

<u>MEETING</u> CHIPPING BARNET AREA COMMITTEE
<u>DATE AND TIME</u> WEDNESDAY 8TH MARCH, 2017 AT 7.00 PM
<u>VENUE</u> HENDON TOWN HALL

Dear Councillors,

Please find enclosed additional papers relating to the following items for the above mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda.

Item No	Title of Report	Pages
1.	PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS (IF ANY)	3 - 6
1.	EAST BARNET VILLAGE HANGING BASKETS PROPOSAL - SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION	7 - 10

sheri.odoffin@barnet.gov.uk
GovernanceTeam@Barnet.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

QUESTIONS FOR CHIPPING BARNET AREA COMMITTEE (agenda item 5 refers, Public Questions and Comments) – 8 MARCH 2017

Item	Question	Response
Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)	<p>1.The feasibility study showed that there were no pedestrian incidents over a five year period in Chase Way and Hampden Way. When evidence shows such a low traffic or pedestrian incident level why did the council proceed beyond the feasibility project stage?</p> <p>Submitted by: Niall Mitchell</p>	<p>While there were no recorded incidents involving pedestrians, traffic speeds, traffic accidents and frequent crossing of the carriageway by pedestrians (at points where crossing was inappropriate, between parked cars etc) was seen as potentially unsafe in this predominately residential area, with schools. It was therefore apparent that some control of vehicle speeds and the creation of a safe crossing point were highly desirable.</p>
Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)	<p>2.School pupils in the area are shown to be 1920 (1500 +420) per The Capital N14 Walksafe School Travel Plan 2015/16 Design Review, The Streetwise Survey showed that of those under sixteen only a total 109 journeys (morning or evening) were made in the whole day, Given the evidence , how does the council justify a solution for such a small portion of the school population?</p> <p>Submitted by: Rula Georgiou</p>	<p>The proposals were not intended to be centred on school use. They were intended for the benefits of all users of the highway throughout the day. The pedestrian surveys indicated a wide range of ages of pedestrians and did not focus on school age pedestrians.</p>
Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)	<p>3. Your own statistics (Streetwise Survey) for pedestrian flow shows 64% NE and 34% SW (2% other) . Note : Due to the selection of zoning the NE statistics does not include the Burleigh Gardens /Chase Way pedestrian flow. The SW zone is more than 3 times the road length of the NE section. Why did the council pursue a SW solution based on overwhelming bias to the NE?</p> <p>Submitted : Petros Georgiou</p>	<p>The original study identified three locations, one north, one south and one at the junction. The location at the junction was considered to offer the greatest benefit to all users of the highway. In regards to its location either immediately north or south of the actual junction. It was considered that the creation of the raised table would slow traffic approaching the crossing from the north, while traffic from the south is travelling uphill and may more easily slow on the approach to the crossing point. There were also several minor benefits such as proximity to the junction and driveways, and the loss of trees that favoured the positioning to the south of the junction. It was also further from the crest that impedes forward vision to the junction and any crossing</p>

		north of it. The numbers crossing the carriageway are higher to the north, but there was no suitable location to place the crossing, it is considered that the proposal offered the safest location and would more likely attract pedestrian use. The location was also considered best by the road safety audit team and the police.
Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)	4. The LTN 1/95 Assessment guidelines (esp. 3.1.2 and 3.5.2) state that the most dangerous area is within 50m of a zebra crossing. The pedestrians have a desire line NE of the junction and will continue to do so, whilst drivers focus is now on the junction table, side roads and zebra. How does the design justify with evidence that it can change pupils behaviour to traverse three roads instead of one? Submitted : Bronwyn Mitchell	Regrettably there is no means to control pedestrian movements. Placing a crossing anywhere will not ensure it is used by all pedestrians. Extensive guardrailling would be required to ensure all pedestrians cross at a specific point. The provision of the raised table has already been seen to reduce vehicle speeds, the creation of a controlled crossing will ensure a safer crossing place is available for pedestrians. It is hoped that such provision will encourage all pedestrians (not just children) to use it.
Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)	5. The Capita Design review states “the telegraph pole does not significantly impact on visibility for or to pedestrians”. A driver cannot see pedestrians waiting to cross the road. This single major hazard (per your photographs your report) will lure pedestrians into a false sense of security to cross at the worst place. How did all these experts in design , build and audit review not NOTICE such a blatant hazard? Submitted : Olga Chrisostomou	The issue was noted, the diameter of the pole and its set back from the kerb means pedestrians can see and be seen by traffic – the issue was not considered significant by either the road safety audit team or the police. While its position is not desirable it is not considered a major hazard as stated. Location 1 makes allowances for the pole to be relocated.
Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)	6. The location is at the bottom of a downward incline, at one of the more complex junctions in the area with 2 side roads of Cecil Rd,. Why, of all the options available, did they still perceive that the evidence would want to put school pedestrian crossing at	It is agreed the position is on a downward incline and it is for that reason the speed table was introduced. There is regrettably no level area where the crossing could be located without substantial impact on roadside parking and where no use of the lofacility would be anticipated. The gradient is a key reason for placing the crossing downhill

	<p>this most vulnerable of spots?</p> <p>Submitted : Niall Mitchell</p>	<p>of the speed table.</p>
<p>Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)</p>	<p>7. The impact of unintended consequences should be part of a review. We urge the council to reflect that these drivers (especially the top 10 percentile which started the concerns for a petition) and consider that will they not now follow the “rat run” of least resistance and use Cecil Rd and Arlington Rd instead?</p> <p>Submitted: Bronwyn Mitchell</p>	<p>“rat running” is probably taken by drivers wishing to avoid the traffic associated with the school . The provision of a crossing is unlikely to impact. Any potential additional “rat running “ due to the construction of the table may already be occurring and again will not be impacted by the provision of a crossing.</p>
<p>Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)</p>	<p>8. The residency consultation was flawed in its distribution of documents. We have sampled 100 residents and established that 33% did not get the consultation documents. Council puts this down "to resident being unable to recall" but as the documents were only addressed to occupier council have no way of establishing which addresses the document were delivered to. This was brought to their attention by email before June 2016 but not redressed. Can a consultation really be declared valid when the council own procedures cannot validate deliver?</p> <p>Submitted : Petros Georgiou</p>	<p>While this particular informal consultation might have been undertaken by post, requirements for service of formal notices under the Highways Act give less weight to delivery by post than they do to delivery by hand unless registered or recorded delivery is used. Hand delivering a standard document is also a more cost effective way of delivering. We are however making changes to the envelopes used for traffic consultations to reduce the risk that some residents may discard these without opening them.</p>
<p>20 mph zone on Cecil Road</p>	<p>When is the 20mph zone on Cecil Road going to be installed? It was agreed that flashing signs would be installed and timed to go on during school drop off and pick up.</p> <p>Submitted by Cait O’Riordan</p>	<p>Response to follow.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank



WINDOWFLOWERS

EST. 1947

Windowflowers Limited, Grove Road, Burnham, Slough SL1 8DT
Tel: 01628 667227 www.windowflowers.com

AGENDA ITEM 11

James Westrope
Chas Lowe Estate Agency
10 Church Hill Road
East Barnet
EN4 8TB

1st March 2017

Dear James

Further to your phone call earlier this afternoon, I have pleasure in submitting our proposal for your consideration.

Lighting Department Consents

To initially submitting Risk Assessments, Method Statements and details of our £10m public liability and employer's liability insurances, together with a statement of our qualifications and experience to the lighting department to help you to seek consent to hanging the baskets and brackets from their columns.

No additional charge

Supply of Brackets and Fixings

To supplying and delivering only **eighty** purpose made black vinyl coated hanging basket brackets and **forty** pairs of tensioned jubilee clips

£10.00 nett per bracket
£2.50 nett per jubilee clip

Installation of brackets

To attending site before mid-April to fix **eighty** hanging basket brackets using **forty** pairs of jubilee clips supplied above onto forty lamp columns

£10.00 nett per bracket



Rental of Summer Baskets

To rental of **eighty** large 450mm diameter hanging baskets, inclusive of installation onto the brackets on forty lamp columns in May/early June, planted with a dense display of seasonal flowering plants selected to maximise the floral impact for as long as possible until removal in late September/early October

£40.00 nett per basket

Maintenance of the Summer Baskets

To visiting as often as necessary between late May/early June and late September, to fully maintain **eighty** hanging baskets on forty columns, ensuring that they are always neat, healthy and in full colour

i.e. watering, feeding, spray-cleaning, pest and disease control, picking over and free replacement of any plants dying prematurely or outgrowing their position in any display, but excluding any plants stolen or vandalised

£30.00 per basket

Rental of Winter/Spring Baskets

To rental of **eighty** large 450mm diameter hanging baskets, inclusive of installation onto the brackets on the lamp columns in late September/early October, planted with a dense display of seasonal flowering plants and shrubs, selected to maximise the floral impact for as long a period as possible until removal in late May/early June

£40.00 nett per basket

Maintenance of the Winter/Springer Baskets

To visiting as often as necessary between late September/early October and late May/early June, to fully maintain eighty hanging baskets on forty columns, ensuring that they are always neat, healthy and in full colour

i.e. watering, feeding, spray-cleaning, pest and disease control, picking over and free replacement of any plants dying prematurely or outgrowing their position in any display, but excluding any plants stolen or vandalised

£20.00 per basket



Terms of Business

1. All prices quoted subject to VAT at the current rate.
2. 50% of charges payable with order, balance payable on day of installation.
4. All goods supplied under rental by Windowflowers Limited remain the property of the Company at all times and will be removed at the end of the contract period.
5. This Contract shall remain in force until terminated by either party in writing with a minimum of three months' notice, after an initial 12-month period.

About Us

Windowflowers is a family owned and managed horticultural nursery founded in 1947, specialising in the provision of plants and flowers to luxury hotels, offices and local authorities.

We have an eight acre nursery with 2.5 acres of glasshouses in which we grow over one million plants each year. We have a staff of eighty nurserymen, horticulturalists and florists and a fleet of thirty vans.

Current clients include Claridges Hotel, The Houses of Parliament, The Ritz Hotel, The headquarters of The Royal Horticultural Society and The Law Society.

We thank you for your valued enquiry and look forward to working with you.

Yours sincerely

Miles Watson-Smyth
Director
miles@windowflowers.com



On behalf of Chas Lowe Estate Agency, I instruct Windowflowers Ltd to proceed with the above work described in their letter of 1st March 2017 in line with their Terms of Business.

Signed.....

Name..... Email.....

Date..... Tel No.....

Do you operate a P/O system YES/NO

If yes, please enter the P/O No here:

Entity or Business name to be shown on the invoice:

.....

Invoices to be addressed and sent to (*accounts office address*):

.....

.....

We prefer to send our sales invoices to our customers by email. Please provide below the email address to which we should send our invoices and a contact telephone number.

Email Address.....

Accounts Tel No.....

Site Tel No.....

MW-S/KW