

**FINCHLEY & GOLDERS GREEN RESIDENTS FORUM**

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

**Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> 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](mailto: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).

	Issue Raised	Response
1	<p><b>Subject: Status of consultation on Victoria Park redevelopment</b>  <b>Submitted by: Tal Potishman</b>  <b>Ward: West Finchley</b></p> <p><b>Background:</b> A few months ago there was a rumour of a consultation that took place with a small number of neighbours on one side of Victoria Park.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> Can you please advise if this consultation is likely to expand to include all neighbours of the park and what is the status of the redevelopment project?</p>	<p>The Greenspaces team has not yet undertake any consultation relating to the Victoria Park improvements that will be funded from the monies raised through the sale of the Lodge. We plan to undertake a Master Planning exercise and this will include a full public consultation. The Master Planning has not yet started and the timeline has not yet been set.</p> <p><b>Response from: Graeme Lawes</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Graeme.Lawes@Barnet.gov.uk">Graeme.Lawes@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
2	<p><b>Subject: Bird, rat and vermin nuisance, owing to continuous bird feeding and food thrown in the open</b>  <b>Submitted by: Tal Potishman</b>  <b>Ward: West Finchley</b></p> <p><b>Background:</b> We are bordering Victoria Park and are badly affected by huge flocks of birds (pigeons, crows). These flocks are growing in size abnormally as a result of constant feeding by the public and local shops/restaurants. This attracts not only birds but also rats, mice and other vermin, which then get into our houses. Due to this endless supply of food, the wild animals multiply at an unnatural rate exacerbating the problem. Their droppings are soiling the pavements, our driveways and gardens. The droppings are dangerous - they are slippery and carry disease (such as Psittacosis).</p> <p><b>Question:</b> Can the council put up a large and visible sign to</p>	<p>A Greenspaces Officer will attend site and investigate the issues. We will put up some laminated signage in order to discourage the bird feeding and will request a site visit by the enforcement team in order to speak with anyone seen to be feeding the birds.</p> <p>Please report any instances of this issue to <a href="mailto:parks@barnet.gov.uk">parks@barnet.gov.uk</a> or using the council's report a problem web page.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	discourage (or possibly Ban?) feeding the birds and clear up the area near the Ballards Lane Entrance to Victoria Park (NW side), which is constantly dirty with food.	
3	<p><b>Subject: Refuse Collections</b>  <b>Submitted by: Betti Blatman</b></p> <p>When will the refuse collections be improved as it seems the staff should refer to the list of residents who are on "assisted collection" to ensure their refuse, whether general, recycled, food waste or garden waste is collected and wheelie bins returned to their original location. Despite numerous scenarios and various excuses, e.g. there is a new crew, which is irrelevant as they should all receive the same training and follow the same specification.</p> <p>In addition to collection scenarios, I've recently had my green wheelie bin "disappear" although after lodging my complaint, a new one was promptly replaced.</p>	<p>We are aware that there have been some failings in the past with using paper based information by the crews. To improve this situation we have reviewed an in-cab technology solution which when implemented will improve the current process.</p> <p>Until this is implemented we have reviewed the paper based process and have put in measures to help crews identify assisted collections.</p> <p><b>Response from: Graeme Lawes</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Graeme.Lawes@Barnet.gov.uk">Graeme.Lawes@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
4	<p><b>Subject: Abbots Gardens, N2 ,Roads Works, Tarmacking</b>  <b>Submitted by: Local resident</b>  <b>Ward: East Finchley</b></p> <p>The Council has recently resurfaced the road. This has not been delivery to a satisfactory standard and it must be reviewed.</p> <p>Can you outline how this work was completed and who carried out the work during September 2016.</p>	<p>Abbots Gardens has been resurfaced recently using Micro Asphalt. This treatment involves the overlaying of the road with two thin layers of bituminous material with an overall depth of around 20 mm. This provides a very cost effective method of extending the life of the carriageway whilst improving the skidding resistance and appearance of the road and reducing the surface irregularities as well as road noise.</p> <p>The works have a 24 month defect period where the LoHAC</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>Contractor provides a guarantee to the Council that the treatment will meet the specification required and that any remedial works are undertaken at their expense.</p> <p><b>Response from: Highways</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk">Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
5	<p><b>Subject: Bus route 263/ 214</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mead Stuart</b>  <b>Ward: Various</b></p> <p>The 263 bus service is unsatisfactory. We need another route running between Archway and North Finchley coming from a different route to the 263. One option could be to extend the 214 from Highgate Village to North Finchley.  Lobby TFL as they don't take any notice of single complaints.</p>	<p>The 263 is the only regular bus service between East Finchley and North Finchley, and there have been concerns raised in previous years the reliability of the service.</p> <p>Over the year to the end of June 2016 TfL's published reliability data identifies that the route met its operating standards in terms of miles operated (98%) in every 4 week monitoring period except one in January/February 2016.</p> <p>However it failed to meet the standard in terms of average excess waiting time* during 4 periods over Autumn/Winter 2015/16, but for the first quarter of 2016/17 it has been well within the standard set and also with better performance than the same time the previous year. (*This is the difference between the wait a passenger could expect if buses were on schedule and the actual waiting time. It shows how long passengers wait because of irregular buses or buses not running at all.)</p> <p>Although it may not suit all passengers, there is already a frequent alternative bus route between Archway and North Finchley. This is the 134 which runs to Tally Ho via Muswell Hill. While both buses</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>use the Archway Road between Archway and Highgate they follow different routes before and after these points.</p> <p><b>Response from: Highways</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk">Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
6	<p><b>Subject: Bus 13</b>  <b>Submitted by: Andrew Dismore</b>  <b>Ward: Various</b></p> <p>Will the Council be making representations to TfL against the proposed changes to the 13 bus?</p>	<p>The Council has submitted the below response to TfL's consultation on proposals for changes to bus routes 13, 82, 113, 139, 189 and N189.</p> <p>This response was copied to Mr Dismore when submitted to TfL.</p> <p><b>LB Barnet Consultation Response</b></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposals for changes to bus routes 13, 82, 113, 139, 189 and N189. We strongly object to any changes that would result in any reduction to frequency or capacity from the current level of service. We feel there is a need for service levels to exceed where they are currently.</p> <p>In general terms Barnet supports the principle of matching bus provision to demand, subject to delivering a minimum level of service; however your proposal gives cause for concern. You consulted on a similar proposal previously. Both the previous consultation and the current consultation involve replacing the current route 13 with a route following that of the current route 82 from North Finchley to Victoria. Your previous consultation retained the designation of this new route '82'. The current consultation designates it '13'.</p> <p>You received significant opposition to removal of bus route 13 in your previous consultation. While we understand that some of this may have related to an attachment to a longstanding route rather</p>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>than the level of service, other concerns expressed remain. Notably the loss of the frequent direct link currently provided to the West End is a concern for many. The extension of the 139 to Golders Green provides an alternative that would be both less frequent and involve significantly increased journey times. In sort we can see little change from the previous proposal which received strong local opposition. The new routes will not improve provision west of Marble Arch, which was of concern previously and needs to be addressed.</p> <p>The introduction of a one-hour 'hopper fare' may reduce the financial burden of changing for some travellers but the inconvenience remains. If this proposal were to proceed we would want to see provision of clear publicity provided about alternative routes to the West End and locations of safe and convenient interchange points.</p> <p>We hope that the increased frequency of the proposed route 13 would mitigate issues currently experienced of overcrowding on route 82 into Central London by the time it reaches Golders Green. We are concerned that the frequency should be sufficient to cater for the passengers that would previously have been shared between routes 13 and 82. This is a particular concern between Golders Green and Hendon Way as the increased capacity of the 113 would not be available on that stretch and the 139 is unlikely to serve the same passenger demand. We would also want assurances that northbound journeys must not terminate short or turn around at Golders Green, Finchley Church End except in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Recent performance on the current route 82 has been less good than on route 13. The potential for the new route to be less reliable overall is a concern and in particular we are concerned that the proposals should not lead to increased curtailment of services short of the end of the route. Replacement of two routes (the 82</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>and 13) with a single route over much of its length could also increase the impact on passenger of any incidents in Central London that affecting the single route (since all buses on the combined route would be affected).</p> <p>Once again thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposals.</p> <p><b>Response from: Highways</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk">Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
7	<p><b>Subject: Rat issue in Old Farm Road in Strawberry Vale</b>  <b>Submitted by: Andrew Dismore</b>  <b>Ward: East Finchley</b></p> <p>Will the Council work with the Peabody Housing Association to reduce the problem of rats in the bins on Old Farm Road in Strawberry Vale?</p> <p>Will you ask the refuse team to ensure that bins are placed properly in their cages and bin lids are closed after they are emptied, with the supervisor checking every week that this is being done.</p>	<p>Recycling and Waste recently completed an exercise where we either repaired or replaced the bins on the Strawberry Vale.</p> <p>The Area Supervisor has also spoken to the crews with regards to the bin return policy and he will monitor future collections.</p> <p><b>Response from: Graeme Lawes</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Graeme.Lawes@Barnet.gov.uk">Graeme.Lawes@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
8	<p><b>Subject: Beresford Road</b>  <b>Submitted by: Andrew Dismore</b>  <b>Ward: East Finchley</b></p> <p>Many residents of Beresford Road in East Finchley have written to me to express their dissatisfaction with the asphalt repaving of the entire footway. Will you listen to the residents and re-do the work as paving slabs.</p>	<p>The July 2016 Environment Committee approved a recommendation to introduce standardised footway construction designs in highway maintenance which are based on best practice and offer best value for money by minimising the cost over the whole life of the footway. Trials have proved that bituminous footways offer this as they minimise future maintenance and are associated with lower trip hazards. The July Committee agreed to use more bituminous footways in footway maintenance especially away from town centres and conservation areas. This new policy came to effect on footway schemes that started as from the 1st September 2016.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>On the 31st August we communicated to all Ward Members by email that the default treatment type to be used in future would be asphalt with crossovers put back in block paving. We also communicated that town centres will be constructed like for like using paving and any schemes within Conservation areas would be consulted on with Ward Members prior to works starting.</p> <p>We will re-issue to all Ward Members in the next 14 days, the list of planned works in their ward including the treatment types that will be used for the remainder of this year's programme. The Council will not be re-doing the work in Beresford Road and will continue to implement the agreed Council policy in accordance with that from the July 2016 Environment Committee of replacing paving with flexible asphalt construction in the majority of cases.</p> <p><b>Response from: Highways</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk">Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
9	<p><b>Subject: Abbots Gardens</b>  <b>Submitted by: Andrew Dismore</b>  <b>Ward: East Finchley</b></p> <p>Abbots Gardens in East Finchley has been resurfaced in an extremely poor quality, with uneven surfaces, lumps, lines from the roller etc. Will you re-do the work to a satisfactory standard.</p>	<p>Abbots Gardens has been resurfaced recently using Micro Asphalt. This treatment involves the overlaying of the road with two thin layers of bituminous material with an overall depth of around 20 mm. This provides a very cost effective method of extending the life of the carriageway whilst improving the skidding resistance and appearance of the road and reducing the surface irregularities as well as road noise.</p> <p>The works have a 24 month defect period where the LoHAC Contractor provides a guarantee to the Council that the treatment will meet the specification required and that any remedial works are undertaken at their expense.</p> <p><b>Response from: Highways</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk">Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>

	Issue Raised	Response
10	<p><b>Subject: Victoria Park – trees in parks</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b>  <b>Ward: West Finchley</b></p> <p>Why is the Park's Department so secretive about works in parks? Signs were placed in Riverside Walk just before works began so there was no opportunity for input from users of this space regarding what was to be done there. The sign gave an email address (parks@barnet.gov.uk) for more information but an email to this was not responded to. Further, there are rumours of works planned for Victoria Park but there has been no consultation with users. Additionally, when trees are felled in parks, notices are not placed on them 7 days in advance of their being felled. Why?</p>	<p><u>Riverside Walk</u>  The works were delivered with the Woodside Park Garden Suburb Residents Association (WPGSRA). The original concept was born from the original Dollis Valley Greenwalk consultation and it was seen that the phase 2 works would be delivered by the local community, following this the WPGSRA undertook a series of consultations, the group were successful in receiving funding from Tesco and the area committee to fund the children's trim trail and to bring the hard standing areas back into use. As the footpath that runs past the play area is being eroded by the brook it needs to be moved away from the brook so the zip wire has been relocated in order to allow for the footpath to be moved.</p> <p>We apologise for the lack of response to the resident's initial enquiry the mistake has been rectified and the enquiry has been responded too.</p> <p><u>Victoria Park</u>  The Greenspaces team has not yet undertake any consultation relating to the Victoria Park improvements that will be funded from the monies raised through the sale of the Lodge. We plan to undertake a Master Planning exercise and this will include a full public consultation. The Master Planning has not yet started and the timeline has not yet been set. An informal discussion took place between Greenspaces and representatives of the Etchingham Friends.</p> <p><u>Trees</u>  The council's tree team put up tree felling notices on street trees so as to inform residents to avoid parking in the works area, contact details for the team are provided on these notices. Within parks as there is no car parking issues notices are not required however if it is proposed to any high profile trees or the removal of any tree has</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>a significant impact on the park then notices would be put up.</p> <p><b>Response from: Graeme Lawes</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Graeme.Lawes@Barnet.gov.uk">Graeme.Lawes@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
11	<p><b>Subject: Victoria Park tennis courts and fences</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b>  <b>Ward: West Finchley</b></p> <p>Two of the tennis courts in Victoria Park were recently resurfaced and the fencing replaced. Where did the funding come from for this and how much did it cost? Was there a condition that the tennis courts be free for the public to use?</p>	<p>The refurbishment of courts 5 &amp; 6 was completed with the support of local users and clubs. With the assistance of the local users the council was successful in receiving grant monies from Sport England, the scheme cost circa £55,000 with £25,000 coming from Sport England and the remaining £30,000 was funded by the council's Greenspaces Team. There was no condition for the courts to be free for public use, however the council is required to provide detailed usage and participation information.</p> <p><b>Response from: Graeme Lawes</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Graeme.Lawes@Barnet.gov.uk">Graeme.Lawes@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
12	<p><b>Subject: Parking controls – Ballards Lane/ Manorside School</b>  <b>Submitted by: Theresa Musgrove</b>  <b>Ward: West Finchley</b></p> <p>Why is the parking service so selective in the areas in which attendants patrol and give PCNS to residents? Specifically, why, despite raising the issue with local attendants, do all of them deliberately ignore the long term parking - often by cars for sale - along Ballards Lane, where there is a yellow line on the section parallel to Moss Hall Crescent? Why do they refuse to come to Manorside School and prevent parents from parking in the disabled bay or causing dangerous obstruction for children? Is this because quotas are easier to meet in busy high</p>	<p>Thank you for your enquiry. We are currently investigating these comments. It has now been passed to our Enforcement team who will assess and undertake site visits within 24 hours. We will assess the findings and take appropriate action. Thank you for bringing this matter to our attention.</p> <p><b>Response from: Geraldine Edwards</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Geraldine.Edwards@Barnet.gov.uk">Geraldine.Edwards@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>

	Issue Raised	Response
	streets?	
13	<p><b>Subject: Pothole- Finchley Central</b>  <b>Submitted by: Theresa Musgrove</b>  <b>Ward: West Finchley</b></p> <p>Outside Tesco in Finchley Central, by the bus stop, there is a pothole which keeps forming that is so deep, when it rains it fills with water and drenches those waiting for buses, often elderly travellers and children. It has been refilled at least twice, so badly, that it inevitably happens again: the filled in material is never properly flattened, and the line sometimes not properly repainted. Presumably contractors are paid again each time they have to repair their own shoddy work. Is this good value for money for Barnet residents?</p>	<p>Temporary repairs have been carried out by the Council's Direct Labour Organisation until a permanent repair is planned and carried out.</p> <p><b>Response from: Highways</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk">Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
14	<p><b>Subject: Alley/service road back of 170-192 Cricklewood Broadway, NW2 3EB</b>  <b>Submitted by: Sonia Bryant</b>  <b>Ward: Childs Hill</b></p> <p>The condition of this alley is much the same as first reported in March 2015. Some days it's reasonable but the same old problems duck up associated with fly tipping, inadequate cleaning and collection of both commercial and private rubbish and bad drainage. Rubbish still collects over the drains resulting in puddles of dirty water in many places. Exactly what action has Barnet council taken with regard to any of this over the last year particularly with regard to site visits and contact with management agents. Is this on a regular basis or just when someone complains about it? I had a walk down to the end just today. It's like a third world country and does not belong in a London borough.</p>	<p>The alley is not public highway and managed by a managing agent.</p> <p>The managing agent cleanses this alley twice a week and the London Borough of Barnet only intervenes if there is a public or environmental health issue</p> <p>Barnet commercial bins and residential bins are collected as per schedule.</p> <p><b>Response from: Cory Sunderland</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Cory.Sunderland@barnet.gov.uk">Cory.Sunderland@barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>

	Issue Raised	Response
15	<p><b>Subject: Loose utility cover in middle of A5, Cricklewood Broadway - Ref 110647</b>  <b>Submitted by: Sonia Bryant</b>  <b>Ward: Childs Hill</b></p> <p>This utility cover is located in the middle of the crossroads with Ashford Road, Depot Approach and the A5, in Cricklewood.</p> <p>Having given up trying to speak to TFL I reported it to Barnet's Highways Dept on 3 Oct 2016.</p> <p>Every time a vehicle passes over this utility cover it makes a dreadful clanging noise and has been doing so for about the last three or four months. The LBB officer said she would find out which utility company was responsible for it (she didn't think it a matter for TFL). I have spoken to the manager of Martins the newsagent on the corner of Ashford Road who had customers complaining that they couldn't sleep at night because of the noise and had contacted Brent council who had said it was Barnet's responsibility!</p> <p>Here we go again same as the Ashley saga ref 103074.</p> <p>Who is supposed to check and report this and see something's done about it? It can't just be a member of the public, surely? Just think what it must be like to have to live with this and not get any sleep. It can be heard in Kara Way</p>	<p>Council officers will investigate ownership of this manhole; if the manhole cover belongs to a Utility then the Utility will be asked to reset at their own cost. If the manhole cover belongs to the Council then the work and cost will be borne by the Council.</p> <p><b>Response from: Highways</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk">Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
16	<p><b>Subject: Ashley Fruit and Veg, 180 Cricklewood Broadway, NW2 3EB</b>  <b>Submitted by: Sonia Bryant</b>  <b>Ward: Childs Hill</b></p> <p>Obstruction of the pavement outside this shop was first lodged again on 28 June 2016, Ref No 91907, latest ref 103074 dated 1 September 2016. This has been an on-going matter for the <b>last three years</b> and</p>	<p>The Licensing Department issue street trading licences. Ashley's Foods and Wine have held a licence for a number of years. Numerous compliance checks have been made at the premises and these visits have confirmed there is compliance with their licence including the area the goods are located in.</p> <p>In 2015 the London Borough of Barnet agreed a new street trading strategy to cover;</p>

Issue Raised	Response
<p>well known to Barnet's Highways Department.</p> <p>Ashleys have persisted in putting out too many boxes of their produce resulting in inadequate room for passers-by and creating, at times, a dangerous surface particularly in wet weather from fruit and veg squashed on the pavement. I have now learned by email from Cllr Jack Cohen that following a licencing meeting, Barnet are introducing specific street trading designated areas and Ashleys is one meaning they will have to stay within an area of pavement marked out by studs.</p> <p>This, of course, is good news but raises questions.</p> <p>Why has it taken so long?</p> <p>What happens when, as they surely will, Ashleys just cover the studs with their boxes?</p> <p>Who is supposed to report this and to whom?</p> <p>We have been told before that studs were to be put on the pavement but it never happened. Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street markets</li> <li>• A boards</li> <li>• Permanent pitches:</li> </ul> <p>Due to the amount of work that had to be undertaken in these areas it was agreed with the Licensing Committee to stagger the implementation of these 3 major changes. Street markets were to be established first, then the "A" boards scheme and finally the designation of streets.</p> <p>The initial time scales were set and identified street markets to be implemented as soon as possible, an "A" board trial providing feedback of its success to the licensing committee by November 2015, and the street trading designations to be in place by the end of the summer of 2016. There has been a slight delay with the last project – designations – however these are currently under consultation with the first licences due to be granted in November. Following this the Highways Department will be commissioned to undertake the demarcation of the pitches.</p> <p>If a trader choses to cover their studs then this would mean they are exceeding their allowed street trading area and enforcement action will be taken in line with the London Borough of Barnet's enforcement policy.</p> <p>If a resident is concerned that a trader is either trading without a licence, or exceeding their licensed area then please can they email the licensing team on <a href="mailto:licensingadmin@barnet.gov.uk">licensingadmin@barnet.gov.uk</a></p>

	Issue Raised	Response
17	<p><b>Subject: Street Cleaning In Cricklewood</b>  <b>Submitted by: Jessica Howey</b></p> <p>I would like the Residents' Forum, Barnet councillors and officers to know and indeed to take note of the fact that in Cricklewood they have two outstanding employees - both members of the street cleaning team. One is Michael Jackson who does is utmost to keep the litter and general detritus under control in Gratton Terrace - we would be lost without him. The Town Keeper, Anatoilly Somokha litter picks Cricklewood Broadway most mornings and when the traffic lights turn to red, he runs in front of the stationary cars and picks the litter from the carriageway. Both deserve to be recognised for their work. The Barnet side of Cricklewood Broadway would be buried under a mass of litter if it was not for these two very conscientious, dedicated employees.</p>	<p>For the Forum to note</p>
18	<p><b>Subject: Archer Academy</b>  <b>Submitted by: Andrew Dismore</b>  <b>Ward: East Finchley</b></p> <p>What support can the Council give to the Archer Academy's bid for a 6<sup>th</sup> Form?</p>	<p>Applications to open new Free Schools as well as expansions of existing Academies are the responsibility of the Department for Education and decisions are made by the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC). Each RSC is supported by a head teacher board (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/schools-commissioners-group/about#Headteacher-boards">https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/schools-commissioners-group/about#Headteacher-boards</a>) made up of experienced academy headteachers and other sector leaders. On the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2016, the Commissioning Director , Children and Young People wrote a letter to the RSC welcoming the Archer Academy's ambition to offer a range of vocational and academic pathways for its pupils.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
19	<p><b>Subject: Pavements and driveways</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b>  <b>Ward: Various</b></p> <p>Until recently, pavements at resident's driveways had about two-thirds of the pavement flat with about a third on a slant to the kerb. Why are new pavements being placed on a slant from the properties to the kerb so that there is no part of the pavement that is flat? On some pavements there will be hundreds of pedestrians each day but each driveway will only have a few vehicle movements. Why has Barnet Council changed its design of pavements to the detriment of pedestrians?</p>	<p>Barnet has not changed its design of driveways; depending on the individual driveway and the width and levels available then the most suitable design is adopted to minimise gradients and avoid trip hazard for the pedestrians.</p> <p><b>Response from: Highways</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk">Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
20	<p><b>Subject: Council notices</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b>  <b>Ward: Various</b></p> <p>Barnet Council notices lately regarding a property are placed in flimsy plastic and wrapped around a pole. Can they please be laminated, like they used to be, so that they are more noticeable and easier to read? Also can they be placed outside the property in question, rather than some distance away? Do they need to be signed by someone from Barnet Council?</p>	<p>Laminating the notices would result in a substantial additional cost to the department considering the number of notices displayed. Site notices are protected in a plastic wallet and attached to street furniture as close as possible to application sites. Site notices do not need to be signed by someone from Barnet.</p> <p><b>Response from: Adam Ralton</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Adam.Ralton@Barnet.gov.uk">Adam.Ralton@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>

	Issue Raised	Response
21	<p><b>Subject: Planning application consultation - documents</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b></p> <p>When a planning application is displayed on the website, there are often more documents added later. Other times the description of the planning application is changed. If these occur, can the consultation expiry dates be forwarded to be 3 and 4 weeks from the last document loaded or description changed date? Additionally, parts of documents are separate files and so the document list is very unwieldy. Can they be combined into one file to make them more user friendly?  The planning website often displays, "Document Unavailable. This document is unavailable for viewing at this time". Why is this?</p>	<p>Any alteration to the consultation period would be on a case by case basis, and relate to the nature of the additional information received and how material it is.</p> <p>Files are displayed on the website in the format they are submitted to the LPA by applicants. Due to file size limitations, it is often necessary to split documents. Where possible these are clearly labelled for ease of use.</p> <p>'Document unavailable' would indicate a technical error which should be reported to the case officer to review with the IT support team.</p> <p><b>Response from: Adam Ralton</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Adam.Ralton@Barnet.gov.uk">Adam.Ralton@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
22	<p><b>Subject: Planning consultation</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b></p> <p>Why does the planning website stop accepting comments when the last consultation expiry date passes? Additionally why does it display the message, "Comments may not be submitted at this time. The consultation period for this application has ended" when by law all comments must be considered up until a decision is made?</p>	<p>The website allows comments to be submitted until the end of the formal consultation period. However comments are accepted on applications up to the time the decision is made. Comments can be submitted by post or email and a specific email address for this purpose is included on all consultation letters</p> <p><b>Response from: Adam Ralton</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Adam.Ralton@Barnet.gov.uk">Adam.Ralton@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
23	<p><b>Subject: Planning team</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b></p> <p>FOI request (3040897) regarding the Planning Department last month shows interim and acting staff as well as 12 temporary workers. Given the number of planning applications being received, is the planning</p>	<p>For the year ending June 2016 in Barnet, 98% of major planning applications were determined within statutory periods compared with a 60% government-set national target, 78% of minor planning applications were determined within statutory periods compared with a 65% government-set national target and 87% of other planning applications (including householder applications) were</p>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<p>department able to process and assess the applications in a timely and competent manner?</p>	<p>determined within statutory periods compared with a government-set national target of 80%. The department is therefore processing and assessing applications in a timely manner.</p> <p><b>Response from: Adam Ralton</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Adam.Ralton@Barnet.gov.uk">Adam.Ralton@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
24	<p><b>Subject: Copthall Planning</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b>  <b>Ward: Mill Hill</b></p> <p>Copthall is considered a borough-wide facility. When the draft plan was released in January, there was no mention in it of granting Chase Lodge a 125 year lease option. Yet in the Assets, Regeneration and Growth Committee's documents of 5 September with regard to the Land at Copthall Playing Fields Page Street, it stated that, "A number of Stakeholder meetings have taken place over the last 12 months, to enable the Council to arrive at this position. Stakeholders have been engaged in design meetings, and a number of informal meetings to discuss the Heads of Terms leading to this paper." Why was the Chase Lodge probable lease option not included in the draft plan? Given that it is in the Green Belt, why is there no ecology assessment in the 'Copthall Planning Brief'?</p>	<p>A planning officer attended a meeting of the Copthall Community Sports Group at Allianz Park in May 2016 where the members of the group were invited to provide further responses and feedback on the consultation draft of the Copthall Planning Brief. Camden Community Football and Sports Association are a member of this group.</p> <p>Further to this a planning officer also attended a meeting with Camden Community Football and Sports Association (Chase Lodge) in summer 2016 where their proposals were presented and they were encouraged to respond to the draft Planning Brief.</p> <p>Regarding biodiversity individual planning applications would be required to demonstrate they fulfil the objectives of the planning brief. The planning brief was revised to set out in paragraph 12.5 that "ecological assessments /statements should set out further detail on how biodiversity and habitat quality will be protected including protected species. Reports produced for different sites across Copthall should be shared to build up a common resource of biodiversity across the site."</p> <p><b>Response from: Mike Carless</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Mike.Carless@Barnet.gov.uk">Mike.Carless@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>
25	<p><b>Subject: FOI responses</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b></p> <p>Why are 'Freedom of Information (FOI) Requests within the last 180 days' displayed on the Council website sorted by 'date requested' rather than 'date displayed on the website'? At present, if a request is not fulfilled for well over 20 working days, as often happens, the response is not obviously available to other residents as it will be displayed well down the scroll down list. Additionally, the date on the FOI Response is not necessarily the date that it was replied (emailed) to the requestor, so can this be changed to the replied date? When part of the response is in a separate attachment why is this not included with the FOI Request response available online?</p>	<p>The software the council uses, known as iCasework, displays requests in the last 180 days by 'date requested' as a standard default and unfortunately we are not able to change this setting.</p> <p>The Council's performance on answering requests within statutory deadline is currently 96% for 2016/2017. We recognise that we have experienced delays in answering some FOI requests recently due to an influx of requests on a specific subject within a short space of time, however we always strive to meet the statutory deadline and our performance reflects this, although we appreciate that delays cause inconvenience to those few requestors affected.</p> <p>Following your question we have checked the system and identified five requests sent out on 30 September which were incorrectly dated 20 September for which the council apologises. The affected responses have now been amended to reflect the correct date. All attachments issued with the responses are present and correct as far as we can see, but we would welcome further correspondence if the requestor can identify where attachments are not available, so that we can investigate and correct where possible. The email address <a href="mailto:foi@barnet.gov.uk">foi@barnet.gov.uk</a> can be used for such queries.</p> <p><b>Response from: Information Management</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:foi@barnet.gov.uk">foi@barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>

	Issue Raised	Response
26	<p><b>Subject: The Lodge IT information</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b></p> <p>Much library information was lost due to an IT problem. Now there is no longer the information available on why it would cost an estimated £100,000 to bring The Lodge to decent homes standard. Was this information lost due to an IT problem and if so what other information has been lost? If not, how was it lost?</p>	<p>The original costings, completed by Barnet Homes, is not available. This is not due to loss of information as a result of IT issues. However the information is available, as revised costings were undertaken which demonstrated the estimate of refurbishment costs would have been in a similar cost region.</p> <p><b>Response from: Anisa Darr</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Anisa.Darr@barnet.gov.uk">Anisa.Darr@barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
27	<p><b>Subject: Library staff</b>  <b>Submitted by: Theresa Musgrove</b>  <b>Wards: Various</b></p> <p>Tory councillors insist that the 60% cuts in library budget are necessary because of the demands of 'austerity', which means £2.85m will be culled from the Libraries service total of £4.8m, in itself a modest amount for a service that was already independently assessed as representing good value for money. Of course at the same time they are spending £6 million on gutting libraries, shrinking the space, and preparing them for a DIY, staffless service.</p> <p>The impact on the well being of residents, especially children who will be barred from the new unstaffed libraries, is incalculable and will affect the most disadvantaged residents.</p> <p>At the same time as cutting this vital service, Tory councillors are happy to sanction the eye watering high level of expenditure - of £18 million in the last year alone - on private consultants and agency fees.</p>	<p>The proposals agreed will keep all of the borough's libraries open in a climate where many neighbouring councils are closing them.</p> <p>At the same time they will save £2.85m annually from the council's revenue budget. Over ten years, for example, this would therefore be a total saving of £28.5m. There are capital (one-off) costs associated with the changes, but these are far outweighed by the ongoing savings and enable features of the new service, such as technology enabled opening that will see overall opening hours increase by over 40% across the network.</p> <p>If spending £18m allows us to achieve a further £80m in annual savings by 2020, whilst delivering on the £105m we have been forced to save from our budget since 2010, then it is totally justifiable.</p>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>
	How is that morally or economically justifiable?	
28	<p><b>Subject: Budget</b>  <b>Submitted by: Theresa Musgrove</b>  <b>Ward: Various</b></p> <p>Half of the library staff who currently help members of the public when they visit their local libraries are about to lose their jobs, supposedly because of the need to save money.</p> <p>Please explain, therefore, why those same Tory councillors have just handed half a million pounds, ie a substantial amount of the 'savings' they claim we need from the library budget, to the RAF Museum, a national and well funded museum - especially when they shut our own local museum, again on the pretext of economy. Also explain why another £800,000 has been spent on creating additional posts on the council's PR team, specifically to 'manage the council's reputation', as we head towards the next local elections.</p>	<p>One-off financial support of £500k has been granted to RAF Hendon, contingent on it being able to raise £6.1m in further funding. This follows consideration of the community benefits of its redevelopment. This £500k cannot be hypothetically used to offset an annual and ongoing revenue saving. The communications re-structure saw a centralisation of existing spend.</p> <p>The council is embarking on a significant programme of transformation needed to improve services, while saving £61.5 million between now and 2020. We are also delivering £565million of capital investment in the borough. Therefore it is important that residents are kept informed of what the council is doing as well as also involved and engaged.</p> <p>Many of the posts in the new communications model are temporary and the additional funding for the restructure has been identified from existing budgets.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
29	<p><b>Subject: Library staff</b>  <b>Submitted by: Theresa Musgrove</b>  <b>Ward: Various</b></p> <p>Tory councillors believe that a professional library service can be run by unqualified volunteers. Are they willing to become unpaid volunteers, and carry out their civic roles without their allowances, and free parking permits?</p>	<p>The library service will continue to be run by professional staff, with support given to volunteers and community groups who take on the four partnership libraries. The use of volunteers is a common feature of library services in many areas. I for one am actively supporting the local community in my ward where there is great interest in taking on Childs Hill library.</p>
30	<p><b>Subject: Fees for renewal of travel passes</b>  <b>Submitted by: Theresa Musgrove</b>  <b>Ward: Various</b></p> <p>The council was recently exposed as allowing Capita to charge another £100,000 fee, on top of the normal massive contractual charges, to renew travel passes for disabled residents which did not need renewing, and in some cases were unlawfully cancelled, causing enormous distress to their users, often finding themselves stranded, unable to access public transport.</p> <p>Why was Capita not asked to return this fee, and why was no one held accountable for this 'mistake'?</p>	<p>The Council is currently carrying out a full review of Disabled Persons Freedom Passes following agreement from the P &amp; R committee on the 1 September 2016. A revised scheme will be presented to P &amp; R on the 1 December 2016.</p> <p><b>Response from: Sam Pandya</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Sam.Pandya@Barnet.gov.uk">Sam.Pandya@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
31	<p><b>Subject: Footpath damage at crossovers</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mr Hale</b>  <b>Ward: Various</b></p> <p>The significant increase in private resident parking in front gardens has resulted in damage to footways and verges from new vehicle crossovers and damage resulting from the poor quality of existing crossovers.</p>	<p>The Crossover owner pays for the initial cost of installing the dropped kerb as well as relaying the footway behind, up to the entrance to the private property. However, the Council takes over the future maintenance of the crossover.</p> <p>You are correct in identifying the paving slabs on footways as creating trip hazards and requiring constant maintenance. The July 2016 Environment Committee approved a recommendation to</p>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<p>Paving slabs are broken and often dangerously projecting and rocking. Damage is also caused to kerb stones. Badly damaged crossovers remain for months outside properties. Existing crossovers often do not relate to the width of the off street parking which in some circumstances extends to the whole width of the property. Vehicles may pass over crossovers just a few times a day while many pedestrians walk on that pavement, the priority needs to be addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the council doing about addressing this matter ?</li> <li>• Who pays for the repairs to crossovers, the general public or the property owner?</li> </ul>	<p>introduce standardised footway construction designs in highway maintenance which are based on best practice and offer best value for money by minimising the cost over the whole life of the footway. Trials have proved that bituminous footways offer this as they minimise future maintenance and are associated with lower trip hazards.</p> <p>The July Committee agreed to use more bituminous footways in footway maintenance especially away from town centres and conservation areas.</p> <p>This new policy came to effect on footway schemes that started as from the 1 of September 2016.</p> <p><b>Response from: Highways</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk">Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
32	<p><b>Subject: The pedestrian environment</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mr Hale</b>  <b>Ward: Various</b></p> <p>With reference to officers reports to the Environment Committee meeting of 11th January 2016 entitled 'Highways Planned maintenance Programme 2016/17' and 'Whole Life costing of Footway Maintenance treatments and Scheme Prioritisation'</p> <p>I notice that Barnet Council has a serious backlog of footway maintenance.</p> <p>This backlog of maintenance has been obvious to pedestrians for many years. Pedestrians are discriminated against by this backlog of street scene maintenance and other factors not being addressed which include:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Worn surfaces and broken paving due to lack of maintenance.</li> <li>2. Parking on pavements obstructing and degrading the pavement.</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. Worn surfaces and broken paving due to lack of maintenance.</b></p> <p>The Council has allocated an additional £50m of funding on highways maintenance spread over 5 years, starting in financial year 2015/16. Improving the Council's footways has been identified as a priority under this funding and so far £7.5 million has been spent last year and another £7 m has being allocated for spending this year on footways. This is believed to be one of the highest spending budgets on footways in the London area. During these two years alone more than 100 roads will have resurfaced footways.</p>

Issue Raised	Response
<p>3. Parking in front gardens leading to broken paving and obstruction at crossovers.</p> <p>4. Overgrown hedges and vegetation</p> <p>5. Leaves and rubbish un-cleared.</p> <p>6. Obstructions caused by refuse bins before and after collection.</p> <p>7. Damage adjacent to building sites by contractors.</p> <p>8. Lack of dropped kerbs.</p> <p>9. Redundant crossovers.</p> <p>10. Poor junction design.</p> <p>How is the council addressing these problems?</p>	<p><b>2. Parking on pavements obstructing and degrading the pavement.</b></p> <p>The Council is aware that some roads attract vehicle parking on footways and works is underway on the worst cases to ascertain ways of preventing this without causing an obstruction on the carriageway for emergency vehicles. Some locations in the borough do have permitted footway parking and the footway is constructed to withstand these vehicles.</p> <p><b>3. Parking in front gardens leading to broken paving and obstruction at crossovers.</b></p> <p>Any resident wishing to gain vehicle access to their property over the public footway should request a vehicle crossover. The Council is aware that there are some unauthorised accesses and those residents risk prosecution and could be liable for the cost of repair to the footway. The Council will investigate any specific location the resident has in mind.</p> <p><b>4. Overgrown hedges and vegetation</b></p> <p>Hedge and shrub maintenance on the public highway is maintained by the Council's Grounds Maintenance team. Hedges are cut twice per annum, shrub maintenance varies on site by site basis however all shrubs are cut once or twice per annum.</p> <p><b>5. Leaves and rubbish un-cleared.</b></p> <p>The Street Cleansing service mechanically sweep approx. 833km of roads.</p> <p>All residential roads receive a fortnightly litter pick and fly tip removal. In addition residential roads are programmed according to</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p>cleanliness levels with each road is swept approximately every 8 weeks.</p> <p>We clear fallen leaves from our roads and pavements during the autumn season as required. The approach is delivered on a flexible programme due to the changing nature of leaf fall.</p> <p><b>6. Obstructions caused by refuse bins before and after collection.</b></p> <p>Recycling and waste operatives are instructed to place bins at point of collection</p> <p><b>7. Damage adjacent to building sites by contractors.</b></p> <p>The Council completed a pilot study earlier this year in the Finchley and Golders Green area to identify damage to footways caused by minor development sites and a proposal is being considered to extend this throughout the borough. Larger developments being undertaken by major developers are usually undertaken under agreements with the Council and alterations to the public highway, resurfacing and repairs included as part of those agreements.</p> <p><b>8. Lack of dropped kerbs.</b></p> <p>All of the footway resurfacing schemes currently being carried out as part of the £50m of additional funding previously mentioned will incorporate dropped kerbs at junctions and crossing points. The Council also has a small budget each year to provide dropped kerbs and tactile paving at various locations throughout the borough which will improve access for the partially sighted and blind pedestrians as well as disabled and those with wheelchairs.</p> <p>If the resident is aware of any locations which would benefit from such measures please contact LB Barnet Highways department.</p>

	Issue Raised	Response
		<p><b>9. Redundant crossovers.</b></p> <p>When the footways referred to in Question 1 are resurfaced any redundant crossover are removed.</p> <p><b>10. Poor junction design.</b></p> <p>Not enough detail to provide a response.</p> <p><b>Response from: Highways</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk">Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p> <p><b>Response from: Graeme Lawes</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Graeme.Lawes@Barnet.gov.uk">Graeme.Lawes@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
33	<p><b>Subject: Anti-social and dangerous behaviour</b>  <b>Submitted by: Ms Howey</b>  <b>Ward: Childs Hill</b></p> <p>For the past 18 months at least, there have been on-going issues with pupils from Hampstead School using Kara Way playground after school. These issues have been raised with our councillors, the SNT team and the school but <b>the situation has now deteriorated to such an extent that last week there were fights between pupils on two consecutive days.</b> 999 calls were made to the police. The first police car on the scene was surrounded by Hampstead pupils and had to call for back up – another two police cars attended. Residents of the terraces cannot call for such back up. One of the fights appears to have been pre-planned with 40 to 50 Hampstead pupils in the playground as spectators.</p>	<p>Further to the incident of Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> October – listed as the one that occurred on the last day of term, the police have confirmed the following.</p> <p>The school concerned ended for their half term one day earlier than anticipated. This information was not known to the Neighbourhood Policing Team and at the time as they were attending a planned meeting with residents, including Ms Howey and Councillor Cohen, with the Police ASB team when this incident took place and those in attendance were updated as the incident unfolded.</p> <p>Response police units were on scene within minutes to deal with</p>

Issue Raised	Response
<p>Fireworks were thrown in the playground and in the street in front of people. One small child arriving home with a grandparent was terrified when the firework exploded in front of him and screamed and screamed. This is very dangerous.</p> <p>Another resident was surrounded by the pupils, who were threatening him and had to shout for neighbours to come and help him.</p> <p>Two laser torches have been used in the playground. These can be very dangerous if used irresponsibly eg aimed at a driver in Kara Way, helicopters, etc</p> <p>Other examples of anti-social and dangerous behaviour by Hampstead pupils include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hampstead pupils racing around our streets overturning wheelie bins</li> <li>Stones being thrown with one hitting a resident</li> <li>Drink cans thrown at windows</li> <li>Aggressive, intimidating behaviour</li> <li>Cannabis being smoked openly in the playground and in our streets</li> <li>A group walking around the terraces carrying a folded up belt in an intimidating and threatening manner</li> <li>Anti-social behaviour, loud shouting, swearing and foul language that is so bad that genuine playground users, parents with children or toddlers have no choice but to leave</li> </ul> <p>A meeting took place with the school head, Mr Szemalikowski, two or three weeks ago but the situation has not improved. The standard response (if any response) from the school is how do we know they are from Hampstead School. They wear the school uniform, so there is no</p>	<p>the incident.</p> <p>The matters are currently subject to an ongoing police investigation and CCTV including mobile phone evidence requires to be reviewed as part of this investigation.</p> <p>A review of the incidents in the area and in particular focussing upon the Kara Way play park, excepting the incidents on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2016, reveal that there have been 10 reports to police since 1<sup>st</sup> January 2016 involving children in the park with the complaints ranging from allegations of smoking drugs to knocking bins over in the park. The days and times do vary and do include weekend/late evening complaints.</p> <p>The Childs Hill, Police Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) are leading on this issue they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have held a public meeting in relation to this and other issues on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2016 in Cricklewood. The matter was discussed and the SNT engaged with Ms Howey .</li> <li>• Have visited the Kara Way play park after School on previous occasions and have not witnessed incidents</li> <li>• Are working with the Police Schools Officer from Hampstead School to identify those involved in last week's incident and take the appropriate action.</li> </ul>

	Issue Raised	Response
	<p>doubt.</p> <p>Kara Way playground is for everyone and it is totally unacceptable that small children and parents have to leave when Hampstead School kids are present. It is intolerable that residents of the terraces should feel threatened by out of control school children. Those causing the problems are aged roughly between 14 and 18. They are young adults, so can be quite intimidating.</p> <p>We need help urgently before someone is badly hurt.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have arranged several days of targeted action with the Schools Officer to attend the park in the first week of November when the schools return.</li> </ul> <p>We urge residents to call 101 and report ASB incidents and call the police on 999 for urgent assistance.</p> <p>In summary there will be increased police presence when the school returns, the schools officer will join the police on patrols.</p> <p><b>Response from: Matt Leng</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Matt.Leng@Barnet.gov.uk">Matt.Leng@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
34	<p><b>Subject: Prohibit parking around roundabout on Horton Avenue NW2</b>  <b>Submitted by: Leanne Sangster</b>  <b>Ward: Childs Hill</b></p> <p>Recently the roundabout on Horton Avenue (London NW2) has become congested with cars and this is posing a real safety issue for those using the road. Those living around the roundabout cannot access their driveways and those trying to use the roundabout are blocked from doing so, including the emergency services - a fire engine and an ambulance to date!</p> <p>Those reversing from their driveways cannot see safely what is coming, posing a risk to drivers and pedestrians.</p>	<p>Many requests are received for new or amended parking controls relating to yellow lines, loading and parking bays and Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs).</p> <p>It is planned to assess and then prioritise each request that is received, with a view to presenting a list of potential schemes to the Environment Committee at the beginning of each year to decide funding allocations for the following financial year's work programmes.</p> <p>Officers will ensure your request relating to possible restrictions at the roundabout on Horton Avenue NW2 are looked at as part of the process.</p> <p>In the meantime it is advisable that residents should try to exit their driveway in a forward motion, rather than reverse onto the</p>

	<b>Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Something needs to be done before an accident occurs.	<p>highway.</p> <p><b>Response from: Highways</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk">Highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
35	<p><b>Subject: Council agendas – public participation</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O’Connor</b></p> <p>As the Agenda is available online for all Barnet Council meetings, can the opportunities for public questions and comments be displayed on the main screen for the meetings where this is appropriate, rather than the separate 'Agenda Frontsheet', as residents are more likely to scroll down the main screen with the items listed. They may be unaware that they have the opportunity to participate. Additionally that the Residents' Forum screens state the closing date and time for questions.</p>	<p>The deadline for public questions and comments is usually displayed on the agenda frontsheet instead of the main website page. There is a facility for Governance staff to add text to the main website page and the Head of Governance has requested that the Governance Service add committee deadlines to <u>all</u> website pages to ensure that members of the public are aware of their rights to submit issues, ask questions or make comments at council meetings.</p> <p>The closing date and time for questions to be submitted to the Residents' Forums is stated on the main page of all three Residents' Forums which you can find <a href="#">here</a>.</p> <p><b>Response from: Iphigenia Christophoridou</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Iphigenia.Christophoridou@Barnet.gov.uk">Iphigenia.Christophoridou@Barnet.gov.uk</a></b></p>
36	<p><b>Subject: Overhanging front hedge</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mr Stern Malcolm</b></p> <p>I just want to compliment the Council on their swift and effective action. A couple of weeks ago I reported (online) a dangerously overhanging front hedge in an unoccupied house in Cumbrian Gardens. It has now been trimmed. Well done, LBB!</p>	For the Forum to note

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

Tel: 020 8359 3822, Email: [f&gg.residentsforum@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:f&gg.residentsforum@barnet.gov.uk)

Future meeting dates:

Date of meeting	Location
24 January 2016	To be confirmed