

<p><u>MEETING</u></p> <p>ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE</p>
<p><u>DATE AND TIME</u></p> <p>MONDAY 21ST JANUARY, 2019</p> <p>AT 7.00 PM</p>
<p><u>VENUE</u></p> <p>HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, LONDON NW4 4BQ</p>

Dear Councillors,

Please find enclosed additional Public Questions and Comments.

Item No	Title of Report	Pages
1.	PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS (IF ANY)	3 - 34

This page is intentionally left blank

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

Qn No	Item No	Raised by	Question Raised	Answer
1	10	Heron Shamash	It was made abundantly clear that an extension of CPZ hours would not resolve the parking stress on these local roads and would only serve to give church goers tacit agreement to park on these roads should they live within the FN zone or receive visitors vouchers from members of the congregation that do. So much so that the previous process of doing so was reversed. Why are we back to implementing a plan that none of the affect parties want or desire, is this a revenue generating exercise on behalf of the council?	<p>This is a new proposal that creates a mini zone in time only for the named roads. There is no reason to believe that this proposal would generate additional revenue compared to other proposals – this is an experimental scheme that can be adjusted if experience demonstrates that this is required</p> <p>There is no supporting evidence that there will be a significant level of drivers from the rest of the FN zone coming to park in the three roads. No similar situations are noted that arise at other locations within the Borough which might justify this action pre-emptively. Traffic management orders are required to be based on evidenced traffic management need. The proposal as stands will allow for this suggestion to be checked and the appropriate action taken if an issue</p>
2	10	Anna and Niall Soutar	If Option 2 is implemented then can this include the change of shared Pay and Display - Resident Bays to Resident Only Bays?	This could be considered.
3	10	Maria Byrne	When does Barnet intend to notify residents and consult on the CPZ changes for the micro zone or otherwise on Highwood & Limes Avenues and	It is the Council's intention to advertise an experimental Traffic Management Order (TMO) at the earliest opportunity, with this likely coming into effect around March this year. The

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			Fredericks Place e?	experimental TMO forms the consultation and any comment on its implementation will be considered at the end of the period or earlier if appropriate.
4	10	Vivienne Peters	Do we the residents have no rights over the overdevelopment of our tiny area of N12? More and more people are putting in driveways and getting rid of their front gardens. This also is a huge environmental issue for drainage and loss of green gardens which process carbon monoxide gas and other pollutants.	<p>The Council has a crossover policy concerning the conservation of frontages to allow for private parking spaces which was agreed at Environment Committee on 13th September 2018 and specifically deals with the issue of drainage:</p> <p>https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s48395/Draft%20Barnet%20Domestic%20Crossover%20Policy.pdf</p> <p>This policy takes into account grass verges and specifies appropriate materials that must be used to protect the wider environment and to protect against flood risk.</p>
5	7	Mr Levey	Re engine idling, what is LBB's assessment of several other Councils' progress in allocating a role to Civil Enforcement Officers, in particular Camden's experience that even during the phase when CEOs could only request that engines be switched off, "the vast majority of motorists responded well to this" (Camden idling press release 13/3/18)?	The Council strongly supports moves to tackle engine idling. We wish to carry out further work before concluding if enforcement action is the best approach to tackle the issue in Barnet.

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

6	10	Dinta Rawson	How will this stop those church attendees with FN permits?	<p>The measures will not stop those with FN permits from parking in the three streets. However, it has not been evidenced that the Church will be an attractor of vehicles from the wider FN area to any significant extent. Surveys will take place during the period this is implemented and if it is noted that a high level of parking arises from vehicles from outside the three roads and adjacent roads from permitted vehicles, this can inform any further changes.</p> <p>There is also a wider review of the FN zone taking place which could consider splitting the zone into two or more zones which would prevent some in-zone commuting for all areas.</p>
7	10	Heron Shamash	Why has the discussed and agreed plan of a zone within a zone been reneged on?	<p>The zone within a zone was a proposal made as a result of the members item brought to committee As is appropriate legal advice was sought with regards to the implementation of the proposal and, as set out in the report, it was found that giving the residents of the three roads a unique arrangement was not recommended as it failed to meet a justifiable traffic management aim.</p> <p>Options were put to Ward Members for consideration, however it was not possible to reach a consensus which would allow an option to be taken forward by the Strategic</p>

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

				Director of Environment (to whom the decision to implement was delegated by the Committee).
8	10	Anna and Niall Soutar	If Option 2 is implemented and during the 'experimental' period of its implementation, it is found to be inadequate - due to Influx of church parking from FN permit holders from the wider zone - can this be reviewed with a view to then consider and implement Option 3?	If this situation was to arise then there could be the option to look at alternatives and the experimental nature of the scheme would allow for a faster change process.
9	10	Maria Byrne	Why has Barnet not consulted and notified residents of the likelihood of implementing an urgent TMO to put into effect the above change, when Barnet know that it is vehemently opposed (as with the changes which were withdrawn last year) without further protections, and any reasons why this could not be put in place before any without notice proposal which assists nobody except producing additional revenue?;	The report to Committee is providing a public forum for consideration of the matter before it is taken to an experimental TMO. The need to bring something in rapidly to benefit residents is the reason for the experimental TMO. There is not anticipated to be any additional revenue of a significant level and the cost of additional enforcement will likely outweigh that.
10	7	Mr Levy	Will LBB conduct a trial of any such role, whether with or without the issue of FPNs?	We wish to carry out further work before concluding what is the best approach to tackle the issue of engine idling in Barnet.

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

11	10	Heron Shamash	If a microzone within the FN zone is difficult administratively or legally why can't the Microzone be created and visitor vouchers for FN supplied to each of the households of the 3 roads free of charge. 365 vouchers per car per household? This would mitigate the adverse impact of the church relocation.	It is a little difficult to see how this proposed option has any greater benefit to residents in the three roads than option two as described in the Committee report which effectively achieves the same outcome of all FN residents sharing equal status. Officers feel that option 2 is the most appropriate and fair option for all residents within the FN Zone.
12	10	Anna and Niall Soutar	If after the experimental period for Option 2 and if it is found not to be adequate to protect resident parking bays, would Barnet re-consider Option 3 (along the lines of an additional paper permit)?	See the response to question 8.
13	10	Maria Byrne	How does Barnet propose to consult on the other wide ranging parking restrictions in a huge area, the result of which seems to mean that Barnet will be the only winner in terms of revenue;	See question 6.
14	7	Mr Levy	What assessments have been done on the relative cost-benefits of any of the different mitigational and educational activities in the Air Quality report?	We use the Draft GLA air quality matrix which looks at the cost benefits of the Air quality action plan measures. The action plan contains simple cost benefit/ mitigation effectiveness information.

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

15	10	Heron Shamash	Are there any other examples of an auditorium of events venue with a congregation of 500+ people been approved by Barnet council in recent times without the provision of any parking?	No planning permission has been granted in the past three years for event venues accommodation 500 plus people without provision of parking spaces.
16	10	Maria Byrne	What are the reasons for Barnet refusing to implement the decision of 13 September 2018 - to create a micro zone for the 3 roads whilst permitting these residents to park in the wider FN zone as an experimental basis (Option 3 in the Report)?	See response to question 7.
17	7	Mr Levy	What assessments have been done on the relative cost-benefits of improving Environmental Health response times to illegal or nuisance smoke incidents?	EH have a reasonably quick response times for dark smoke incidents of four hours-one day this is because of the increased effect on lungs from darker smoke which is more toxic. The white smoke bonfires are far less toxic and harder to prove a nuisance as need to see visible smoke directly affecting habitable premises to prove nuisance. Therefore a lower enforcement policy priority with a longer response time of 3 days unless the incident is a regularly recurring statutory nuisance.
18	10	Maria Byrne	Given the decision was published, and residents informed that Option 3 would be implemented how can Barnet be permitted to unilaterally without due	See the response to question 7.

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			notice or consultation (as required by the planning decision and to ensure fair treatment of residents) propose to implement Option 2 which is materially different to Option 3, includes no protection for residents of the 3 roads (like increasing the number of residents bays using the shared pay & & display bays meaning it is simply is a money earner for Barnet. Also, as Barnet will be aware is the very experimental scheme that the Council wanted to implement last year and had to abort, so how can Barnet now seek to re-impose this on a few residents (being the very residents that are having their amenity lost by the parking issues associated with St Barnabas)?	
19	7	Mr Levy	At November's meeting, the Strategic Director of Environment admitted expecting some increase in fly-tipping from the proposed new waste charges, so it is reasonable to suspect some increase in smoke from bonfires/backyard burning also. What will LBB do to monitor the extent of increase, or any indicators of an increase, e.g. callouts?	There has been an increase in fly tipping around communal waste facilities, but evidence to show an increase in bonfires.

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

20	10	Maria Byrne	If Option 2 were to be implemented as an experimental order / TMO, and which could only be after consultation and on condition that the additional residents bays are secured by changing at least 8 out of the 11 pay & display shared bays to residents only, how will Barnet monitor whether this is in effect any help to the parking issues when St Barnabas increases its numbers to over 500 once the auditorium is built?	<p>An experimental TMO can be implemented without consultation, as comments within the experimental period constitute consultation, with any required changes being made prior to the experimental order becoming permanent</p> <p>We intend to check on the level of permit holders from outside the three streets and immediately adjacent streets (who it would not be unreasonable to expect to park in these streets from time to time and are highly unlikely to be there other than to park near their home) to check whether there is any basis in fact to the suggestion that there will be a significant level of in zone commuting.</p>
21	11	Mr Levy	Approximately how many bus stops are expected to be individually resurfaced in 2019/20, whether the whole bus stop or a large portion of one, excluding where as part of a whole stretch of road being resurfaced?	The 2019/20 resurfacing programme is being discussed with TfL through our Local Implementation Programme to agree funding levels. We will be prioritising that funding on a condition basis related to individual bus stops.
22	10	Maria Byrne	Option 2 would be unworkable without further changes, such as all shared pay & display / residents bays being available as residents only. This is because after 5pm residents rely on parking on the single yellow lines on Highwood which means around 6-8 cars parking on yellow lines. Where does Barnet intend for these residents who have	It seems possible that there are some vehicles parking after the end of parking controls presently who are not resident permit holders. These will not be able to do so after the changes take place. The suggestions around conversion of the pay and display parking could if implemented also improve this issue further. The capacity will be monitored during the experimental period.

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			paid for a residents parking permit park?	
23	11	Mr Levy	Approximately how much total funding will this represent?	Funding is currently being discussed with TfL.
24	11	Mr Levy	I understand a review was being conducted of materials for resurfacing rutted bus stops. When is such resurfacing expected to re-commence?	Works will resume once funding has been confirmed by TfL.
25	11	Mr Levy	What is being done to prevent repeats of last year's saga of the former Castle Pub bus stop, Childs Hill, where rutting had progressed to such an extreme state the nearside lane had to be closed and the bus stop relocated downhill for several weeks?	The Council has a Highways safety inspection regime whereby defects such as these are reported and remedial works commissioned on a case by case basis
26	10	Maria Byrne	By its conduct to refuse to implement option 3, and now refuse to consult and notify before any further options are considered, how is Barnet adhering to its own regulations on the very reason the CPZ were introduced being "to assist the Council in meeting its key parking objectives: • Prioritise the parking needs of local residents	See the answer to question 7.

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the safe and efficient flow of traffic, and • Ensure that parking regulations are fairly implemented.”? 	
27	10	Maria Byrne	<p>In relation to Barnet’s Parking Policy why has Barnet not implemented Option 3 under its powers authority as re: “Section 6 - Parking Control (p 21)?</p> <p>“Parking control within the Borough is vital, ensuring the road network is used efficiently. The Council will;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · manage parking regimes for new developments · apply on-street parking management and controls appropriately · consider introducing new Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) were appropriate.” 	See the answer to question 7
28	9	Mary O'Connor	<p>The appendices for item 9 were not placed online until after 10am last Wednesday, 16th January, which meant that it was after the time to submit public questions and Requests to Speak according to the Constitution’s Public Participation and Engagement Rules. It was also too late to comply to Barnet Council’s constitution. Why is item 9 still on the agenda?</p>	<p>The schedule for preparation of the LIP document set out in the statutory guidance issued is for submission of the final draft LIP to Transport for London (for Mayoral Approval) by 16 February 2019. This necessitates bringing the LIP to the 21st January Environment Committee. Post consultation revisions were still being completed up until the 15th January. Therefore it was unfortunately not possible to publish the document at the same time as the other Environment Committee reports.</p>

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

29	9	Mary O'Connor	<p>Why was a Site of Specific Scientific Interest in the borough (Welsh Harp) not mentioned in “4.11 Natural Capital and Natural Environment” ?</p>	<p>The Council recognises the Welsh Harp as a significant site. However, at a strategic level, the possible effects on European protected sites are the only ones that are considered potentially significant.</p> <p>A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SAE) includes a scoping stage that involves consultation with the Strategic Environmental Bodies regarding the baseline and scope of the assessment. Natural England were the relevant body identified in this case. Natural England did not ask for a broader scope in terms of sites and did not suggest that the approach undertaken was not adequate in relation to these sites.</p> <p>As stated in the relevant section, the identified sites are those identified as European sites:</p> <p>http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/category/652847166</p>
----	---	---------------	---	--

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

				4689152
30	9	Mary O'Connor	As there are many 'Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation' (SINC) in the borough, should they not also be listed in "4.11 Natural Capital and Natural Environment", particularly as some of the works planned in this LIP are within SINC's? Similarly, why is there no mention of Green Chains and the effect some of the planned works in this LIP will have on them? And the effect on the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land in the borough?	As per the response above. In addition; these sites have not been identified specifically in the SEA. However , potential and existing off-road paths may be within or near borough level SINC's and may require mitigation as proposals develop.
31	9	Mary O'Connor	The three overarching Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) outcomes: 1) Healthy Streets and healthy people, including traffic reduction strategies 2) A good public transport experience and 3) New homes and jobs, do not cover footpaths through SINC's that are also Metropolitan Walks and include the Capital Ring and London Loop. There is also Dollis Valley Greenwalk which is a link between these two. There are also other footpaths being similarly converted to cycling. How is it that the MTS requires these paths to be converted from footpaths through SINC's to	The MTS does not require any specific route to be converted to permit cycling. The focus on off-road routes at least in the early stages is a Borough choice which supports leisure proposals as well.

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			transport corridors to include cycling?	
32	9	Mary O'Connor	In Table 7, there was a LIP project, “Dollis Valley cycle route bridge widening (x2)”. In my response to this consultation I queried whether this was on Dollis Valley Greenwalk (DVGW) and which of the bridges were planned to be widened (replaced). In the final Draft LIP they are still referred to in the same way. Are these bridges on Dollis Valley Greenwalk and which bridges are they? Will they be completely replaced or just ‘widened’ and to what width? When widened will they have bollards to protect pedestrians as stated in Mayor Boris’ answer to a question by Andrew Dismore when a new bridge was built over Dollis Brook previously?	The bridges are the Lovers Walk bridge and the adjacent Oakdene Park bridge. The proposal involves replacement of the entire bridge deck / parapets and work to the abutments with a wider bridge provided as part of that. The new bridges will be 2.55m wide between parapets (an increase on the current bridges which are 1.675m wide).
33	9	Mary O'Connor	In Table 7, two of the LIP projects are Cycle/pedestrian route lighting improvements at Pursley Road-Copthall and Sunny Hill Park. In the area of Copthall there are protected species including bats. How is it justified to have lit cycle/pedestrian routes through this area and still maintain the dark areas required for bats? Why will	Both of these routes are already lit. The proposal is to improve the existing lighting with the use of more modern light fittings that provide increased control of light distribution. The Council will ensure that the proposed lighting scheme is in compliance with the ‘Code of Practice’ recommendations for lighting footpaths/cycleways and that any specific industry recommendations/guidance is fully considered. In this case

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			the lit route go through Sunny Hill Park when an alternative quiet streets option is possible using nearby streets, which will not have a detrimental effect on wildlife? What lighting of paths will be permitted in Cophall given its importance for nature?	the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance document PLG04 will be relevant as it provides guidance on considerations related to people, fauna, flora and landscape.
34	9	Mary O'Connor	In Section 5.2 Alternatives, why has the option of cycleways on quiet streets not been investigated rather than downgrading footpaths for pedestrians and SINC's for nature conservation? There are quite street alternatives running parallel to Dollis Valley Greenwalk for cycling. These are also lit so can be used 24 hours a day. They also have better visibility at intersections than DVGW. DVGW was pedestrian-only and sections have been changed to permit cycling but these are not to London Cycling Design Standards and have been to the detriment of pedestrians and the SINC's. Why not use quiet streets instead of DVGW?	As identified in the relevant paragraph, in the context of LIPs delivering the policies and proposals already identified in the MTS, it can be assumed that the only real reasonable alternative to the LIP proposals is the "do-nothing" scenario and as such it was not intended to manufacture other alternatives simply for comparison in the SEA. The LIP identifies provision of cycle routes in a range of locations in broad terms, including both on and off-street provision. The plans for short term provision are generally proposals where scheme development and delivery plans are well advanced and these do tend to be mainly off road or quiet road routes. The only specific proposals related to the Dollis Valley Green Walk, however, is the bridge proposal identified.

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

35	9	Mary O'Connor	<p>The TfL Factsheet for Barnet (http://content.tfl.gov.uk/barnet-june-2017.pdf) has 26% of journeys are walking (does this include all pedestrians? If so, please name it as pedestrians, not walking.) Only 1% are by cycle. Combined with this are pedestrian activities to improve health and well-being, which are available to many more people than cycling. Cycling requires skill, equipment, ability to maintain the equipment or afford a cycle to be maintained. Why does this LIP document not provide funding for pedestrian-only paths and public conveniences to permit more people to be active with the most available physical activity - pedestrian activities (walking, jogging and running)?</p>	<p>Our understanding is that the London Travel Demand Survey on which TfL's figures will be based includes running and other forms of pedestrian activity as well as walking. (This was specifically checked in relation to the LIP targets). However, we are not responsible for the content of TfL's fact sheet.</p> <p>There are many pedestrian only paths and pavements in the borough, and the LIP includes proposals for improvements to these as well as cycling improvements. Separate work is taking place regarding public convenience provision.</p>
36	9	Mary O'Connor	<p>How can Matrix 6 and 7 be assessed as "unlikely to have any direct impacts in this respect" for the objective, "To protect, connect and enhance London's natural capital (including important habitats, species and landscapes) and the services and benefits it provides, delivering a net positive outcome for biodiversity" ?</p>	<p>Based on the information on proposals available, we believe this statement to be true. Detailed design for proposals may allow this objective to be achieved.</p> <p>Matrix 6 and Matrix 7 consider the long-term and short term proposals overall. These are set out in general terms in the LIP. The assessments "unlikely to have any direct impacts" and "unlikely to have any direct effect" are made in relation to</p>

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

				specific assessment guide questions.
37	9	Mary O'Connor	My submission to this LIP consultation was reduced to a basic “summary” which covered little of my submission. It would appear that some responses were a “summary of response” and others were the “response”. While I would not expect all I wrote to be included, the summary did not include my concerns. I addressed what was specific to the LIP3 Plan in the replacement of two footbridges, but the summary did not include reasons for retaining the present bridges, or, my concerns if these replacements were to occur. Other issues were included. There was also the need for correct terminology (pedestrians - not just walkers; paths for both pedestrians and cyclists - not “shared paths”), the need to consider the interaction of pedestrians (foot strike) and cyclists (wheels rolling over) on a path surface and how forcing cycleways on Dollis Valley Greenwalk (DVGW) had negatively impacted on pedestrians and the natural environment. There is a need to maintain dark corridors for nature, rather than lighting them for cyclists. I also	<p>The consultation response focussed very heavily on the replacement of two bridges on a route that is already identified as for use by both pedestrians and cyclists. Other comments related in large part to previous work on that route, but as such did not seem to be directly relevant to the LIP itself.</p> <p>The bridge replacement scheme has been developed using LIP funding over a number of years and questions regarding the need for the bridge replacement, as well as wider issues regarding the use of paths in parks for both pedestrians and cyclists have been responded to comprehensively on earlier occasions.</p> <p>The LIP itself does not refer to “shared paths” as far as we are aware. This was a comment in the consultation response related to a previous consultation undertaken for previous work on paths in the area</p>

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			highlighted the need to not only consider travel but also the health, well-being and enjoyment benefits of footpaths, in particular DVGW, London Loop, Capital Ring and other Metropolitan Walks, and protecting the natural environment that DVGW passes through (SINCs, MOL and GB). Why was my response reduced to so little?	
--	--	--	--	--

Public Comment –Item number	Agenda Title	Name	Public Comment submitted in writing
------------------------------------	---------------------	-------------	--

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

<p>Item 10</p>	<p>Update Report - North Finchley Controlled Parking Zone</p>	<p>Syed Naqvi Roi Lustik-Cohen Mr Naqvi</p>	
<p>10</p>	<p>Update Report – North Finchley Controlled Parking Zone</p>	<p>Anna and Niall Soutar</p>	<p>It is our understanding that only “Option 2” will be given consideration at the committee meeting on 21/1/19.</p> <p>The Option 2 proposal appears to be very similar to the (aborted) experimental scheme that the Council wanted to implement last year. This previous scheme was to extend the CPZ hours but in a much wider area of the FN Zone. There was also going to be a change implemented whereby the shared pay and display/residents, bays in Highwood Avenue would become resident only bays. After much objection from the wider community, Barnet aborted/suspended the whole scheme.</p> <p>It is our understanding that if Barnet now implements Option 2, this would mean an extension to the CPZ hours but in three roads only (Highwood Avenue, Limes Avenue, Frederick’s Place). However, there does not appear to be the provision to change the shared bays in Highwood Avenue to resident bays only.</p> <p>Approximately a third (11 bays) of the parking bays in Highwood Avenue are shared Pay and Display / Resident Bays. There are not enough resident only bays for the number of properties in Highwood Avenue. It is therefore crucial</p>

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			<p>that if Option 2 is to be implemented then the change to the Pay and Display Bays must also be included. Barnet had proposed this change in its previous (aborted) scheme. This is a residential area and there is no need for Pay and Display bays in Highwood when there are not enough Resident Only bays. There is Pay and Display provision along the main High Road.</p> <p><u>Comment</u> Option 2 does not protect our resident bays from parking by visitors to the church that hold FN permits.</p> <p><u>Comment</u> We appreciate that Option 3 is a far more complex scheme which would involve a change to resident permits and not just signage. This may be a reason why Barnet has refused to implement the decision of the committee (13/9/18) for the agreed Option 3. Residents of the three roads already hold electronic FN resident parking permits which all are renewable at different times. If Option 3 were to be re-considered and implemented, in the future, these residents would need a new resident permit for the “micro zone”. In practice, it may be difficult to make changes to the issuing of the electronic permit system. Another way to differentiate residents’ vehicles of these three roads would be to simply issue a paper permit which residents could display. This would be in addition to their FN e-resident permit.</p>
--	--	--	--

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

10	Update Report – North Finchley Controlled Parking Zone	Heron Shamash	<p>Against the wishes of local residents the church has been granted permission to operate from Solar House. We were contented by the assurances that a suitable traffic management plan would be put in place that would mitigate any impact regarding amenities of the local residents. A plan of a Micro-zone was proposed that would have satisfied the residents and agreed to, which is now being reneged on, by the exact people who are employed to safeguard our interests in such matters.</p> <p>Extending CPZ hours does not work as many of the Church congregation hold FN permits and visitors vouchers. All that would happen is that they would be given tacit approval to park on our roads ruining our quality of life. Conversely, we would need to spend more on visitors vouchers as our guests would face the same restrictions as to when they can park. In my case, I already use the 200 vouchers available to me and I can not purchase more, meaning our way of life will be severely impacted. Even if I could, the cost of them would effectively represent a "church tax" which I would unjustifiably would have to pay.</p> <p>I know of no other application for a 500+ auditorium or events stadium that has</p>

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			<p>been supported through the planning process with a nil parking provision. This problem has been forced on us and the least we can expect if a fair and reasonable solution to mitigate our concerns. We all know what that is and that is an inclusive micro zone. It should be supported by Barnet council, who supposedly are at the service of its residents.</p> <p>The council are renegeing on their duty under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. On approving the application we were assured a suitable parking plan would be put in place. But nobody in the council is listening to the advice of those that live with the day to day consequences. Extending CPZ hours do nothing to resolve the problem and only complicate the situation further. We should be listened to as we understand the problem better than anyone else. We live with it.</p>
--	--	--	---

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

<p>10</p>	<p>Update Report – North Finchley Controlled Parking Zone</p>	<p>Maria Byrne</p>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>Highwood Avenue was argued by Barnet in considering the planning applications on either side of it to be a “residential area with Edwardian houses north of Finchley town centre”</p> <p>Highwood Avenue has 38 houses (2 of which are divided into 2 flats each)</p> <p>Parking allocation in Highwood Avenue:</p> <p>26 residents bays</p> <p>11 shared residents / pay & display bays</p> <p>So at any one time there is pressure on parking, given that 1/3 of Highwood is shared with pay & display.</p> <p>Barnet’s arguments relating to a precedent to protect residents’ ability to park is to compare it to the ‘underground station’ or Finchley town centre.</p> <p>Clearly this is a completely different set of circumstances where Barnet has permitted a venue (St Barnabas) with a potential of 500+ people attending multiple times on a Sunday not to require any parking allocation to be provided</p>
-----------	---	--------------------	---

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			<p>by St Barnabas; but able to park on a residential road adjacent to the venue.</p> <p>It is incumbent on Barnet where (a) it permitted planning on conditions of a parking consultation, (b) has a s106 agreement in place with St Barnabas with a £50k allocation for parking consultation, (c) a decision was approved with legal advice and input from the Barnet officer in charge, and (d) already has the experience of having to withdraw the changes imposed without notice in August/September 2018, to work with the residents to trial a workable experimental order giving proper notice and consulting with the residents affected by this.</p> <p>There are not enough resident only bays for the number of properties in Highwood Avenue in any event. The proportion of pay & display to residents bays is totally out of synch for a residential area with ample nearby pay & display along the High Road.</p> <p>Regardless of any proposed option, Barnet should change with immediate effect at least 75% of the shared pay & display / residents bays to become resident only bays.</p> <p><u>Comment</u> Whilst Option 3 may be a more complex scheme this is not ‘unique’ as a similar method as is used at Saracens could be implemented by a ‘residents only past this sign’ at the weekends, for example.</p>
--	--	--	--

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>In proposing Option 2, Barnet has not taken into account that Highwood Avenue has 11 shared pay and display/residents bays in Highwood Avenue thereby permitting the continued use of over 1/3 of Highwood to continue to park notwithstanding the increased hours of the CPZ. So Option 2 as it stands will only serve to be a huge detriment to the residents and revenue earning for Barnet which is unfair treatment of this group, inequitable and open to challenge in the courts.</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>On Sunday for example, I counted 7 cars attending the evening service at St Barnabas. About 1/2 hour later, coincidentally, I received (a) I received 2 notes from neighbours who were afraid to move their cars that day for fear of not being able to park when they got home, (b) a note about a distressed nurse trying to attend a medical emergency of a resident in Highwood but could not find any nearby parking, (c) asked an able bodied woman who came out of St Barnabas and got into her car why she was not following the faith travel plan, whose answer was 'I don't care'. I spoke to representatives of St Barnabas who said their view was it was for Barnet to put the restrictions to make sure their congregation could not park on Highwood.</p>
--	--	--	---

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

<p>10</p>	<p>Update Report – North Finchley Controlled Parking Zone</p>	<p>Carole and Bernie Nyman</p>	<p>We are appalled that the decision to implement a micro-zone agreed at the committee meeting on 13 September 2018 is now to be ignored, without so much as consultation with those directly affected. We cannot believe that this is the right and proper thing for the Council to do. We still believe that the micro zone for the three most affected streets (Highwood, Limes and Fredericks), giving us also wider access to the rest of the FN controlled zone, is the proper way forward.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Update Report – North Finchley Controlled Parking Zone</p>	<p>Vivienne Peters</p>	<p>I am writing to you to register my comments to the proposed changes to the CPZ timings for the three specified roads as set out in the above mentioned report. Before making these comments, I would remind the Council of their duty under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, and in particular the paragraph “to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway etc.” When considering the planning application, this was never just about the impact of a Sunday congregation and the related parking issues, the removal of St Barnabas Church to the High Road, was always about the removal of community activities to Solar House, operating seven days per week and the associated traffic and parking. I am sending two photographs separately to you illustrating my point. These were billboards outside Solar House as building work was being undertaken. So the comment in the Council’s Report (21 January 2019) Section 3.8 “in accordance with the legislation it is felt that it would need to be shown that ‘residents’ in the wider</p>

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			<p>zone will cause a substantial amount of the excessive parking when attending the church. It is not felt that this is likely to be the case, with the nature of the new church, seeing an expected congregation coming from a wider area than the FN CPZ”. Section 3.9 also has not taken into account the level of activities as promised by the Church itself.</p> <p>I have lived in Highwood Avenue for nearly 40 years and more recently, have been surrounded by massive developments which already have had an adverse impact on the ability of residents to park in their own street, but not necessarily near to their particular homes. Barnet Council has shown its inability to stop parking from the new flats at 931 High Road’s development which was part of the planning agreement with residents of nearby roads. I am aware that the Council has already been advised of this.</p> <p>From Friday after 5pm through to a Monday morning, we, the residents and family members/friends attempting to visit over the weekend, seem to have no rights as set out in my first paragraph under the said Act. This has been made much worse since the opening of St Barnabas’s Church. I returned home this past Sunday at 5.34 pm only to end up parking in Woodside Avenue; I am in my early 70s and in need of a knee and hip replacement and have deliberately not applied for a Disabled parking place outside my home as I am hoping that surgery will resolve my personal health problems. In addition to last Sunday’s experience, I met a District Nurse desperately trying to find a parking place as she had an emergency call in Highwood Avenue (5.45pm); even the single</p>
--	--	--	---

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			<p>yellow lines on the corner turning in the middle of Highwood Avenue were parked bumper to bumper. This is no coincidence since the Church took up residence. I believe that the Council’s departments for Parking and Environment were not aware of the size of the operation and services to be offered by the Church. Why was this when the Church was clearly advertising a very comprehensive set of services?</p> <p>With regard to the options for CPZ change being proposed by Barnet Council to “MANAGE” the parking issues which we the residents are suffering through no fault of our own, my preference would be for Option 3 (minute 1.16.3) with the residents of all three roads being allowed extra visitors’ parking vouchers so that our visitors can park at the weekends. I do agree with the comment of Heron Shamash (Limes Avenue) that such revenues from visitors’ permits are a “tax” which is completely unfair considering that this parking congestion mess is not of our making. From the minutes of 21 January 2019, it would appear that the Council is pushing for Option 2 (minute 1.16.2) however, this takes away our right to park within the FN area which would be another added hardship and COST. We, in the three roads, whatever we say to the Council, are hugely disadvantaged through no fault of our own which again breaches the principles of the Act as quoted in para 1. of this response.</p> <p>It also is iniquitous given St. Barnabas’s position on the corner of Highwood Avenue that we still have pay and display parking spaces when there are plenty of these on the High Road itself. This adds to the problems of being able to park</p>
--	--	--	--

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			<p>legally as it removes multiple spaces. Speaking for myself, I do not remove my car at weekends unless it is critical in order to keep a parking space. I return home in the dark using a taxi.</p> <p>In conclusion, I ask a serious question (<i>ADDED ABOVE</i>). Do we the residents have no rights over the overdevelopment of our tiny area of N12? More and more people are putting in driveways and getting rid of their front gardens. This also is a huge environmental issue for drainage and loss of green gardens which process carbon monoxide gas and other pollutants.</p>
10	Update Report – North Finchley Controlled Parking Zone	Veronica Bruton	I support the views put forward by Maria Byrne of Highwood Avenue in her emails regarding the parking situation in Limes Avenue, Highwood Avenue & Fredericks Place and I will attend the meeting on Monday 21 January.
10	Update Report – North Finchley Controlled Parking Zone	Dinta Rawson	<p>I write in objection to the committee’s decision to now implement an extended hours CPZ on the neighbouring roads to the church despite the committee agreeing to implement the micro zone at the previous committee?</p> <p>The committee has to consider the significant impact the Church has had on the local residents since its opening on Sunday with no parking available for local residents as the church attendees continue to ignore signs and the stewards and park on the roads leaving the residents significantly impacted!</p> <p>The residents STRONGLY OBJECTED to the planning permission for this to be built given the experience of the residents at the previous site who openly</p>

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			<p>documented the issues they experienced with the church attendees.</p> <p>I understand you now what to go ahead with implementing an extended hours CPZ on the neighbouring roads as you probably recognise that there is an issue and simply want to implement the easiest option but will continue a have a detrimental impact on the residents as we will have to spend more money on visitors vouchers for friends and family who visit us.</p> <p>Are the council going to compensate us for this?</p> <p>But the key question for the committee is how will this stop those church attendees with FN permits?</p> <p>Highwood Avenue is already over occupied as the number of resident bays does not cover all households - and this is not only exacerbated by the church attendees now but (let's not forget) the council's breach in condition on the Berkeley Homes development where permits were issued to residents and visitors continue to park on Highwood Avenue!</p> <p>Please voice my comments and questions to the committee.</p>
10	Update Report – North Finchley Controlled Parking Zone	Maria Byrne	<p>Barnet's excuse seems to be not to create a precedent or challenge. However, it is not true that this is "unique" or "something no other permit holders have". Barnet is required to operate the permit parking system "on the basis of reciprocity", and the fact that 3 small roads should have to accept the invasion</p>

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			<p>on a daily and weekly basis of what may be 100s cars is totally unfair.</p> <p>Further, there was a consultation for a micro zone in East Finchley, which was not implemented and Barnet could have considered to make the 3 Roads a 'Permit holders past this point' areas as one road is a cul-de-sacs and the other is a small chicane of 2 roads with (usually) little or no through traffic. The main outside traffic is in fact the Barnet parking enforcement car traffic. This also would allow permit holders to park as they would usually, rather than be limited to parking bays and thereby giving some flexibility.</p> <p>Such 'Permit Holders Past this point' restrictions were introduced at Saracens for an Event Day Parking Zone for use by residents or visitors with vouchers. Therefore, there is a precedent that could be adopted on a smaller scale.</p> <p>The above option is supported by the legislative framework (section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984) quoted by Barnet in the report because as required, it deals with the issues and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) “securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises; and (ii) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected.” <p>Therefore, there is a clear traffic management basis for the proposal for Option 3 and any “challenge” can be dealt with in the consultation given this is only an experimental order. The principals that are repeatable within similar contexts can be taken from the Saracens plan and the proposed plan in East Finchley (which</p>
--	--	--	---

Procedure for Questions and Comments at Committees

At the committee meetings a time period of up to 30 minutes, is available for public questions and comments in total. Public comments will be received by the Committee before supplementary questions are asked. Where a resident has submitted more than one question, their second item or question will be considered after all other residents have asked their first supplementary question. Supplementary questions will continue to be asked in this way until there are no further questions or 30 minutes has elapsed.

			was not implemented).
10	Update Report – North Finchley Controlled Parking Zone	Ishpal Anand	<p>1. Due to the proposed restrictions friends and families of residents will not be willing to come and visit. I believe this would make the lives of elderly residents (one of whom is my father who relies on his friends to visit him) more difficult and could lead them into depression/loneliness. There are many elderly residents in our road who expect family to come visit them on weekends.</p> <p>2. Actually making the whole road exclusively for residents only and not have the pay by phone option that currently exists at the top of the road. This option can be catered for by the high road anyway (which is only a 30 yard walk) and allow people who want to pay to park there. This will also free up spaces for residents in the road.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank