

**FINCHLEY & GOLDERS GREEN RESIDENTS FORUM  
ACTION SHEET  
WEDNESDAY 5 JANUARY 2011**

Held at Avenue House, 17 East End Road, London N3 3QE

\*Chairman: Councillor Dean Cohen  
\*Vice-Chairman: Councillor Graham Old  
\*denotes Councillor present

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>
1.	<p><b>Pavement trading licences</b> A retail premises in Cricklewood Broadway displays boxes of fruit and veg on the pavement. Pedestrians are sandwiched between the boxes and the pavement railings. It is very hard to walk past. This is exacerbated by the fact that there are also customers eyeing up the items on sale and further blocking the pavement. It is impossible for anyone pushing a pram to get by safely. This has been raised with Barnet on several occasions in the last six months and also raised several times at our residents' association meetings. I believe a Council officer visited the shop and put a couple of marks on the pavement beyond which they should not extend. This is ignored. Please could this matter be dealt with quickly as we are now all very fed up with it. Our association would also like to know the basis for issuing pavement trading licences to shop keepers? Who makes the decision that the pavement is wide enough to allow a trader to put boxes and stock on the pavement and that there is adequate room for pedestrians to walk past safely? Who is responsible for monitoring</p>	<p>A temporary street trading licence for this premises was granted for the period 1/10/1010 until 31/03/2011 subject to standard conditions. All licences are determined with a view to balancing the needs of businesses and residents with the public expectation of an unobstructed footway. Licences are issued subject to standard conditions regarding the operation of the street trading activity. Trading is not permitted outside the licensed area and usually a minimum of 2.5 metres clear of any obstruction shall be maintained on the public highway for the safe pass, repass and free flow of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. This distance may be varied depending on the location and other local factors such as footfall, traffic, railings etc. London Borough of Barnet officers assess the suitability of the site prior to the grant of the licence. Visits are also made periodically during the term of the licence to assess the ongoing suitability of the pitch. If it becomes apparent that the activity is not appropriate for the location once the licence has been granted, it may be revoked or the size of the pitch reduced to allow for the safe passage of</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Action
	<p>this and ensuring that the shop keeper does not extend beyond the agreed limit? What action is taken when the licence terms are breached?</p> <p><b>Jessica Howey</b>  <b>Co-secretary Railway Cottages Residents' Association</b>  <b>Member of the Cricklewood Improvement Group</b></p>	<p>pedestrians.  London Borough of Barnet Priority Intervention Team are responsible for monitoring this and ensuring that the shop keeper does not extend beyond the agreed limit.  If the terms of the licence are breached officers can issue a fixed penalty notice, prosecute for breach of condition, vary the conditions or revoke the licence.  <b>David Curtis-Botting</b>  <b>Principal Trading Standards and Licensing Officer</b></p>	
2.	<p>An abandoned blue car has been parked outside my house in Llanvanor Road for several months. The tax disc has expired. Can it be removed?</p> <p><b>Andrew Tucker</b></p> <p>Resident confirmed that he would be contacting the Parking Service to advise of the make and registration number of the vehicle.</p>	<p>Officers visited the location mentioned on 4 January 2011 and the only blue vehicle in the location mentioned had a valid tax disc and a resident permit. Parking Service officers have contacted the resident to confirm whether the vehicle is still there and if it is what the make and registration number is.  The Council has systems for dealing with suspected abandoned vehicles and any reported to us by telephone, email, letter or web form are inspected within 48 hours and appropriate action commenced. Tel: 020 8359 4600  In a separate, but linked, process any vehicle parked on the highway within the borough which does not display a valid tax disc is removed immediately and held until the tax has been paid.  <b>Mervyn Bartlett – Transport and Regeneration Manager</b></p>	

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>
3.	<p>What efforts, if any, have been made to organise the performance assessment of councillors which was promised months ago at the time of the allowance rise increases? <b>Theresa Killick</b></p>	<p>In July 2010 Council resolved; <i>'That the recommendation of LCIP be followed for role descriptions to be developed for councillors for all their areas of work; the role descriptions to be placed on council websites; Members to report publicly on their activity through a variety of channels...and the introduction of an appraisal system for Members.'</i> Work towards this is ongoing. <b>Aysen Giritli – Democratic Services Manager</b></p>	<b>Democratic Services Manager</b>
4.	<p>I have been told that the borough's huge lighting replacement project was both necessary and progressing satisfactorily. At a recent Budget and Performance Scrutiny Committee meeting, however, a council officer was apparently summoned to explain how it would be possible to make savings to the DW lighting contract. He told the meeting: "We may be able to use technology to resolve the problems instead of replacing lighting columns". This would appear to support the suspicions of many residents that the replacement project was a misuse of financial resources and quite unnecessary. At a time when, supposedly due to a need for financial restraint, many council officers are facing redundancy, and so many vital services are at risk, how can this Council justify the waste of such a large amount of residents' money on this pointless exercise? <b>Theresa Killick</b></p> <p>Resident asked when the current PFI contract commenced and how much of that funding had been allocated for replacing columns when the funding could have been</p>	<p>The Council has not allocated any additional funding to the Street Lighting budget since before the start of the current PFI contract. The requirement of the contract was to maintain the status quo only. Additional resources have been allocated for the contract, but by central government, and as such have no impact on any other Council allocation of resources. Savings could be made by introducing new technology into the contract and this is currently being investigated. <b>Mervyn Bartlett – Transport and Regeneration Manager</b></p> <p>Senior Lighting Engineer will be asked to contact resident to answer her queries on the matter.</p>	<b>Mervyn Bartlett – Transport and Regeneration Manager</b>

	Issue Raised	Response	Action
	used to lessen cuts.		
5.	<p>The Cricklewood Community Forum have been approached by residents of Handley Grove, NW2 whose houses abut Donoghues's building in Claremont Road, NW2. Their concern is about the nature of Donoghue's waste business there and the effect on residents' health. Dust is always landing in their gardens, making it unpleasant to sit outside in the summer, when they would obviously like to. Also at least 2 young people have developed asthma since moving to these homes. The questions are therefore:</p> <p>1. What is the exact nature of Donoghue's waste business in Claremont Road? 2. What are the hours they are permitted to operate there?</p> <p><b>Pauline McKinnell</b> <b>Chairperson, Cricklewood Community Forum</b></p> <p>The Chairperson of the Cricklewood Community Forum voiced residents' concerns that the dust is asbestos and that the contractor does not have a contract for hazardous waste.</p> <p>Cllr Jack Cohen advised that complaints had been received for many years and that something needed to be done.</p>	<p>Planning permission was granted on 9 September 1987 for: "Yard and buildings for the operation of a builder's merchant, a skip waste transfer station and a haulage company" (ref: C09210B).</p> <p>One of the planning conditions attached to the permission stated: "No work shall be carried out on the premises at any time on Sundays or Public Holidays or before 7.00am or after 6.00pm on other days".</p> <p>Officers are aware that lorries associated with the business have been operating outside the allowed hours and legal action is currently being taken to address this. If details on the nature of legal action being taken are required, please contact the case officer dealing with this (Jim Clark, tel: 02083594625, email: jim.clark@barnet.gov.uk).</p> <p>The owners of the site (PB Donoghues Ltd) have a waste management licence which is policed by the Environment Agency, North East Thames region (contact details 01707 632483/ 01276 454 629 - Emergency incident hotline 08708 506 506).</p> <p>The licence allows for the storage and processing of packaging, inert, municipal and metal wastes but does not allow for the storage or processing of special or hazardous wastes.</p> <p>The main waste handling occurs in a steel structured building which is a partial enclosure with a fine water mist dust suppressing system.</p> <p>In periods of hot weather there may be some</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Action
		<p>dust and odour issues which can only be dealt with by the Environment Agency who have powers to enforce the conditions of the licence.</p> <p><b>Joe Henry</b> <b>Planning Regulations and Enforcement Manager</b></p>	
6.	<p>Objections to the removal of free parking bays and an increase in the cost of resident parking permits from £40 to £100.</p> <p><b>Mr Julian Stern</b></p> <p>Residents raised the following concerns in respect of the above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*The proposed 150% price increase in parking permits – far greater than other Councils.</li> <li>*The reason for removal of free parking bays is to deal with a shortfall of money from central government and not to make the CPZs more effective as stated in the consultation.</li> <li>*The CPZ is already effective allowing sufficient freedom for visitors and businesses to park during certain hours in the day.</li> <li>*A failure of the Council’s statutory duty to consult residents properly.</li> <li>*Notices were put up giving 21 days notice of consultation just prior to the Christmas holiday period.</li> <li>*One notice was put up in each road wrapped around pole where they could not be properly seen.</li> <li>*The precedent of consultation with all houses previously adopted 10-12 years ago</li> </ul>	<p>In order to meet the Council’s aspirations of converting all existing free bays to paid for parking places in the borough work has already commenced in order that identified changes can be implemented and operational by 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011 although it is anticipated that roll out of the changes will commence on-street in late January 2011.</p> <p>It has been necessary to commence work now as the proposed changes are subject to an obligatory statutory consultation process where opportunity must be given to invite comments or objections. All Ward Members have been advised of the aspirations and have been sent relevant details.</p> <p>Objections have been received to some of the proposed changes and these will be considered in submitted letters of recommendation to the Cabinet Member and relevant AESC Chairman as part of the process.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed permit increase, the Council are reviewing all fees and charges relating to parking. However at this time no decision has been made and therefore there is no further comment to be made regarding the suggested £100.</p> <p><b>Mervyn Bartlett – Transport and Regeneration Manager</b></p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Action
	<p>and again 2-3 years ago when amendments were made should still be followed.</p> <p>*A decision cannot be based on one person's personal opinion.</p> <p>*There would be a case for judicial review if the scheme goes ahead.</p> <p>*A petition with 65 signatures from residents of Gurney Road and a letter to the Council and Councillor Coleman had been submitted.</p> <p>*The scheme goes against the new guidance issued to Local Authorities by Eric Pickles.</p> <p>*An undemocratic process with difficulty in getting information on decisions taken.</p> <p>*The legality of using parking charges as a revenue raiser.</p> <p>*A lot of residents are unaware of the consultation as a lot of people are on holiday at this time of year and notices are not clear.</p> <p>*Lack of transparency which must be part of the process.</p> <p>*A blanket policy cannot be justified as it cannot take on board the individual requirements of each area.</p> <p>*Parking bays should meet the needs of the people using the roads, there should not be a blanket approach.</p> <p>*The justification for the removal of the free parking bays of effectiveness of the CPZ is a blanket statement and not a substantive reason.</p> <p>*Removal of free parking bays will displace traffic to areas without CPZs.</p> <p>*Did the Council object to Jewish Care having their own underground parking facility for visiting relatives?</p> <p>*There should be no charge for residents</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Governance and Civic Affairs addressed the Forum and explained that both he and the Chairman had spent considerable time over the last few days speaking to residents. Residents were advised that no decisions in respect of this issue had yet been taken. In respect of the removal of free parking bays consultation had been extended to 6 January and a further extension to the middle of January was being considered.</p> <p>The decision, when taken, would be an informed decision with everybody's comments taken on board.</p> <p>Councillor Monroe Palmer advised the Forum that Childs Hill ward councillors had been speaking to residents and seeking their views with regards to the removal of free parking bays. Mixed responses had been received and collated and passed on to Council officers. Councillor Palmer urged residents to write to the Highways Manager – Traffic and Development with their views about the proposal of a blanket decision to turn free bays into residents' parking bays.</p> <p>With respect to the proposed increased charges, Councillor Monroe Palmer advised that a report in this respect was going to Cabinet Resources Committee on 13 January 2011.</p> <p>The Transport and Regeneration Manager advised the Forum that :</p> <p>*Barnet's increased charges have been low in comparison in previous years.</p> <p>*During the consultation, some residents had requested giving up the free bays.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response	Action
	<p>parking in Brim Hill or a charge for people parking to go to work. No ingenuity has been shown. Spaces should be created for people to park.</p> <p>*Diagnostic, and servicing business in Falkdale Avenue, N3 which is bringing business into the area will have to close down if changes are implemented. Falkdale Avenue is not broken and 'if it is not broken don't fix it'.</p> <p>*A request to explore delaying the decision to be taken on 13 January 2011.</p> <p>*A request under the Freedom of Information Act on all notes and conversations the Cabinet Member has had with officers and colleagues concerning the proposals.</p> <p>*How much would the Council Tax need to increase to stop this?</p> <p>*Some of the notices advising about the consultation were folded around the poles. Is there any guidance that Barnet is not following in this respect?</p>	<p>*The Council does not have to consult on CPZ charges.</p> <p>*No decisions had yet been made on the conversion of free bays or on the increased charges.</p> <p>*Statutory consultation requirements had been met, as had consultation to date on CPZ extensions and reviews.</p> <p>*Mindful of the fact that consultation had taken place over the Christmas period, the current round of consultation had already been extended and residents were encouraged to write in over the next few days. The Transport and Regeneration Manager would write to residents to confirm the dates for the extended resident consultation, and when consultation with the three Area Environment Chairmen would take place and decisions made.</p> <p>*Changes in government guidance mostly refers to parking associated with new developments although the implications are under consideration.</p> <p>*The Transport and Regeneration Manager advised that the petition from residents of Gurney Drive had been received and would be taken into account when a decision was made.</p> <p>*Parking income is ringfenced to be spent on highways and transport.</p> <p>*The process of the removal of free parking bays has been ongoing for some time and in terms of effectiveness it was fairer and better management to remove them in one go rather than bit by bit.</p> <p>*The decision for the removal of free parking bays would be taken in accordance with the Council's Constitution. The results of the</p>	<p><b>Transport and Regeneration Manager – Mervyn Bartlett</b> to confirm consultation and decision making dates.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response	Action
		<p>consultation would be carefully collated with all relevant information taken into account and this and the resultant recommendation sent to the Cabinet Member and the Chairmen of each of the Environment Sub-Committees.</p> <p>*The Transport and Regeneration Manager will write to the resident in response to his query about the amount of increase of Council Tax needed to nullify the need to remove free parking bays together with his query on whether Barnet is following guidance in the way they are erecting notices.</p> <p>The Finchley &amp; Golders Green Area Planning Manager will investigate the residents' query with regards to the provision of underground parking for the Jewish Care development in Golders Green Road.</p> <p>The Democratic Services Manager advised that all Freedom of Information requests should be sent in writing to the Freedom of Information Officer at <a href="mailto:foi@barnet.gov.uk">foi@barnet.gov.uk</a> .</p>	<p><b>Transport and Regeneration Manager</b> <b>Mervyn Bartlett</b></p> <p><b>F&amp;GG Area Planning Manager</b> <b>Karina Conway</b></p>
7.	<p>Pay by phone change of policy on pay and display parking machines <b>Rachel Rogosnitzky</b></p> <p>Resident raised her concerns regarding a new policy whereby if pay and display machines are 'out of order' payment has to be made by mobile phone. She asked when this had been introduced and if the public had been made aware of it. She commented that not everyone (eg elderly people) had a mobile phone. The various costs to the mobile phone owner</p>	<p>The Transport and Regeneration Manager advised that an update on all matters would be put in the updated action sheet of the meeting.</p>	<p><b>Mervyn Bartlett</b> <b>Transport and Regeneration Manager</b></p>



	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>
	were also queried.		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Matters arising from Action Sheet from 23 November 2010 Forum :</b>		
1.	<p><b>Item 3(a) – Lighting Renewal Project</b> Resident advised that since the last Forum the information on the contractors website now appears to be different with her road not listed. How accurate are the contractors listings? <b>Theresa Killick</b></p>	The Transport and Regeneration Manager advised that the Senior Lighting Engineer would be asked to contact the resident as soon as possible to discuss the points raised.	<b>Mervyn Bartlett Transport and Regeneration Manager</b>
2.	<p><b>Item 4(b) – Gypsy/Traveller Ethnic Minority?</b> Resident thanked the officer who had sent her the requested information detailing the Council;s decisions on provision of suitable sites for the gypsy/traveller community.</p>		
3.	<p><b>Item 8 – Level of service experienced in the initial handling of two enquiries sent by email to First Contact desk last Sept-October 2010.</b> Resident resubmitted this issue as the previous response did not reflect his original query. Six emails regarding two separate queries sent to the First Contact desk last September-October 2010 did not generate an automatic acknowledgment or a failure to deliver email received message. This resulted in a delay on a time sensitive query.  The resident asks the Council to confirm that the auto-acknowledgment of enquiries sent by email to the First Contact desk is an integral part of the service standard they</p>	The Chairman undertook to arrange for this issue to be passed to the relevant officer for a response.	<b>Democratic Services Officer</b>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>commit to provide and if so can it be stated in their standards?</p> <p>If this is the case, if a resident, does not receive an auto-acknowledgement to an email they could phone at the earliest opportunity to enquire whether an email has in fact been received and prevent urgent delays.</p> <p><b>Lou Kourra</b></p>		
<b>9.</b>	<b>Matters Arising from Action Sheet from 19 October 2010 Meeting</b>		
1.	<p><b>Item 1 – Traffic and Pedestrian Safety concerns in the area around Brookland School</b></p> <p>Resident explained that the police had spent a week outside Brookland School during the week that commenced 15 November and he hoped that their observations had been passed on to the school. However, the resident was concerned that no progress had been made since he first raised the issue in the Spring Term and that after eight months the school had made no communication with him. He voiced his concerns that it was taking so long to paint a white line at the end of the school driveway.</p> <p><b>Brian Ingram</b></p>	<p>The Chairman of the School Governors explained that a number of discussions had taken place, petitions had been received, residents had been invited to come and discuss issues, the police had spent a week with the school and meetings had been held. Subsequently a specific detailed list was being prepared. Two responses were still outstanding. Proposals would be sent to residents and Alison Sharpe and taken into consideration within the budget process. This was a long process as there were two schools on the same site, processes had to be adhered to and all residents comments taken into account. She confirmed that a white line at the end of the school driveway had been agreed along with a speed hump. She was not aware of why there was a delay on this.</p>	
2	<p><b>Item 13 – Dangerous manhole cover on a slope on the pavement on the corner of Golders Green Road and Armitage Road.</b></p> <p>Resident complained that the manhole cover</p>	<p>The Chairman explained that the pavement could not be levelled out but advised that the relevant utility company had been asked to change the cover to a type that would be less</p>	<p><b>Mervyn Bartlett</b> <b>Transport and Regeneration Manager</b></p>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>
	was not on a level surface but that it was situated on a slope. Nothing had been done and she was concerned that somebody else would slip and hurt themselves.	susceptible to becoming slippery and wet. The Transport and Regeneration Manager would arrange for the utility company to be chased for a date for when the cover would be changed and the resident would be advised.	
3	<p><b>Item 16 – Donoghues Skip Lorries on The Vale, NW11</b></p> <p>(a) What is happening about the request for a weekly Saturday sweep?</p> <p>(b) Resident asked what is happening about the speeding traffic on The Vale as no-one had contacted her.</p>	<p>The Transport and Regeneration Manager assured residents that officers were monitoring the situation. They have requested Donoghues to carry out a Saturday sweep. It was hoped that the situation would improve.</p> <p>PC Carl Mercer advised that The Childs Hill Safer Neighbourhood Team would be asked to contact the resident. The Forum was advised that the Council had four speed detectors. The Council had donated three of these to the police. The detectors can be erected anywhere and used by Council officers or the Local Safer Neighbourhood Team.</p>	<p><b>PC Carl Mercer</b>  <b>Garden Suburb Safer</b>  <b>Neighbourhood Team</b></p>

**The meeting which started at 6.30pm ended at 8.14pm**

**Officers present:**

Aysen Giritli: Democratic Services Manager  
Mervyn Bartlett: Transport and Regeneration Manager  
Karina Conway: Finchley & Golders Green Area Planning Manager  
PC Colin Barker: Finchley & Church End Safer Neighbourhood Team  
PC Carl Mercer: Garden Suburb Safer Neighbourhood Team  
Stephanie Chaikin: Democratic Services Officer