</p> <p>3. The water pressure on the site has been an on-going problem which we have been unable to resolve despite exploring opportunities to bring in a further supply and working with the water provider.</p> <p>4. Eurobins are not provided to allotment sites via the Council. A skip service of up to two skips per annum is available upon request. Please note that allotment rubbish is generated from allotment gardening activities and does not constitute non allotment items such as fridges, sofa's etc.</p>	No further action

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p>been difficult to water crops during this dry weather. Please liaise with Thames Water to remedy the problem.</p> <p>4. We would like a Eurobin on site, to be emptied every 2 weeks to remove rubbish, can this be arranged? Hilary Burden Secretary, Child's Hill Allotments Association</p>		
8.	<p>Parking in Granville Road, NW2 Matthew Curtis Resident spoke of the parking problems in Granville Road exacerbated by</p>	<p>The Director of Corporate Governance advised the Forum that the Assistant Director – Legal would be asked to work with colleagues to investigate the set of circumstances raised by the residents and ascertain whether the planning conditions given for the development have been breached. If developers for this or other developments have found a loophole to</p>	<p>Planning and Legal officers have investigated the circumstances surrounding the development and have concluded that the developer is not breaching the terms of the conditions of the</p>

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	the overspill from new flats where developers were charging an additional £15,000 for a parking space which residents were not buying.	enable them to breach planning conditions, appropriate action will be taken by the Council to ensure this does not happen in the future when planning applications are approved.	<p>planning permission.</p> <p>The Council is currently trying to negotiate more restrictive methods by suggesting for instance that it is incorporated in a Section 106 legal Agreement so that a restriction is secured between the developers and individual purchasers of flats. Further legal advice is being sought for these alternative approaches.</p> <p>The local planning authority impose conditions which are in accordance with guidance recommended by the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p><i>Assistant Director of Planning & Development Management</i></p>
9.	Hendon Football Club Dorothy Badrick Resident advised the Forum that the 19 July deadline for a bat survey had	Noted	

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	passed and the survey had not taken place.		
10	<p>Outstanding Items from 17 June Action Sheet :</p> <p>Item 2: Halls for Hire : Resident advised the Forum that the CommUnity Barnet website currently did not show halls for hire although he had been advised that they were planning to do so in the future. Anyone who had a hall for hire should contact CommUnity Barnet.</p>	Noted	

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p>Item 3: Reduction of Alcohol Related Crime in Tally Ho Area : Resident requested reassurance that policing levels would remain the same in this area.</p> <p>Item 4: Cricklewood Community Forum - Resident showed photographs of the pavement area between Millenium Green and the shop on the corner of Claremont Road still showing much litter.</p>	<p>This question was raised at 13 July 2010 Council when the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Cohesion advised that 'to date we have not been advised of any specific proposals relating to police numbers in Barnet'.</p> <p>This is a matter for the Metropolitan Police and the Borough Commander.</p> <p>The matter will be reported as a priority to the Street Cleansing and Ancillary Services Manager.</p>	<p>The area was cleared of litter on 27 July 2010 and arrangements made for the area to be monitored twice weekly.</p> <p>Mervyn Bartlett Transport and Regeneration Manager</p>

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p>Item 5: 11 Mountfield Road, N3 3ND Resident asked if families were placed here under the Home Choice Scheme and whether or not properties are inspected before vulnerable families are placed in them.</p>	<p>The Housing Manager will be asked to write to resident with this information.</p>	<p>A letter was sent to the resident on 2 August 2010 advising that there are eight flats in the building and three of these were used for housing homeless applicants to the Council. The remaining ones are private tenancies initiated by the landlord.</p> <p>The Homechoice team have confirmed they have not placed any clients there.</p> <p>The flats or houses the Council uses as temporary accommodation are inspected when first taken on, and there can be further visits or occupational checks thereafter. The three studio flats in question were inspected last year in June.</p>

	Subject:	Response:	Action:
	<p style="text-align: center;">The next meeting of the Finchley & Golders Green Area Residents' Forum will take place at 6.30pm on Tuesday, 19 October 2010 at Avenue House, 17 East End Road, Finchley N3</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(Post meeting note: An extra Forum has been arranged for Wednesday, 15 September 2010 at 6.30pm at St Michael's Church Hall, The Riding, Off Golders Green Road, NW11 8HL)</i></p>		

The Forum which started at 6.30pm ended at 8.40pm

Officers Present:

Jeff Lustig – Director of Corporate Governance
Karina Sissman – Finchley & Golders Green Area Planning Manager
Mervyn Bartlett – Transport & Regeneration Manager
Stephanie Chaikin – Democratic Services Officer