

## FINCHLEY & GOLDERS GREEN RESIDENTS FORUM

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

Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> 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](mailto:f&gg.residentsforum@barnet.gov.uk)) by **10.00am on the fifth working day before the meeting**  
(For this meeting this will be Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> March 2017).

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

	Issue Raised	Response
3	<p><b>Subject: CPZ or parking permits</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mr John Levy</b></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><b>Subject: Street Litter</b>  <b>Submitted by: David Farnworth</b></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><b>Subject: Dollis Valley Greenwalk</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b></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"> <li>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</li> <li>b. porous, so leaves dry and are blown away rather than sodden muck</li> </ol>	

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><b>Subject: Cricklewood rubbish</b>  <b>Submitted by: Sonia Bryant</b></p> <p>I could repeat almost word for word the description given you for the F&amp;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&amp;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><b>Subject: Air Quality Champion</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mr Levy</b></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><b>Subject: Golders Green Tube and Bus station</b>  <b>Submitted by: Azza Rahman</b></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><b>Subject: Drop kerb parking</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mr Levy</b></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><b>Subject: Resident forum responses</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mr Levy</b></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><b>Subject: Whetstone Stray</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b></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><b>Subject: Brookside Walk</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b></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><b>Subject: Riverside Walk</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b></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><b>Subject: New Bridges at Lovers Walk and the next bridge downstream</b></p> <p><b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b>  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><b>Subject: Invasive Weeds</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b></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><b>Subject: Trees in Fursby Avenue</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b>  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><b>Subject: Signage wrapped around pole again</b>  <b>Submitted by: Mary O'Connor</b></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><b>Petition: CPZ on St Marys Avenue N3</b>  <b>Submitted by: Gary Plein</b>  <b>Signatures: 27</b></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](mailto:f&gg.residentsforum@barnet.gov.uk)

Future meeting dates:

Date of meeting	Location

5 <sup>th</sup> July 2017	To be confirmed
18 <sup>th</sup> October 2017	To be confirmed