

	<h2>Environment Committee</h2> <h3>15 March 2017</h3>
<p style="text-align: right;">Title</p>	<p>Motion from Full Council – A Public Realm Management Forum for Barnet</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Report of</p>	<p>Head of Governance</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Wards</p>	<p>All</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Status</p>	<p>Public</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Urgent</p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Key</p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Enclosures</p>	<p>None</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Officer Contact Details</p>	<p>Paul Frost – Governance Officer paul.frost@barnet.gov.uk 0208 359 2205</p>

Summary

The report informs the Environment Committee of a Motion on 'A Public Realm Management Forum for Barnet' which was reported to Full Council on 31 January 2017. In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 23.5, if a Member's Motion is not dealt with by the end of a Full Council meeting, it will be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration. An opposition amendment Motion has also been referred to the Environment Committee under this rule. Details of the original motion and the amendment are set out in this report.

Recommendations

1. That the Environment Committee instructions are required in relation to this item.

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

1.1 On Tuesday 31 January 2017 Councillor Rohit Gover submitted an Administration Motion to Full Council as follows:

1.2 A Public Realm Management Forum for Barnet

Council believes that Barnet's 16 conservation areas contribute to the Borough's distinctive character, making it an attractive place to live and work. Any dilution of this character due to insufficient conservation input with respect to the design of streets could have profound consequences for perceptions of Barnet and therefore its future prosperity.

Council notes that improving traffic flows and parking across Barnet is important, but that as well as getting people from A to B roads and streets also serve as arteries of communities which have the capacity to greatly affect the overall quality of life for local residents. While traffic signs control and guide traffic and promote road safety, when used to excess and with no clear function they can clutter streets, make them unattractive, and introduce hazards for users. This is also true for excessive street furniture and lighting equipment.

Council therefore believes that designers and stakeholders should be encouraged to work together at an early stage in order to promote a focus on the creation of locally distinct high quality places. A Public Realm Management Forum, with specialist input from conservation experts, would enable such a multi-disciplinary approach to be adopted with respect to the design of public realm works across the Borough, secure improved decision-making and instil best practice in line with other local authorities.

Such an approach is recommended by the Department for Transport, Historic England and the Institute of Highway Engineers.

Council acknowledges that all parts of the public sector face challenges of reduced budgets. However, a Public Realm Management Forum would actually save Council money by avoiding abortive works and expensive mistakes being made which then have to be corrected at implementation stage - while ensuring compliance with best practice and statutory conservation requirements. Considerable sums could also be saved by minimising the need for street clutter and its subsequent maintenance, and through the recycling of materials.

Council therefore requests that officers are instructed to:

- Investigate how a Public Realm Management Forum may be able to ensure multi-disciplinary input into the design of future public realm works across the Borough; and*
- Consider a trial period for certain areas, bearing in mind that informal collaboration of this nature already takes place within Garden Suburb ward where a number of residents and other stakeholders have specialist conservation expertise.*

Council also requests that the results of this investigation are reported back to the Environment Committee for consideration.

1.3 Councillor Allan Schneiderman submitted an Opposition amendment to the Motion, to Full Council as follows:

Add after the first paragraph:

"In addition to conservation areas being important, Council also believes that every area of the Borough is important and that proper planning and investment is necessary across Barnet."

Insert in second bullet point after 'certain areas':

"... - Cricklewood, for example, which is on the border of three Boroughs -...."

Substantive text to read:

Council believes that Barnet's 16 conservation areas contribute to the Borough's distinctive character, making it an attractive place to live and work. Any dilution of this character due to insufficient conservation input with respect to the design of streets could have profound consequences for perceptions of Barnet and therefore its future prosperity.

In addition to conservation areas being important, Council also believes that every area of the Borough is important and that proper planning and investment is necessary across Barnet.

Council notes that improving traffic flows and parking across Barnet is important, but that as well as getting people from A to B roads and streets also serve as arteries of communities which have the capacity to greatly affect the overall quality of life for local residents. While traffic signs control and guide traffic and promote road safety, when used to excess and with no clear function they can clutter streets, make them unattractive, and introduce hazards for users. This is also true for excessive street furniture and lighting equipment.

Council therefore believes that designers and stakeholders should be encouraged to work together at an early stage in order to promote a focus on the creation of locally distinct high quality places. A Public Realm Management Forum, with specialist input from conservation experts, would enable such a multi-disciplinary approach to be adopted with respect to the design of public realm works across the Borough, secure improved decision-making and instil best practice in line with other local authorities. Such an approach is recommended by the Department for Transport, Historic England and the Institute of Highway Engineers.

Council acknowledges that all parts of the public sector face challenges of reduced budgets. However, a Public Realm Management Forum would actually save Council money by avoiding abortive works and expensive mistakes being made which then have to be corrected at implementation stage - while ensuring compliance with best practice and statutory conservation requirements. Considerable sums could also be saved by minimising the need for street clutter and its subsequent maintenance, and through the recycling of materials.

Council therefore requests that officers are instructed to:

- *Investigate how a Public Realm Management Forum may be able to ensure multi-disciplinary input into the design of future public realm works across the Borough; and*
- *Consider a trial period for certain areas, - **Cricklewood, for example, which is on the border of three Boroughs** - bearing in mind that informal collaboration of this nature already takes place within Garden Suburb ward where a number of residents and other stakeholders have specialist conservation expertise.*

Council also requests that the results of this investigation are reported back to the Environment Committee for consideration.

1.4 Council's Constitution, Full Council Procedure Rule 23.5 states that:

If the Member's Motion is not dealt with by the end of the meeting, it will be referred to the appropriate Council Committee or sub-Committee for consideration and any necessary action. (However, if the proposer has specifically asked in his or her notice for the Motion to be voted on at that Council meeting it will be voted on without discussion).

1.4 The motion was not discussed or voted on at the Full Council meeting. Therefore the Environments Committee are requested to consider the contents of the motion as set out in this report and give instruction.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 No recommendations have been made. The Environment Committee are therefore requested to give consideration to the motion and provide instruction.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

3.1 Not applicable.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Post decision implementation will depend on the decision agreed by the Board.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

5.1.1 As and when issues raised, they will need to be evaluated against the Corporate Plan and other relevant policies.

5.2 Resources (Finance & Value for Money, Procurement, Staffing, IT, Property, Sustainability)

5.2.1 None in the context of this report.

5.3 **Social Value**

5.3.1 None in the context of this report.

5.4 **Legal and Constitutional References**

5.4.1 Council Constitution, Full Council Procedure Rules (section 23.5) states if the Member's Motion is not dealt with by the end of the meeting, it will be referred to the appropriate Council Committee.

5.4.2 The Council's Constitution, Responsibility for Functions (Annex A) sets out the terms of reference for the Environment Committee, it is therefore considered appropriate that this motion is considered by this Committee.

5.5 **Risk Management**

5.5.1 None in the context of this report.

5.6 **Equalities and Diversity**

5.6.1 None in the context of this report.

5.7 **Consultation and Engagement**

5.7.1 All of these issues must be considered for their equalities and diversity implications.

5.8 **Insight**

5.8.1 None in the context of this report.

6. **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

6.1 Motion to Full Council, 31 January 2017:

<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=162&MId=8818&Ver=4>