

FINCHLEY & GOLDERS GREEN RESIDENTS FORUM

VENUE: Avenue House, 17 East End Road, Finchley, London N3 3QE

Wednesday 26th October 2016 – 6.30PM

Chairman: Councillor Shimon Ryde

Vice Chairman: Councillor Reuben Thompstone

ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED AT THE FORUM MEETING

Items must be submitted to Governance Service (f&gg.residentsforum@barnet.gov.uk) **by 10.00am on the fifth working day before the meeting** (for example, if a meeting is due to take place on a Thursday evening, questions must be received by 10am on the preceding Thursday).

FINCHLEY & GOLDERS GREEN RESIDENTS FORUM

VENUE: Avenue House 17 East End Road, Finchley, London N3 3QE

Wednesday 22nd March 2017 at 7pm.

Chairman: Councillor Shimon Ryde
Vice Chairman: Councillor Reuben Thompstone

ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED AT THE FORUM MEETING

Items must be submitted to Governance Service (f&gg.residentsforum@barnet.gov.uk) by **10.00am on the fifth working day before the meeting**
(For this meeting this will be Wednesday 15th March 2017).

	Issue Raised	Response
1	Subject: Parking bays and parking penalties Submitted by: Jaffer Mohammed Council should not be chasing the motorist to raise revenue to fund other council activities.	
2	Subject: Traffic lights Gravel Hill Finchley Submitted by: Manish Dhokia Gravel hill Finchley should have traffic lights and pedestrian crossings!	

AGENDA ITEM 1

	Issue Raised	Response
3	<p>Subject: CPZ or parking permits Submitted by: Mr John Levy</p> <p>Whetstone N20 Rasper Road /Sherwood Street/Green Road/Capel close N20 Council need to consider for CPZ or parking permits. Audi and Garage at 16 Sherwood Street are taking up a lot of the spaces. Cars are being dumped on our streets for days on end. Parking on the pavement so that you cannot walk on them. The 3 local schools don't help. We get the office staff also needing a place to park. These cars start arriving from 7pm and don't leave until gone 7pm. Its impossible for the residents to get a parking space during the day. On some days we have to park at least 20 mins away and this is just not fair Our streets are small to cope with the amount of traffic going down them Council need to help its residents to solve these problems</p>	
4	<p>Subject: Street Litter Submitted by: David Farnworth</p> <p>Street Litter - Litter picking and leaf removal in the side roads of Ballards Lane seem very poor. I reported a build up of litter in Dollis Road, some 2 weeks ago and the area has yet to be visited. Seeds are now starting to shoot in the leaves yet to be removed at Dollis Rd junction with Gordon Rd.</p> <p>A commitment to litter pick 'B' roads once a week i.e. Dollis Road, Nether Street, Frith Lane etc. In the short term, for Dollis Road to receive attention.</p>	
5	<p>Subject: Dollis Valley Greenwalk Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</p> <p>1. Until 2010 Dollis Valley Greenwalk was a pedestrian and ecological corridor. But since then Barnet Council has been ruthlessly adding a cycle path for 'shared use'. In doing so, it has been downgraded DVGW for pedestrians and ecologically, but</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>the resulting new paths have not been to Department for Transport Shared Use or London Cycling Design Standards. Parallel to and in the vicinity of DVGW there are quiet streets or alternative 'shared paths' (asphalt pavements) next to roads, signposted as cycle routes. Further, apart from some short sections of road, the land DVGW goes over is SINC, MOL, Green Belt or Local Nature Reserve, so it cannot be lit at night. It is a green chain, green corridor and a Metropolitan Walk. Why is Barnet Council progressively changing the 'no cycling' designation of more and more sections of this path to 'cycling'?</p> <p>Has anyone evaluated the feasibility of cyclists crossing roads at points with limited visibility, for the cyclists or drivers of vehicles, of the other crossing their path? Where are the approved transport plans for safe cycle crossings of Argyle Road, Fursby Road, Totteridge Lane, Dollis Road, Barnet Lane and Finchley Lane? At Riverside Gardens the path is 1.5m with a pinch point of 1.2m with no space to widen this to 3m. Under the bridge for Great North Way, the path is 2.1m with pinch points at each end of 1.5m and 1.9m. Additionally the brook there is not fenced. How are these to be made safe for cycling?</p> <p>There are now more pedestrian and environmentally friendly materials for paths that are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. softer, so less force back through the body especially when running, but also of much benefit to elderly and obese people. Also less injury following a fall b. porous, so leaves dry and are blown away rather than sodden muck 	

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>c. do not require edging to sprain an ankle on</p> <p>d. Do not require loose materials to be brought in, containing seeds of plants to colonise the area that are then not controlled.</p> <p>Of journeys originating in Barnet, 26% are walking and 1% cycling so why are the paths built "to better provide for cycle use", rather than remain pedestrian-friendly paths when cycle alternatives are available?</p> <p>With Barnet Council cutting back on so many services, why are they spending thousands on converting DVGW to cycling at the expense of pedestrians who are the greater number on DVGW? Where are the funds coming from for these works?</p> <p>The geovey website states that "this is not a formal consultation process" and "we would like to gather views to help develop schemes". This is inappropriate for DVGW upgrades as it is being used as a front for having consulted residents, but only using views that suit the Council. Why are consultations for DVGW not given the same structure as other consultations via engage.barnet? Why is the Council even considering cycling on DVGW given the lack of safety the 'shared path' will have for all users, especially cyclists?</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response
6	<p>Subject: Cricklewood rubbish Submitted by: Sonia Bryant</p> <p>I could repeat almost word for word the description given you for the F&GG residents forum held on 26 October 2016. The response received then stated LB Barnet could only intervene if there is a public or environmental health issue. In fact, it is much the same as reported to you two years ago for the F&GG forum held 25 March 2015. If this is not a PEH issue how bad does it have to get and how long will it be allowed to go on for? I repeat, it is a disgrace to Cricklewood and makes nonsense of the efforts local residents have made in trying to make a Cricklewood Town Centre when 200 m away there is this mess every day of the week.</p>	
7	<p>Subject: Air Quality Champion Submitted by: Mr Levy</p> <p>Barnet recently employed, jointly with Harrow, an Air Quality Champion for a fixed term, having won a grant for the purpose from the Mayor of London. What (i) were the results of this (ii) measurable benefits were there, if any; (iii) did he/she make any further recommendations, and (iv) what were the Council's assessments of them?</p>	
8	<p>Subject: Golders Green Tube and Bus station Submitted by: Azza Rahman</p> <p>The issue is the Golders Green tube and bus station, I would like to hear what the plans for TFL to develop it, like North Fincley, might be.</p> <p>.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response
9	<p>Subject: Drop kerb parking Submitted by: Mr Levy</p> <p>Certain drop kerbs are clearly a relic from a driveway that is now fenced or walled across at the property boundary, and and show no show signs of being part of a pedestrian crossing point i.e. being paired with another opposite, studs for the visually impaired and other evidence. The benefits to the community of permitting parking across dropped kerbs where they stand in front of brick walls or fixed fences surely greatly outweigh the occasional enforcement revenue of not permitting it. Therefore please can the Council develop a policy to allow such parking where no other parking restriction applies, in line with its stated value: "We actively listen, respond, collaborate and share ideas, to achieve the best outcomes with residents, businesses and colleagues." N.B. I tabled this same issue as item 16 of the last Residents Forum, asking if they would do this for drop kerbs "that now stand in front of a brick wall or fixed fence". Any sensible person can see I mean relic drop kerbs installed for driveways that are now non-functioning. However the department's response referred only to drop kerbs that serve pedestrian crossing points, and those that do serve a functioning driveway. The Chairman then requested a direct answer to the question but I've still not received any.</p> <p>Develop a policy to allow parking across those drop kerbs that are clearly a relic from a driveway that is now fenced or walled across at the property boundary, and do not form part of a dedicated pedestrian crossing point, when no other parking restriction applies.</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response
10	<p>Subject: Resident forum responses Submitted by: Mr Levy</p> <p>When questions tabled at Residents Forums are not returned with direct answers it just demands more time of residents, the Forum panel, other attendees and ultimately Officers themselves, if residents have to pose the same questions again at the next Forum. It goes against the purpose of Residents Forums and Putting the Community First.</p> <p>Please can Governance Officers for Residents Forums press departments to provide direct answers to residents' questions if their responses lack this, and record if they are still waiting for them?</p>	
11	<p>Subject: Whetstone Stray Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</p> <p>Why was there no consultation before these works begun, and, no Barnet Council sign displayed indicating why the path is closed and how long it will be closed? Was the possibility of the road above the allotments being continued to Totteridge Lane along the TfL fence line or a cycle-only path on the other side of the tube line investigated? With works in progress it is obvious that the new path will have blind corners. How is this acceptable for a 'shared path', which is being 'upgraded' so cyclists can travel faster? The works have turned the path into a quagmire. Is this acceptable close to the brook and in a SINC?</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response
12	<p>Subject: Brookside Walk Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</p> <p>The path by the playground and the fences were installed in 2010. Why does this now need widening at great expense requiring moving the playground fence also? Next to this is the subway bridge under the North Circular, which is the only pedestrian and cycle means of crossing the North Circular here, and is 2.4m wide with 2.0m of that being useable. Yet this carries more traffic than DVGW so how is it proposed to widen this?</p>	
13	<p>Subject: Riverside Walk Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</p> <p>Why does this need "to be refurbished urgently" when, if broken tarmac is the gauge of what needs work next, the sections in Little Wood and between Windsor Open Space and the exit to Claremont Park are much worse? If it has been identified that a children's playground next to speeding cyclists requires the installation of chicanes, why permit cycling on this path?</p> <p>What improvements are planned at Fursby Ave and Argyle Road to permit the safe crossing of cyclists?</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response
14	<p>Subject: New Bridges at Lovers Walk and the next bridge downstream</p> <p>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor Lovers Walk bridge is part of Lovers Walk, which is a footpath, so no cycling. Why is it being replaced with a 3m wide bridge for cycling when it is part of a 'no cycling' path? Additionally, the structural report for this and the next bridge did not report any structural concerns. Can the approach to Lovers Walk bridge be improved and new spindles and deck for the next bridge, plus the identified maintenance in the structural report be done in preference to their total replacement?</p>	
15	<p>Subject: Invasive Weeds Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</p> <p>Now it is Spring, weeds will be growing again. There are many sites of invasive weeds in the borough. Has the Council considered developing an app so that residents can inform the Council of sites of invasive weeds including those that are a health risk and those on the LISI list? What is the budget to treat invasive weeds for the 2017 / 2018 year and what weed species will be treated?</p>	
16	<p>Subject: Trees in Fursby Avenue Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</p> <p>Some of the tree pits in Fursby Ave were asphalted over when the trees were removed. Will the felled trees be replaced with a new tree at these sites? If not, why not?</p>	

	Issue Raised	Response
17	<p>Subject: Signage wrapped around pole again Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</p> <p>At a previous Residents Forum it was agreed to laminate Barnet Council street notices and this occurred for a time. This made them more noticeable, less likely to be damaged or disappear, and easier to read. But now they are in flimsy plastic and wrapped around poles again. Why?</p>	
18	<p>Petition: CPZ on St Marys Avenue N3 Submitted by: Gary Plein Signatures: 27</p> <p>I live in St. Mary's Avenue N3 and our road is continually crowded with day parkers which blocks the top of the road and makes access in and out at peak times difficult and even a little dangerous when you are trying to turn in off Hendon Lane and you can't get through the bottle neck at the top of the road.</p> <p>Wish for a CPZ, or maybe 1 hour of no parking during the day unless you have a permit which will eradicate the underground station parkers at Finchley Central.</p>	

Contact: Abigail Lewis, Governance Service, Assurance Group, London Borough of Barnet, NLBP, Building 2, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP.

Tel: 020 8359 4369, Email: f&gg.residentsforum@barnet.gov.uk

Future meeting dates:

Date of meeting	Location

5 th July 2017	To be confirmed
18 th October 2017	To be confirmed

This page is intentionally left blank

FINCHLEY & GOLDERS GREEN RESIDENTS FORUM

VENUE: Avenue House 17 East End Road, Finchley, London N3 3QE

Wednesday 22nd March 2017 at 7pm.

Chairman: Councillor Shimon Ryde
 Vice Chairman: Councillor Reuben Thompstone

ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED AT THE FORUM MEETING

Items must be submitted to Governance Service (f&gg.residentsforum@barnet.gov.uk) by **10.00am on the fifth working day before the meeting** (For this meeting this will be Wednesday 15th March 2017).

	Issue Raised	Response
1	<p>Subject: Parking bays and parking penalties Submitted by: Jaffer Mohammed</p> <p>Council should not be chasing the motorist to raise revenue to fund other council activities.</p>	<p><i>Parking Service:</i></p> <p>It is the duty of the Council to manage its road network to ensure as far as reasonably practicable that traffic flows expeditiously as set out in the Traffic Management Act 2004 and to ensure that it exercises its functions under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, so far as practicable, to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. To achieve this, we may take steps as we see fit to contribute to securing more efficient use of the road network and the reduction or elimination of congestion. Such action may involve the Council using its powers to regulate or co-ordinate the uses made of any road or length of road under their authority.</p> <p>Parking enforcement provides a tool to assist the authority to meet its statutory duties and its traffic and transport strategies and goals, as set out in the Parking Policy. The idea is to encourage a high level of compliance by motorists with parking controls so as to best</p>

AGENDA ITEM 2

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>meet the objectives and the council's overriding duties, and penalty charges should dissuade motorists from contravening parking restrictions.</p> <p>The objective of enforcement is to maximise motorists' compliance with regulations. This makes Barnet's streets safer for all road users, particularly children and other vulnerable pedestrians, prevents obstruction and delays (especially for buses and emergency vehicles) and ensures that parking bays are available for their intended use making the public highway a more pleasant environment.</p> <p>Where non-compliance is evident, the Council's strategy is to enforce firmly but fairly, transparently and proportionately to assist in the delivery of the Council's obligations in ensuring that the borough's roads are safe, and enable traffic to flow.</p>
2	<p>Subject: Traffic lights Gravel Hill Finchley Submitted by: Manish Dhokia</p> <p>Gravel hill Finchley should have traffic lights and pedestrian crossings!</p>	<p><i>Highways:</i></p> <p>The junction of Gravel Hill with Regents Park Road is provided with traffic signals but, while all the other arms of the junction have pedestrian lights, the Gravel Hill arm does not. We assume this is what the resident would like to see addressed.</p> <p>The traffic signal phases at the junction are such that traffic from at least one of the other arms of the junction can proceed from the junction into Gravel Hill during every phase.</p> <p>Introducing a pedestrian phase here would mean less time could be given to other movements, which would lead to increased congestion.</p> <p>Staggered crossing points are provided to a central island on the</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>Gravel Hill arm of the junction. Although no pedestrian signals are provided pedestrians only need to cross a single lane of traffic to and from the central island.</p> <p>The arrangement is a compromise that provides no formal signal for pedestrians on the part of the junction that is easiest to cross.</p> <p>There have been no pedestrian injury accidents on the Gravel Hill arm of the junction (or elsewhere in Gravel Hill) in the most recent three years data available.</p> <p>Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk</p>
3	<p>Subject: CPZ or parking permits Submitted by: Mr John Levy</p> <p>Whetstone N20 Rasper Road /Sherwood Street/Green Road/Capel close N20 Council need to consider for CPZ or parking permits. Audi and Garage at 16 Sherwood Street are taking up a lot of the spaces. Cars are being dumped on our streets for days on end. Parking on the pavement so that you cannot walk on them. The 3 local schools don't help. We get the office staff also needing a place to park. These cars start arriving from 7pm and don't leave until gone 7pm. Its impossible for the residents to get a parking space during the day. On some days we have to park at least 20 mins away and this is just not fair Our streets are small to cope with the amount of traffic going down them Council need to help its residents to solve these problems</p>	<p><i>Highways:</i></p> <p>Issue to be Reported to the Chipping Barnet Residents Forum as the roads fall within this consistency area.</p> <p>The response can be viewed at the following link: https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=157&MId=8647&Ver=4</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
4	<p>Subject: Street Litter Submitted by: David Farnworth</p> <p>Street Litter - Litter picking and leaf removal in the side roads of Ballards Lane seem very poor. I reported a build-up of litter in Dollis Road, some 2 weeks ago and the area has yet to be visited. Seeds are now starting to shoot in the leaves yet to be removed at Dollis Rd junction with Gordon Rd.</p> <p>A commitment to litter pick 'B' roads once a week i.e. Dollis Road, Nether Street, Frith Lane etc. In the short term, for Dollis Road to receive attention.</p>	<p><i>Streetscene:</i></p> <p>Thank you for bringing this issue to our attention. A Street Cleansing Supervisor will attend the roads concerned and inspect the area for any outstanding works.</p> <p>The Street Cleansing Team operates a fortnightly litter pick on all roads across the borough. The Supervisor will monitor the area in question and ascertain if it should be included as a hot spot area which is subject to additional cleansing.</p>
5	<p>Subject: Dollis Valley Greenwalk Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</p> <p>1. Until 2010 Dollis Valley Greenwalk was a pedestrian and ecological corridor. But since then Barnet Council has been ruthlessly adding a cycle path for 'shared use'. In doing so, it has been downgraded DVGW for pedestrians and ecologically, but the resulting new paths have not been to Department for Transport Shared Use or London Cycling Design Standards. Parallel to and in the vicinity of DVGW there are quiet streets or alternative 'shared paths' (asphalt pavements) next to roads, signposted as cycle routes. Further, apart from some short sections of road, the land DVGW goes over is SINC, MOL, Green Belt or Local Nature Reserve, so it cannot be lit at night. It is a green chain, green corridor and a Metropolitan Walk. Why is Barnet Council progressively changing the 'no cycling' designation of more and more sections of this path to 'cycling'? Has anyone evaluated the feasibility of cyclists crossing roads at points with limited visibility, for the cyclists or drivers of vehicles,</p>	<p><i>Streetscene:</i></p> <p>proposals to introduce shared use pathways are considered to be an upgrade as it would provide a safe durable surface for all users.</p> <p>As set out in Question 25 of the Finchley and Golders Green Residents Forum 13 January 2016; Under section 3.4.2 (Fig 3.10 Summary of guidance on width) of the London Cycling Design Standards it states that a shared use footpath which is fully shared (two way low flows) should be a minimum of 2.0m wide. The Department for Transport Shared Use document states as a guideline under Section 7 (7.34) the preferred width of an unsegregated cycle and pedestrian track or path is 3m. Both of these guidance notes take into account how busy the level of usage is for this shared use pathway.</p> <p>The shared use pathways that have been provided and those that are currently under consultation are in line with these guidance documents. There are also no plans to light the shared use network.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>of the other crossing their path? Where are the approved transport plans for safe cycle crossings of Argyle Road, Fursby Road, Totteridge Lane, Dollis Road, Barnet Lane and Finchley Lane? At Riverside Gardens the path is 1.5m with a pinch point of 1.2m with no space to widen this to 3m. Under the bridge for Great North Way, the path is 2.1m with pinch points at each end of 1.5m and 1.9m. Additionally the brook there is not fenced. How are these to be made safe for cycling?</p> <p>There are now more pedestrian and environmentally friendly materials for paths that are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. softer, so less force back through the body especially when running, but also of much benefit to elderly and obese people. Also less injury following a fall b. porous, so leaves dry and are blown away rather than sodden muck c. do not require edging to sprain an ankle on d. Do not require loose materials to be brought in, containing seeds of plants to colonise the area that are then not controlled. <p>Of journeys originating in Barnet, 26% are walking and 1% cycling so why are the paths built "to better provide for cycle use", rather than remain pedestrian-friendly paths when cycle alternatives are available?</p> <p>With Barnet Council cutting back on so many services, why are they spending thousands on converting DVGW to cycling at the expense of</p>	<p>Proposals to re-designate currently no cycling footways to shared use pathways is being proposed as a way to upgrade the pathway network through the boroughs many open spaces through the use of external funding allowing for the funding available to enhance our greenspaces to be put other uses such as new planting schemes, play and sport facilities.</p> <p>The current proposed schemes do not cover road crossing points as they are out of scope however all exit points would have "cyclist dismount" signs for safety purposes. If the proposed schemes are taken forward the council proposes to look at the end to end journey along the shared use network in order to ascertain if any improvements could be applied to ensure crossing between shared use sections can be made safer for all users.</p> <p>Detailed designs of the shared use proposals are available upon request please email parks@barnet.gov.uk The designs show a 3m wide pathway across all sections of the proposed network and where pinch points hinder this addition features are included for everyone's safety.</p> <p>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. As noted above these schemes offer the benefit of being delivered through external Transport for London LIP funding.</p> <p>The council is piloting the new geovey website as an engagement tool. Through the use of geovey we can showcase the proposals along a map in order for residents to get a better understanding of the scope and details of the proposals. It also carries the added benefits of allowing residents to comment or response to specific</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>pedestrians who are the greater number on DVGW? Where are the funds coming from for these works?</p> <p>The geovey website states that "this is not a formal consultation process" and "we would like to gather views to help develop schemes". This is inappropriate for DVGW upgrades as it is being used as a front for having consulted residents, but only using views that suit the Council. Why are consultations for DVGW not given the same structure as other consultations via engage.barnet? Why is the Council even considering cycling on DVGW given the lack of safety the 'shared path' will have for all users, especially cyclists?</p>	<p>features or items along the route as well plot or propose their own suggestions. Additionally to the use of geovey the Greenspaces Team has put up notices in the park regarding the proposals and has arranged for members of the team to be on site at the following times to answer questions, gather comments and suggestions;</p> <p><u>Riverside Walk</u> Wed 15 March 2-4pm (this session has already taken place) Thu 23 March 10-12am</p> <p><u>Brookside Walk</u> Mon 20 March 2-4pm Fri 24 March 2-4pm</p> <p>Through the provision of a wider pathway the proposed schemes would provide a safer facility for all users. If the schemes are taken forward a site assessment would take place once the works are complete to assess if any additional infrastructure needs to be put in place as was done along the Fursby Avenue section which saw the installation of a safety fence along the brook edge of the pathway near a sharp corner.</p> <p>Based on the limited use made of flexible paving in the borough to date it would appear that the overall cost would be about twice the price of a conventional asphalt footpath, and we do not know how well such material would perform in the longer term. (a) While some path users might welcome a flexible surface, others may be less comfortable with such a surface. (b) Asphalt paths would normally shed water to one or both sides of the path and may therefore dry quicker than a flexible porous path. (c) Edging at the side of an asphalt path simple forms the edge of the path, the transition to the adjacent grass etc would be similar for a flexible surface. (d) While the need to import aggregates would be reduced, the need for imported topsoil (if reuse was not possible) would be similar.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
6	<p>Subject: Cricklewood rubbish Submitted by: Sonia Bryant</p> <p>I could repeat almost word for word the description given you for the F&GG residents forum held on 26 October 2016.</p> <p>The response received then stated LB Barnet could only intervene if there is a public or environmental health issue. In fact, it is much the same as reported to you two years ago for the F&GG forum held 25 March 2015. If this is not a PEH issue how bad does it have to get and how long will it be allowed to go on for?</p> <p>I repeat, it is a disgrace to Cricklewood and makes nonsense of the efforts local residents have made in trying to make a Cricklewood Town Centre when 200 m away there is this mess every day of the week.</p>	<p><i>Environmental Health:</i></p> <p>Our service had received a complaint on 3rd of March 2017 regarding an accumulation from waste materials at the above address.</p> <p>After, I contacted the managing agents and advised that this service has received a complaint regarding an accumulation from waste materials at the external areas of the above property/land in question and upon inspection this complaint was found to be justified, therefore this service requested the agents to remove the accumulation from waste materials from the external areas of the property/land within 7 days.</p> <p>I revisited the concerned above property/land on 15th of March 2017, upon inspection witnessed the accumulation from waste materials had been removed/cleared from the external areas of the property/land.</p> <p>Photographic evidence has been taken during the investigation and attached for your information to prove the inspection is justified. Therefore, this case has now been resolved.</p> <p><i>The service road gets cleared twice a week by the Street Scene Team and once on the weekend via the managing agents.</i></p>

	Issue Raised	Response
7	<p>Subject: Air Quality Champion Submitted by: Mr Levy</p> <p>Barnet recently employed, jointly with Harrow, an Air Quality Champion for a fixed term, having won a grant for the purpose from the Mayor of London. What (i) were the results of this (ii) measurable benefits were there, if any; (iii) did he/she make any further recommendations, and (iv) what were the Council's assessments of them?</p>	<p><i>Environmental Health:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By the conclusion of all project aspects, at least 22,666 people will have been engaged with (excluding leaflet drops). • Directly engaged with 45 schools in Barnet and Harrow delivering lessons on air quality/active transport, anti-idling and road safety/active transport days. • Engaged with a total of 66 schools/institutions in Barnet and Harrow • Engaged 35 businesses regarding smoke control and other applicable legislation • Funded or secured funding for theatre in education in 45 schools • Distributed over 7,000 leaflets with over 3,000 left for future use • Provided funding for three community air quality projects to commence in April 2016 with mapping for change. • Delivered at least one air quality lesson to upwards of 600 primary pupils • Advised 189 drivers of anti-idling at 10 schools over seven days and stopped 64 instances of idling. • Engaged with 520 residents, staff and students at a multi-

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>agency (Council, police and fire) at Ayesha Community School on air quality, idling, road safety etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 schools given an 'Air Quality Award' (Roxeth, Chalgrove, Courtland, Northside and St Joseph's) to acknowledge the commitment to improving air quality education for students, staff and parents. • Provided Harrow school travel team with three resources boxes to facilitate future air quality learning and can be used many times over. <p>From our air quality monitoring results there is a gradual improvement in air quality in the borough but still exceedences of National Objectives at busy roads which is why we revised our air quality action plan 2016-21.</p> <p>It's impossible to attribute any improvements down to one measure as there are so many sources of air pollution but the air quality champion did help raise awareness of the need for active sustainable travel.</p> <p>Further details for residents can be found https://www.barnet.gov.uk/citizen-home/environmental-health/air-quality.html Which contains monitoring results and the revised air quality action plan in the documents.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
8	<p>Subject: Golders Green Tube and Bus station Submitted by: Azza Rahman</p> <p>The issue is the Golders Green tube and bus station, I would like to hear what the plans for TFL to develop it, like North Fincley, might be.</p> <p>.</p>	<p><i>Commissioning and Planning:</i></p> <p>The Council is working closely with Transport for London to ensure that we achieve a design for Golders Green Tube and Bus station that is fit for the future and that is in keeping with the local area. The new design is also being aligned closely with the Authority's future Transport Strategy and assumptions about how residents will move around the Borough in the future.</p> <p>Specifically we are working with Transport for London to achieve the following objectives in relation to the new station:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sustainable mixed-use development, which respects and enhances the distinctive historic environment of Golders Green • Supports a successful and vibrant town centre that serves the needs of residents, workers and visitors • Creates high quality public realm that engenders civic pride and serves as a focal point for Golders Green <p>Provides safe, effective and efficient travel within an accessible public transport interchange through improved transport connectivity and land use integration</p> <p>The Council will consult on the details of any development proposals as part of the usual planning application process, which will involve a minimum 3-week public consultation. The Council cannot discuss or share details of any pre-application matter it is involved in due to commercial confidentiality</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
9	<p>Subject: Drop kerb parking Submitted by: Mr Levy</p> <p>Certain drop kerbs are clearly a relic from a driveway that is now fenced or walled across at the property boundary, and and show no show signs of being part of a pedestrian crossing point i.e. being paired with another opposite, studs for the visually impaired and other evidence. The benefits to the community of permitting parking across dropped kerbs where they stand in front of brick walls or fixed fences surely greatly outweigh the occasional enforcement revenue of not permitting it. Therefore please can the Council develop a policy to allow such parking where no other parking restriction applies, in line with its stated value: "We actively listen, respond, collaborate and share ideas, to achieve the best outcomes with residents, businesses and colleagues." N.B. I tabled this same issue as item 16 of the last Residents Forum, asking if they would do this for drop kerbs "that now stand in front of a brick wall or fixed fence". Any sensible person can see I mean relic drop kerbs installed for driveways that are now non-functioning. However the department's response referred only to drop kerbs that serve pedestrian crossing points, and those that do serve a functioning driveway. The Chairman then requested a direct answer to the question but I've still not received any.</p> <p>Develop a policy to allow parking across those drop kerbs that are clearly a relic from a driveway that is now fenced or walled across at the property boundary, and do not form part of a dedicated pedestrian crossing point, when no other parking restriction applies.</p>	<p>This question was raised at the Resident's Forum meeting on the 24th January 2017.</p> <p>In line with the Councils Constitution Public Participation and Engagement rules this question should not be brought back to the Forum within a 6 month period.</p> <p>Public Participation and Engagement 5.4 ' The six month rule shall apply whereby matters dealt with cannot be raised again within this period.</p> <p>https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s36953/18PublicParticipationandEngagementRules.doc.pdf</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
10	<p>Subject: Resident forum responses Submitted by: Mr Levy</p> <p>When questions tabled at Residents Forums are not returned with direct answers it just demands more time of residents, the Forum panel, other attendees and ultimately Officers themselves, if residents have to pose the same questions again at the next Forum. It goes against the purpose of Residents Forums and Putting the Community First.</p> <p>Please can Governance Officers for Residents Forums press departments to provide direct answers to residents' questions if their responses lack this, and record if they are still waiting for them?</p>	<p><i>Governance Service:</i></p> <p>For the four Finchley and Golders Green Residents' Forums held in the 2016-17 municipal year, 99 questions were submitted. From this, 88 responses were given before the meeting, and 11 responses were marked at to follow.</p> <p>From the deadline for the submission of issues, Governance has five days to do the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Check the questions submitted and ensure that they are relevant to the forum's remit, and constitutionally permissible. Questions are often very complex, and this process can be resource intensive; 2. Clear the questions with the Chairman and then publish an initial list online – questions without responses; 3. Identify officers to respond to the issues and co-ordinate responses from a variety of Delivery Units and teams; 4. Clear the responses with the Chairman and publish the completed list online – questions with responses. <p>In addition to this, the Governance Officer responsible for the forum must arrange a suitable venue for each meeting and ensure that it meets all suitability requirements (i.e. located in a reasonable accessible place, and disability-friendly).</p> <p>Following each meeting the Governance Officer responsible writes the minutes and ensures to communicate to relevant officers and partners those answers which require a follow-up response. In this communication, it is made clear that the relevant officer is responsible (and indeed compelled by a constitutional provision) to provide a response to the relevant resident, and to copy in the Chairman for completeness. In all communication, the Governance</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>Officer responsible copies in the Chairman so as to ensure oversight.</p> <p>Unlike many other local authorities, the London Borough of Barnet's Governance Service does not have Member Support Officers (or equivalent) roles, which would usually be responsible for tasks such as monitoring responses and chasing officers for issues such as this. Due to the very high volume of work that the Governance Service undertakes (around 400 meetings are organised and supported by the Governance Service each year, in addition to several resource-intensive projects), it is not feasible to effectively monitor where an officer has or has not followed up on an issue arising from a meeting of the forum. As a result, it is made clear every time that each identified officer tasked with providing a follow-up response has a personal and constitutional responsibility to complete that request. If residents wish to follow-up on any actions agreed at the Forum then they should send an e-mail to the address listed on the Issues List with Responses document published on the website.</p> <p>The Governance Service aims to ascertain high quality answers in advance of each meeting for every question submitted. We note that, often due to the tight turn around between the receipt of issues and publishing a complete list for the meeting, answers may not always be of a consistently high quality. We will therefore take into account Mr Levy's comments when reviewing the process, and intend to liaise with appropriate Delivery Units and teams to improve – where appropriate – the answers that are submitted for forums.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
11	<p>Subject: Whetstone Stray Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</p> <p>Why was there no consultation before these works begun, and, no Barnet Council sign displayed indicating why the path is closed and how long it will be closed? Was the possibility of the road above the allotments being continued to Totteridge Lane along the TfL fence line or a cycle-only path on the other side of the tube line investigated? With works in progress it is obvious that the new path will have blind corners. How is this acceptable for a 'shared path', which is being 'upgraded' so cyclists can travel faster? The works have turned the path into a quagmire. Is this acceptable close to the brook and in a SINC?</p>	<p><i>Streetscene:</i></p> <p>The Whetstone Stray pathway that is currently being upgraded was already designated as a shared use footpath however it was not set out to the correct width as set out in line with the guidance documents noted in Q5. As the works did not require a reclassification of the pathway no formal consultation was required ahead of the improvement works taking place. Additionally as the pathway was already designated for shared use no alternative route was considered.</p> <p>Signage was installed at the entrances noting the closure of the pathway during the works. An officer will inspect the entrances and replace any missing signage.</p> <p>The pathway will be closed until the 21st April 2017, when the works will be completed and the pathway reopened</p> <p>Once the works are complete a site inspection will be completed to assess if any additional infrastructure needs to be put in place as was done along the Fursby Avenue section which saw the installation of a safety fence along the brook edge of the pathway near a sharp corner.</p> <p>It is inevitable that the works to this pathway would result in the ground being broken in order to allow deliver the new 3m wide pathway, however once complete the area will be reinstated and any ruts will be removed. We are retaining the existing soil on site so as to avoid bring in any contaminated soil at the completion of the works.</p> <p>A geotextile barrier has been erected along the edge of the brook in order to catch any silt washing into the brook but still allow for</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		surface water to pass through.
12	<p>Subject: Brookside Walk Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</p> <p>The path by the playground and the fences were installed in 2010. Why does this now need widening at great expense requiring moving the playground fence also? Next to this is the subway bridge under the North Circular, which is the only pedestrian and cycle means of crossing the North Circular here, and is 2.4m wide with 2.0m of that being useable. Yet this carries more traffic than DVGW so how is it proposed to widen this?</p>	<p><i>Streetscene:</i></p> <p>The Brookside Walk scheme includes a proposal to move a section of the play area fence back in order to provide the recommended width for a shared use footpath as set out in the guidance documents noted in Q5.</p> <p>There are no proposals to widen the pathway through the subway bridge. The current proposals include slow markings to be placed before the subway entrances. We will take the consultation responses into account before any decision is taken. For this section of concern we will investigate if any further calming systems could be used or if this section should require cyclists to dismount.</p>
13	<p>Subject: Riverside Walk Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</p> <p>Why does this need "to be refurbished urgently" when, if broken tarmac is the gauge of what needs work next, the sections in Little Wood and between Windsor Open Space and the exit to Claremont Park are much worse? If it has been identified that a children's playground next to speeding cyclists requires the installation of chicanes, why permit</p>	<p><i>Streetscene:</i></p> <p>The urgency of the works relates to a section of the pathway that is being eroded by the Brook and the proposed works include for this section be rerouted away from the Brook in order to allow nature to take its course along this stretch.</p> <p>Other pathway repairs across the borough are being undertaken as and when funding is available. The Greenspaces Team uses its budgets to deliver pathway and surfacing repairs however the works are part of a borough wide programme in 2016-17 we have</p>

Issue Raised	Response
<p>cycling on this path?</p> <p>What improvements are planned at Fursby Ave and Argyle Road to permit the safe crossing of cyclists?</p>	<p>completed/programmed repair works to the Barnet Playing Fields car park, Mill Hill Park (Daws Lane) car park, Sunnyhill Park viewing platform, Old Courthouse Recreation Ground and Brook Farm Open Space.</p> <p>The advantage the shared use proposals is that it is entirely funded through the TFL LIP funding scheme and so allows for the councils budgets to be used to deliver other repairs across the borough.</p> <p>We are unable to relocate the pathway away from the play area as such we was looking for a way to ensure the safety of any children playing around the play area, this is why the proposals include the calming measures (chicanes) and the removal of the third play area gate. We are confident these features will allow a safe space for all users. If the calming measures prove successful we may consider want to consider repeating this approach in other areas along the shared use network, this would be assessed as part of the end to end journey survey.</p> <p>As noted in Q5; The current proposed schemes do not cover road crossing points as they are out of scope however all exit points would have “cyclist dismount” signs for safety purposes. If the proposed schemes are taken forward the council proposes to look at the end to end journey along the shared use network in order to ascertain if any improvements could be applied to ensure crossing between shared use sections can be made safer for all users.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
14	<p>Subject: New Bridges at Lovers Walk and the next bridge downstream</p> <p>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor Lovers Walk bridge is part of Lovers Walk, which is a footpath, so no cycling. Why is it being replaced with a 3m wide bridge for cycling when it is part of a 'no cycling' path? Additionally, the structural report for this and the next bridge did not report any structural concerns. Can the approach to Lovers Walk bridge be improved and new spindles and deck for the next bridge, plus the identified maintenance in the structural report be done in preference to their total replacement?</p>	<p><i>Highways:</i></p> <p>Cycling or other vehicular use of public footpaths is not normally permitted as a right, but other rights or permissions may nevertheless permit such use.</p> <p>For example a public footpath may exist along the route of a private road or driveway but the landowner and any visitors will still be able to drive along it.</p> <p>In this case Lovers Walk footpath runs through land that is part of one of Barnet's parks. At the bridge it also serves people crossing the brook from other paths through the park as well as the public footpath.</p> <p>Use by cyclists (or maintenance vehicles or other users as appropriate) can be permitted here just as it could be in other parts of the park, without this affecting the status as a public footpath.</p>
15	<p>Subject: Invasive Weeds Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</p> <p>Now it is Spring, weeds will be growing again. There are many sites of invasive weeds in the borough. Has the Council considered developing an app so that residents can inform the Council of sites of invasive weeds including those that are a health risk and those on the LISI list? What is the budget to treat invasive weeds for the 2017 / 2018 year and what weed species will be treated?</p>	<p><i>Streetscene:</i></p> <p>The council has not considered the development of an app for this purpose however it does recommend if any resident identifies an area of concern they can report it through the Report a Problem feature which allows for a the issue to be noted on a map; https://www.barnet.gov.uk/citizen-home/council-and-democracy/report-it-now.html</p> <p>The Greenspaces Team has a contract for treating Japanese Knotweed, Himalayan Balsam, Giant Hogweed and Duckweed. The treatment of these species is delivered through the Greenspaces revenue budgets as such no set budget is attributed to these works however the council spent circa £20,000 controlling</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>these species in its parks and open spaces.</p> <p>Additionally the Greenspaces Operations Team has a number of its operatives trained in the treating these species and they will provide additional treatments if required.</p>
16	<p>Subject: Trees in Fursby Avenue Submitted by: Mary O'Connor Some of the tree pits in Fursby Ave were asphalted over when the trees were removed. Will the felled trees be replaced with a new tree at these sites? If not, why not?</p>	<p><i>Streetscene:</i></p> <p>We have identified six vacant tree pits in Fursby Avenue and plan to plant three of these in the forthcoming planting season this autumn. We plan to plant Jacquemont's Birch outside numbers 33/35, 37 & 45/47 where we had to remove mature trees in order to fill in the obvious gaps here. Three further sites outside numbers 5, 23 & 32 have had appropriate tree species identified and it is planned these will be planted in the following year.</p> <p>Vacant tree pits are capped following tree felling as a matter of safety.</p>
17	<p>Subject: Signage wrapped around pole again Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</p> <p>At a previous Residents Forum it was agreed to laminate Barnet Council street notices and this occurred for a time. This made them more noticeable, less likely to be damaged or disappear, and easier to read. But now they are in flimsy plastic and wrapped around poles again. Why?</p>	<p><i>Planning Service:</i></p> <p>Currently planning do not laminate site notices. It is something we have responded to recently and have said we will investigate the viability of laminating site notices in the future. It is not something we will be introducing imminently, although we agree laminated notices look much better.</p>
18	<p>Petition: CPZ on St Marys Avenue N3 Submitted by: Gary Plein Signatures: 27</p>	<p>To be dealt with in line with the Council's constitution:</p> <p>The Lead Petitioner will be given three minutes to present the petition to the Forum. Following the</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>I live in St. Mary's Avenue N3 and our road is continually crowded with day parkers which blocks the top of the road and makes access in and out at peak times difficult and even a little dangerous when you are trying to turn in off Hendon Lane and you can't get through the bottle neck at the top of the road.</p> <p>Wish for a CPZ, or maybe 1 hour of no parking during the day unless you have a permit which will eradicate the underground station parkers at Finchley Central.</p>	<p>presentation the Residents Forum Chairman will decide to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take no action; • Refer the matter to a chief officer to respond to within 20 working days; or • Refer the matter to the relevant Area Committee (if funding is required)

Contact: Abigail Lewis, Governance Service, Assurance Group, London Borough of Barnet, NLBP, Building 2, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP.

Tel: 020 8359 4369, Email: f&gg.residentsforum@barnet.gov.uk

Future meeting dates:

Date of meeting	Location
5 th July 2017	To be confirmed
18 th October 2017	To be confirmed

This page is intentionally left blank