

<b><u>MEETING</u></b> <b>ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE</b>
<b><u>DATE AND TIME</u></b> <b>WEDNESDAY 15TH MARCH, 2017</b> <b>AT 6.30 PM</b>
<b><u>VENUE</u></b> <b>HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, LONDON NW4 4BQ</b>

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 - 8

This page is intentionally left blank

Question Number	Item Number	Raised by	Question Raised	Answer
1.	11	Mary O'Connor	<p><b><u>Playing Pitch Strategy</u></b></p> <p>Given that tennis was not included in Sport England's list of playing pitches, why were other outdoor sports' pitches not considered? Examples being netball, athletics, lawn bowls.</p> <p>The Playing Pitch Consultation Survey did not necessarily give the opportunity to comment. The survey did not permit questioning the sports to be included / excluded. Additionally, it did not permit comments on individual sites. Why?</p> <p>It would appear that the consultation was written to gain the desired results. Who wrote this consultation and are they qualified to do this to ensure the consultation was not biased?</p>	<p>The draft Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) was developed in accordance with the Sport England Guidance on the development of such strategies. There is no requirement within the guidance to include Netball, which is primarily an indoor sport, Bowls or Athletics</p> <p>Tennis and Gaelic Football are included in the draft PPS due to their significance within the area.</p> <p>The findings and proposals relative to individual sites and pitches were consulted on with the pitch providers and users during the development of the strategy.</p> <p>The more recent wider public consultation, developed in liaison with the Council's Consultation, Marketing and Engagement Team, gave individuals other than pitch providers and users the opportunity to comment on the proposals within the draft PPS. There was no prohibition on the making of comments on individual sites and a number of respondents made such responses.</p>
2.	12	Mary O'Connor	<p><b><u>Lip Funding</u></b></p> <p>Why is Barnet Council downgrading Dollis Valley Greenwalk for pedestrians in favour of cyclists? As this is the third section of DVGW to be converted to 'shared path' has an evaluation been</p>	<p>The Greenspaces Team is currently undertaking a consultation exercise regarding the proposed extension to the shared use network along Riverside Walk and Brookside Walk, to the benefit of both cyclists and pedestrians – offering them a safe place to cycle and providing them with a new wider pathway</p>

			<p>undertaken regarding the feasibility or not of converting all of DVGW for cycling? Are detailed designs available of how intersections of Dollis Valley Greenwalk and roads will be designed so that cyclists can cross them safely without having to dismount? If not, why not? If yes, are they available to the public?</p> <p>Why is cycling given preference over the pedestrian activities of walking, jogging and running when 26% of journeys origination in Barnet are by walking, in contrast to 1% for cycling? (£150,000 "<i>to better provide for cycle use</i>") Why are pedestrian paths being downgraded for pedestrians when cycling provision must also be provided on streets as these paths cannot be lit for ecology reasons? If £120,000 can be spent on "<i>Cycle Infrastructure provision</i>", why is many times more than this not being spent on pedestrian infrastructure provision as there are many more pedestrian journeys?</p>	<p>to walk. The consultation is available here; <a href="https://barnet.geovey.org/">https://barnet.geovey.org/</a>. The schemes are developed on a case by case basis as such no wider evaluation has been completed.</p> <p>We hold some more detailed designs which are available upon request (please email <a href="mailto:parks@barnet.gov.uk">parks@barnet.gov.uk</a> ), however at road crossings there will be signage informing cyclists to dismount.</p> <p>The LIP funding that would be used to fund these improvement schemes can only be utilised as the investment would be classed as improvement and enhancements to the pathways. If we were to simply replace them like for like this would be classed as maintenance and the LIP funding would not be a suitable funding solution.</p> <p>Cycling is not being prioritised over pedestrian activities as the proposed schemes offer shared and safe use for both users. Cycling in Barnet is low due to the lack of a safe cycling network and we see these schemes as a way to improve and increase cycling in Barnet. The pathways are not being downgraded as they would be upgraded to a safe surface for all users. The proposals do not include any plans to install lighting along Riverside Walk or Brookside Walk.</p> <p>No decision will be made regarding Riverside Walk or Brookside Walk until the results of the consultation have been collated. The consultation can be found at</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>the above web address and the Greenspaces Team will be on site near the play areas at the following times if anyone has further questions;  <u>Riverside Walk</u>  Wed 15 March 2-4pm  Thu 23 March 10-12am  <u>Brookside Walk</u>  Mon 20 March 2-4pm  Fri 24 March 2-4pm</p> <p>Additionally to the two schemes noted above, works have already started on site to widen an existing shared use footpath that runs through Whetstone Strays. The pathway is already designated for shared use, however it was only 1.2m wide and the guidance recommend a wider surface for shared use and as such we widening this pathway to 3m. As this pathway is already designated as shared use it did not warrant an additional consultation.</p>
3.	13	Mary O'Connor	<p><b><u>Footway Treatment Types</u></b></p> <p>Last winter was mild, but there were some frosty nights, one being 24th January. The new paving stones were exceptionally slippery, necessitating walking on the road. How can these be treated so there is not a repeat next winter and will alternative pavers be sourced to prevent a reoccurrence?</p> <p>Every driveway the whole width of the pavement is on a slant (camber) whereas previously two thirds of the pavement was level across</p>	<p>All materials used on the footways are compliant with British and European Standards. All public roads in the Borough have been prioritised for salt gritting during adverse winter weather conditions. Road category A and B roads and other roads such as main commuter routes, bus routes and roads providing access to emergency services and rail/underground stations have been classified as Priority 1 road network which are pre-treated when snow ice or frost may form, in accordance with the London Borough Barnet Winter Maintenance Plan. The remaining road and footway network have been</p>

			driveways. Why are vehicles given priority over pedestrians on pavements? Were pedestrians not considered when designing the footway treatment types?	categorised as Priority 2 and 3 and are normally post treated subject to resources being available to deal with snowfall or continued icy conditions. The cross fall from property boundary to edge of pavement to the road will govern the amount of slope provided for the cross fall across the pavement.
4	14	Mary O'Connor	<p><b><u>Footway Parking</u></b></p> <p>Footways are for pedestrians so why are the pedestrians who use the footway not consulted? Why only "all frontages in the road will be consulted"? Can signs also be placed along the road so that users of the footway are also consulted? Further, can at least 2 weeks of the consultation period be during school term time to give those encouraged to walk to school the opportunity to comment on the proposal? Wing mirrors on cars are head height for some children. For Health and Wellbeing students are encouraged to walk to school, so can within 200m of a school be categorised as "high footfall" requiring a minimum 2.0m width?</p>	The aim of this exercise is to ensure that pedestrians can safely use the footway by removing obstructive or illegal footway parking. It therefore follows that pedestrians would be in favour of the proposals. Frontages will be consulted as they will be the ones more affected by the proposed measures. Where possible the Council will aim to retain a minimum footway width to balance both the needs of pedestrians and residents' parking.

**Environment Committee – 15 March 2017**

Item No	Public Comment Request
7. Motion from Full Council	Philip Davis
6. Members Item - Donoghue waste management and skip hire – Councillor – Alon Or-bach	Lisa Pate
6. Members Item - Hire of parks, green spaces and other council premises – Councillor Agnes Slocombe	Pam Edwards
6. Members Item Cllr Dr Devra Kay - Parking of large vans that turn residential streets with no parking restrictions into car parks	Derek Bluston
11. Playing Pitch Strategy 2017/2022	Mary O'Connor
12. 2017/18 Local Implementation Plan (LIP) Work Programme	Mary O'Connor
15. Highways Planned Maintenance Programme 2017/18	Myk Tucker

<b>Ward Members Request</b>	
7. Motion from Full Council	<b>Ward Member - Councillor Grover</b>
6. Members Item - Hire of parks, green spaces and other council premises – Councillor Agnes Slocombe	<b>Ward Member - Councillor Coakley Webb</b>
<b>6.</b> Donoghue waste management and skip hire	<b>Councillor Ryde</b>

Public Comment and Ward Members (3 minutes per comment)