

Appendix B

Chipping Barnet build out scheme proposal – consultation summary

Approximately 300 letters were hand delivered to residents and businesses in the local area. Proposals were also published on the consultation page of the Council's website and on the noticeboards at Barnet Library.

122 individual responses were received. Of these 64 respondents supported the scheme, 33 objected to the proposals and 25 had comments or concerns relating to particular aspects of the scheme.

A petition opposing elements of the scheme was submitted signed by 1,586 traders and residents in the Chipping Barnet area opposing the removal of parking bays on the High Street and the siting of loading bays in Union Street and Salisbury Road.

Summary of comments supporting the proposals

- The initiative will enhance the appearance and convenience of shoppers and perhaps encourage better shopping outlets. Possibility of planting trees will certainly have an impact on the environment.
- As our understanding of the impact of pollution grows, we need to give more space to pedestrians and café users to protect them. The High St is far too focussed on cars driving through at the expense of those on foot using local facilities.
- I think it will improve the environment and stimulate shopping footfall in the area.
- I hope it will bring a much needed injection of life into our ailing High Street.
- I think it will greatly benefit the area and have a real positive impact on the community, shopping experience and general ambience of the area. The loss of parking on the High Street is not material.
- I support the most of the changes planned by the Council to High Barnet that will improve the look and suitability for local shopping shown on the current plans. In particular the idea of trees, chairs and bicycle stands will make a nice change in addition to a widening to the footpath on the west side of the High Street. However I do not support any changes that encroach on the lives of residents in the area and in particular the suggestion of establishing loading bays in front of their homes. This need to be addressed very carefully. The loss of 7 parking places on the High Street is not much of a problem and probably will help improve traffic flow I believe.
- It's vital to create a new and vibrant environment where the emphasis is on pedestrians not cars that will help the existing businesses and attract new ones.
- In an area with so many families and small children a wider pavement would be beneficial.
- The majority of the shops are low quality and it's too cramped at weekends when people are walking, particularly with prams. A pedestrian culture is exactly what is needed.
- I support the plans to make Barnet High Street more pedestrian friendly, the planting of trees and improvements to attract decent retailers.
- More trees are a must as the pollution and traffic levels are already too high. The amount of charity shops is way too high.

- I think the proposals to broaden pavements etc sounds like a great idea and will hopefully bring much needed additional investment into our tired but lovely High Street.
- I express my support for the plans to widen the pavement in the High Street. I have lived in Barnet for 47 years and have had a retail shop at the top end of the High Street (number 220) for 15 years. During this time I have seen the decline in the look of the High Street and the general ambience. Improving the aesthetic would encourage a more diverse High Street and a better range of retailers. Barnet High Street could be a wonderful area. Something has to change to make this area something that people want and are interested in.
- I am for the pavement widening in High Barnet. We need to make the High Street more attractive so that we can compete with North Finchley and Enfield which have better shops. I'd like to see more trees along the High Street to make it feel more pleasant.
- We think it will make the High Street look better, encourage new brands into the area and increase pedestrian safety.
- We are in favour of anything that will rejuvenate and enhance the dull and depressing High Street.
- In my opinion the proposed plan should go ahead. The improvements to the width of the western pavement and provision of better cycling facilities will augment and encourage more people to walk into town.

Summary of comments objecting to or raising concerns about elements of the scheme

Loading bays

- Concerns about siting of loading bays in Union Street and Salisbury Road as both roads (especially Union Street) are very narrow at the High Street end.
- Locating a loading bay in Union Street is impractical. How do the goods get from the new bay to the shop, 40 to 60 metres away. The pavement is not wide enough to transport goods. Would suggest all deliveries should be made before 7.30am when the streets are quieter and unloading immediately outside the shop should be easy.
- It would be worth considering some kind of dual use so that they can be part of the widened pavements for most of the day but loading/unloading could take place at certain times **(Theresa Villiers MP)**.
- Trolleying distance from the loading bays in Union Street/Salisbury Road is too long to be attractive. Footways are also rather narrow for trolley and pedestrian to pass each other.
- I do not believe that Union Street is a suitable street in which to place a loading bay for the following reasons:
 - The street already suffers from increasing traffic with many vehicles driving too fast.
 - Pavements and kerbstones are continually in a damaged state due to the fact that vans and SUVs park up on the curbs due to the narrow nature of the road.
 - There is a danger of an obstacle being created for emergency vehicles making their way down Union Street.
 - The siting of a loading bay will add to the general noise, unpleasantness and mess which this street already suffers. You are basically condemning us to live in a depot yard as vans and lorries unloading will be moving between their vehicles and the High Street past our homes. I know from close up the noise that vehicles, including

large lorries, coming into the street to park for a short period cause, leaving engines idling and then throwing litter as they drive off. I particularly resent my quality of life being damaged for the sake of a few extra trees and benches on the High Street.

- If you need to change the layout of Union Street, may I suggest an additional disabled bay outside 14 Union Street for those attending Cherry Lodge and the doctor's surgery and the current disabled bay outside 120 High Street becomes the additional loading bay.
- I object to the loading bays in Union Street and Salisbury Road because they:
 - Would be too far from shops they might service
 - Would impede or obstruct traffic and pedestrians
 - Would remove parking spaces intended for residents
 - There is no information on how the loading bays would be used when not in use
- I object to the loading bays on Salisbury Road and Union Street as I am well aware of the long tailbacks that develop from heavy traffic at certain times. Buses are already held up by these and a loading bay will only worsen the situation there.
- Air quality in these two residential streets will also be affected as a result of the increased congestion and tailbacks.
- The loading bays would hinder pedestrians' movements, especially those with prams, pushchairs or using wheelchairs or mobility vehicles.
- I am concerned about safety. Union Street is already very busy and as a narrow street it will become increasingly dangerous with the added obstruction of new loading bays.
- The streets are too narrow for large lorries to be driving down and the noise from the lorries will disturb residents especially during night time deliveries (it's bad enough already from the bays on the High Street).
- The loading bay in Union Street is proposed to be opposite Room 89 shop behind which is a private car park that many local businesses and residents use. It is hard enough to turn into/out of this when there is a big car or van parked opposite, let alone a large HGV.
- The proposal to site loading bays in residential side streets would create further congestion, serious risk to pedestrians, pressure on parking and increase pollution.
- A loading bay in Salisbury Road would impede buses and increase vehicles queuing to access the High Street.
- Evidence shows that pedestrians are already at risk from vehicles mounting the Union Street pavement to pass vans and lorries parked legally and illegally.
- TfL guidelines present evidence that delivery drivers will not look for loading bays unless they are close to their drop off point – otherwise they will stop at 'first sight' – which means even on yellow lines, undermining another objective of the scheme; to increase traffic flow.
- I believe the loading bays should remain on the High Street but given a time restriction say from midnight to 10am.
- Moving loading bays to Union Street and Salisbury Road will make it even harder to park and affect traffic flow in these roads which are already tiny (union St) and overflowing with buses (Salisbury Road). There simply isn't the spare capacity.
- I would support all loading spaces being located in the High Street even if this means removing more car parking spaces on the other side of the road.
- The positioning of designated loading bays on side streets will further negatively impact on the residents parking allocation.

- The loading bay in Union Street as marked on the plan is located at the narrowest part of the street and is only 2 metres wide. According to TfL a loading bay must measure 2.4 metres wide. A narrow one-way residential street is not suitable for a loading bay. Union Street is already used as a cut through and driving speeds are in excess of 30mph.
- I would like to express my specific concern regarding the relocation of one of the loading bays. I don't believe Union Street is equipped for heavy traffic and these proposals would only lead to an accident waiting to happen. Another concern is that once these large vehicles reach the top of Union Street they could then be turning left onto a very narrow part of the road (again with a narrow pavement). This will cause further safety issues for pedestrians and also increase traffic congestion in the area – there are already problems with buses trying to navigate this problematic area and directing large vehicles to this area will only make it worse.
- How do you propose delivery trucks are going to be able to make their deliveries by crossing the road several times with their full pallets of goods? Also the width of their vehicles would prohibit any other vehicle entering or leaving Union Street and Salisbury Road. What will happen to the buses as they try to turn from Salisbury Road?
- This will directly increase traffic, congestion and pressure on parking for residents of Union Street. Union Street is already seeing increased traffic from the change to access to Wood Street from the High Street. Unable to park on the High Street and with no access up Salisbury Road, Union Street will bear the brunt of through traffic and vehicles seeking parking. This increases congestion and pollution and given the speed with which vehicles travel up Union Street, danger to pedestrians.
- Vehicles, unable to get past the lorries on the road drive on the pavement. This is not safe, the pavement is for pedestrians.
- Increased lorries and traffic waiting to pass with engines running increases pollution which is bad for everyone, particularly high risk groups. Unions Street is a narrow residential road. It is not suitable for this type of traffic. The vibration from additional traffic will damage the fabric of the street and our homes. At what times will the loading bays be operational? Will there be lorries at night? A loading bay in Salisbury Road would impede buses and increase vehicles queuing to access the High Street – again increasing pollution from running engines and causing traffic jams and congestion up Salisbury Road and onto the High Street. TfL guidelines give evidence that delivery drivers will stop at 'first sight' at spaces nearest their drop off point – including on double yellow lines. They do not look for loading bays unless they are close enough to the drop off point, thus reducing the proposed improvement by moving the loading bays off the High Street. While i would support a carefully thought through improvement of the High Street I strongly object to this proposal, which will, without achieving significant improvements on the High Street, have a very negative impact on many local residents and specifically those in Union Street and Salisbury Road.?
- There has been a good deal of local reaction to the idea of locating two loading bays in side streets to compensate for the removal of one bay on the west side of the High Street. I would not wish to see the force of a 'no' campaign prevent the pavement project going ahead, and although I don't necessarily agree with the arguments put forward, I suggest the scheme is amended to relocate the bay back on the High Street. I suggest it should be placed at the southern end, outside the Post Office, in the position currently taken by two parking bays, next to the bus stop. The pavement build outs could start immediately beyond

and before the Union Street junction. This bay could double up for loading only during restricted hours and as 2 pay parking bays for the rest of the day.

- I object to the placing of loading bays at the end of Salisbury Road. Getting out of this road often takes over 10 minutes especially when two or three buses are lined up trying to turn right or when a disabled driver has parked at the end of the road. It is not unusual for stationary traffic to fill the entire road and impact Stapylton Road. With additional loading bays this would become the norm.
- The traffic on my road (Salisbury) is already excessive – it is often at a standstill during rush hours – and there is a chronic lack of parking for local residents. The consequences of additional noise, traffic congestion, parking access and not least pollution from lorries to residents of these roads would be serious.
- I urge the Council not to proceed with this proposal without first identifying an alternative solution to the access problems it would cause High Street shops that do not disproportionately affect residents of Salisbury Road and Union Street – as the current proposals would.
- I OBJECT to the cynical attempt at obfuscation by not showing the width of the proposed loading bay in Union Street on the drawing.
- I OBJECT to the proposal on the grounds that it is devoid of any technical credibility given the widths of the proposed loading bays - 2.4m (Salisbury Road), 2.0m (Union Street) & 1.9m (proposed new loading bay in the High Street), the latter in particular being barely wide enough for a modest family saloon. If the proponents of this scheme are so manifestly unable to propose viable loading bays, how is the public supposed to have confidence in the rest of this proposal?
- I OBJECT to the proposal on the grounds that it is devoid of any technical credibility given the proposal to site a loading bay in Union Street: a) Union Street is far too narrow b) The distance between the proposed bay and the High Street - 45m - is too great; & c) The pavement is too narrow to accommodate the unloading of goods from side-loading delivery vehicles, at the same time as wheelchairs and mobility scooters are using that pavement - and I note that some of the regular clientèle of Kwafers salon are users of wheelchairs and mobility scooters. As a consequence this would clearly constitute indirect discrimination contrary to the provisions of the Equality Act 2010.
- The following photograph shows a bin lorry side by side with the proposed loading bay outside Kwafers salon in Union Street, graphically illustrating that the street is far too narrow to accommodate a loading bay at this point (as, in fact, it is anywhere within 50+ m of the High Street): 6) I OBJECT to the siting of a loading bay ANYWHERE in Union Street for the reasons set out above.
- I OBJECT to the re-siting of the existing loading bays as proposed, on the grounds that no study has been carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the “Kerbside Loading Guidance, TfL Freight Unit technical guidance advice note FU5/08, July 2009”. “When reviewing, planning and implementing street schemes, it is vital [my emphasis] to take into account all the issues, considerations and delivery characteristics discussed in this guide. Not only will this enable delivery activities to be integrated successfully into a street’s day to day operation, it will have a positive impact on air quality through reduced congestion and improved traffic conditions.” These are objectives on which we can all agree - people living near the High Street, the traders and their staff, the public shopping there, and the

public driving to, from and along the High Street, and the Council has completely ignored these very clear and eminently reasonable guidelines provided by TfL.

Removal of parking bays on the Western side of the High Street

- The planned removal of High Street parking spaces can only add to the misery of Union Street residents trying to find a parking space. Union Street parking is already under heavy pressure as a result of ill-considered planning approvals.
- It would be useful to know how many parking movements will be affected in a typical shopping day by the removal of the parking on the west side of the High Street. Would their removal be replaced by similar or more 'pedestrian' shoppers (who may have parked elsewhere in this local centre)? Does the balance between short and longer term parking tariffs and payment method in the town centre need to be re-examined to encourage displaced motorists to park away from the High Street?
- Please don't kill off Barnet High Street by making parking impossible. I frequently use several of the shops and the Post Office and it already difficult to park in the High Street. As a blue badge holder, it is ideal to be able to park in the main road or alternatively in either Salisbury Road or Union Street. Will this still be possible if more loading bays are installed? I find that the two car parks in Stapylton Road are just too far away and often very busy. There is much building work within the Spires but surely it will be in vain if people cannot park. Just a short distance away is Borehamwood Retail Park with hundreds of parking spaces, free for three hours.
- We already have to pay as a resident to not be able to park within 500 yards of our own homes because there are not enough resident only bays. Now you plan to remove more parking and push cars into the side roads for café culture on a main arterial route into London.
- Lack of parking spaces will reduce access for disabled, elderly and infirm people to access the services they require on the High Street.
- What is needed is to improve footfall to the area with cheaper/free parking (not less accessible parking) to enable us to compete with surrounding areas
- As a disabled individual who possesses a blue badge, I feel the removal of parking bays in High Street can have nothing but a detrimental effect upon my ability to use the facilities in the High Street.
- Removing 8 or 10 parking spaces will result in 8 to 10 fewer potential customers throughout the day.
- The proposal to remove parking bays and a loading bay on the High Street contradicts one of the main objectives; to attract and retain business and small traders near the High Street.
- Removing the 9 parking bays in the High Street will cause elderly, infirm and less able drivers accessing the services they need, banking, building societies, post office, chemists, dry cleaners, bakers etc.
- I believe the loss of parking bays could seriously impact disabled users. If you don't keep the existing number of disabled spaces how will they be able to use pharmacies for medications and other things and the bank and other shops if necessary. Please can you ensure that you retain disabled bays at or very near the current locations to ensure this remains possible. Ideally you need them on both sides of the road but certainly near where they are now.

Even crossing the road can be a challenge for some disabled people. Repositioning disabled bays away from the main road or to less central areas will have a serious negative impact on those who rely on them.

- With the new development of restaurants at the Spires the roads next to and behind the Spires are already facing enormous problems for permit holders when the controlled parking there ends at 6.30pm. The roads are going to become free parking magnets for people visiting.
- I do not see the need for any public parking spaces on either side of the high street except for disabled drivers.
- I feel very strongly that removing parking bays and widening the pavement will kill the trade for the local shops; Barnet High St will become a ghost town. The best solution would be to allow free parking for half an hour, Hertsmeire Council do this and the shops have a healthy living.
- If you are taking away parking from the High Street how will those of us who live in flats on the High Street be able to park close by to unpack our cars after shopping or any other such expedition? If we move residence where will a moving van park? It is not very conducive to have movers carry furniture half way down the road to get to a van.
- The reduction of parking spaces in the High Street will result in 'out of town' shoppers being displaced to residential side roads where residents parking is at a critical point of over subscription (permits).
- On the basis that current resident and shop parking facilities are under great pressure this proposed traffic management scheme does not appear to deliver any real benefit for ratepayers of High Barnet other than the planting of some trees in the High Street.
- The loss of parking spaces will negatively affect footfall to shops nearby the High Street and it has not been shown by Barnet Council that the users of these spaces will park either in the Spires car park or elsewhere. Our High Street is already peppered with vacant premises due to high rents and a change to people's shopping habits. Removing these spaces will surely further harm our high street.
- The removal of parking spaces in the High Street will adversely affect the businesses along this stretch of road. At the moment they are used for short term parking by people using local shops, banks and other facilities. Over 400 of my customers have signed a petition against these proposals. These customers are crucial to our business and we cannot afford to lose them.
- I am concerned that as a local business owner, the proposals would be removing nearby parking spaces for my customers which may have a negative impact on my business.
- Loss of parking is a big issue. You should look to replace these with a 30 minute free parking adjustment to the meters to encourage a greater number of stop and shop visitors in turn improving visitor numbers, local trade and the vitality of the High Street. Many motorists park opposite Barclays Bank and pedestrians cannot move between the building (by the Halifax) and the cars to get on their way.
- Anyone who has been in the retail trade knows that people shop where there is easy and cheap parking. People now go to London Colney.
- The loss of 7 parking spaces will result in all those shoppers unable to access the High Street which, multiplied over days and weeks is a large loss of trade for the local shops. More parking is needed not less.

- High Street parking spaces and signage to car parks is desperately inadequate. Shops that people want to quickly run into; the bakers, coffee shops, dry cleaners, charity shops, the Post Office and the banks need people to be able to park outside and preferably free for 15 minutes.
- People with disabled badges park at the High Street at the end of both Union Street and Salisbury Road and whilst I understand the need for this, it can be a source of potential danger to pedestrians and adds to congestion. To me it would make more sense to allow blue badge holders to park on the High Street whilst maintaining spaces for the people making a short visit to shops.
- In terms of parking I'm happy for a reduction in the number of spaces as the High Street needs to appeal to local residents who walk into the High St. I think there needs to be a complete review of the parking needs of the High Street. It needs to cater for the short term parking where people want to just pop into shops. It needs to allow for evening parking to support restaurants (removal of some double yellow lines) and Sunday parking should be reviewed as the free parking means that people can park there all day, blocking shoppers. I think there should be 2 or 3 hour free parking on a Sunday to encourage a turnover of visitors.
- The Town Team had an agenda which was environmentally based and good but did not take into account the very short term parking needs of a few long-established premises including the Post Office and Victoria Bakery. The council might borrow from a previous option which would designate some of the kerb build-out footway space as 'off street' parking space, allowing pedestrian use when not occupied by very short term parking. One or two such spaces might be suitable outside the Post Office and immediately north of the Union Street junction.
- How is the widening of a pavement and the loss of parking meters and their revenue going to help an already ailing High Street? As a blue badge holder my walking is very limited and if your proposal goes ahead I will no longer be able to visit the High Street. This would be the same for other Blue Badge holders. Have you given any thought to these people and the ones who park quickly to run into the bank etc.
- The removal of parking spaces on the High St is absolute madness. This is where locals stop for quick shopping trips or parents with children/disabled people use to load and unload.
- I OBJECT to the proposed loss of 15 car parking bays at the very heart of the High Barnet shopping area, which would be very detrimental to the residents of Union Street and Salisbury Road, the small traders in the High Street and Union Street, and for the public alike.

Other parking related comments

- Suggestion to switch the parking bay on the eastern side of the road just north of the junction with Moxon Street with the disabled bay further along the High Street. When larger vehicles park in this bay visibility is reduced on entry/exit from Moxon Street.
- Often disabled and non-disabled users park at the entrance to Union Street for easy access to the High Street. As a pedestrian and mother with a buggy navigating these cars is a nightmare with the narrow pavement as you approach the High Street

- Due to there now being no requirement to display residents permits on the vehicle windscreen there is no method to check the validity of a vehicle parked other than by a parking warden. This leaves the system open to abuse for any period between warden inspections.
- There is constant parking abuse at the entrance to Union Street alongside our premises principally by misuse of blue badges , this should be targeted with cameras if necessary. This is a major issue of congestion turning in from the High Street, and to the entrance to Union Street and a constant frustration. – the exit from Salisbury Road should be given a central white line to separate vehicles turning left or right, this would ease congestion in Salisbury Road by freeing up the larger numbers of vehicles turning left.
- People have also started pulling up and parking temporarily on double yellow lines outside the Halifax and Children’s Hospice charity shop – difficult for passing traffic and those turning left out of Salisbury Road. Adding to this restricted flow by adding a loading bay on Salisbury Road does not make sense to me. Buses and traffic turning right need a full view (people also park outside Barclays Bank).
- If the council seriously want to help Barnet High Street they should implement a free 30 minute parking system as used in Potters Bar.

Build-outs

- I understand that the moving traffic carriageway in parts of the High Street will be marginally narrowed with a minimum width of 6 metres (two-way). I ask you to reconsider this, especially where it coincides with larger vehicles turning from Salisbury Road into the High Street. My regular use of buses exiting Salisbury Road demonstrates to me that all but the shortest buses do not seem to be able to straighten up in the High Street without their offside rear ends straying into the northbound carriageway south of the extended KEEP CLEAR marking. Northbound vehicles giving way to buses often overshoot the start line of the marking, but at present can pull into the yellow line protection outside Barclays Bank. A kerb build out will prevent this procedure. Legitimate parking on the eastern side of the High Street by 4x4s and transit size vans may not always be wholly contained within the parking bays and some will rest marginally in the moving traffic carriageway. Do the kerb build outs need to be 2.6m wide? Why not 2.4m?
- There is allowance for large vehicles turning left out of Salisbury Road so they may avoid the proposed build out there, however far more large vehicles (mostly buses) turn right out of Salisbury Road. The presence of the proposed build out immediately south of Salisbury Road will make the drivers job even more difficult there. Buses already struggle to turn right and traffic takes little notice of the KEEP CLEAR. Last year someone was killed by a bus turning right onto the High Street at that junction.
- I do not think that extending the pavement will improve the shopping experience in Barnet. What is needed is better and more varied shops.
- The shorter distance from one side of the road to the other will encourage pedestrians to cross wherever they fancy, with the possibility of accidents, and enhanced formal crossings will just slow the traffic on what is a very busy main road.
- With cars unable to stop to drop the north travelling traffic will have no alternative but to stop and hold up other vehicles to let out disabled passengers or deliver heavy goods.

- You mention reduced queuing time for motorists. With no parking places and a wider pavement, the road is reduced to just two lanes and any vehicle stopping in the High Street will just cause the traffic flow to stop. Queuing will not be reduced and I just see a constant traffic jam all day long.
- The High Street is never going to be somewhere to stroll through, it's always been the highway going north and it should stay that way. If you want to get people into the shops the parking fees need to change, an hours free parking would make a difference.
- I am not happy with the present proposals as consider them detrimental to the efficient operation of the High Street/A1000 and vital link road north-south. I believe that the full four carriageways are necessary to contain the present (and likely future) traffic flow, the necessary loading bays, the desired stopping/parking area, the manoeuvring space for emergency vehicles, bus stops and bus access from Salisbury Road.
- Currently pedestrians waiting to cross the high street near Union Street block the pavement for other pedestrians as it isn't currently wide enough. Especially if there is a buggy or wheelchair waiting and another walking up the pavement. This is the case on both sides of the road and also on the Sainsbury's side of the other crossing.
- The layout shows an area immediately to the north of the junction with Salisbury Road without pavement build out. The previous layout did not. There is a note to say this is an overrun area for large vehicles turning out of Salisbury Road. This will reduce the benefits and impact of the widened pavement. Has it been shown to be necessary for delivery vehicles accessing the proposed loading bay? If so it will not be required if the loading bay does not go ahead. If it has to be included for other reasons, I would ask for it to be reduced in size as it appears to be excessive (have vehicle tracking diagrams been produced?)
- There is no need to extend the pavement as the streets are not overflowing with people.
- The widening of the pavements is pointless and expensive. The current arrangement is adequate.
- I fail to see how the changes can make the High Street safer for pedestrians to improve the visibility of adjoining junctions. How can narrowing the road improve traffic flow? It will create more problems than it will solve. I cannot imagine what it will be like trying to enter the High Street from Salisbury Road. This junction is already hazardous, don't make it any worse.
- I've never heard anyone complain about the pavement width. In fact it's plenty wide.

Shared use facilities

- I really cannot understand how the building of a 'shared use' feature at the end of Salisbury Road would achieve anything. Traffic is slow or even stationary there, sometimes backed up by a driver who insists on turning right from the left side of Salisbury Road or more usually behind a bus which is unable to get out into the High Street.
- The existing shared use feature at the Union Street junction does not prevent drivers nearly running down pedestrians who cross there.
- I seem to remember that a 'shared use' area was installed in Salisbury Road when that at Union Street was put in, however the former broke up under the weight of vehicles exiting

and turning into the High Street and was removed. If you replace please ensure that the foundations are robust enough to withstand the weight of heavy vehicles on the paving.

Trees/benches/cycle stands

- The tree that would be installed just to the north of Union Street may obstruct the view between pedestrians and drivers turning from the north.
- Trees /planters – that these be places so that they cannot be removed and are as vandal proof as possible. Also that they are positioned with consideration for the view of the shops concerned ie not in front of historic long-term businesses such as Victoria Bakery.
- I query the wisdom of providing extra seating on the build outs (7 benches are shown) for two reasons: the juxtaposition of seats to the moving traffic flow which is noisy and polluting, and the likelihood of their occupancy by homeless sleepers at night. Single metal seats with armrests arranged around part of the base of some of the trees might be more acceptable.
- I doubt that bicycle stands will encourage more cyclists to the area. Barnet is very hilly and polluted.
- An early objective of the Council was to ‘de-clutter’ the High Street but the scheme proposes to site potted trees, benches, litter bins, further cycle stands, defeating another aim; to make the High Street more pedestrian friendly. The new clutter will create further obstacles for not only able bodied but also the elderly infirm, wheelchair users, parents with children in buggies.
- You mention cycle stands but I do not see them on the drawing.
- Litter bins attract rubbish which should be recycled; will you be providing bins which take this into account?
- While I welcome the proposal I feel that the trees and benches as shown on the plan will largely negate the benefit of the widening. The new pavement would be cluttered and would not therefore provide the much-needed additional space for people with buggies, wheelchairs and those who have difficulty walking. Cafes would be unable to take advantage of the opportunity to provide seating outside their premises. We already have a couple of benches towards the northern end of the High Street, the seating near the Church and several cafes. I think all that is needed is one additional bench located between Salisbury Road and Union Street.
- Likewise while two or three trees would improve the look of the area and improve the air quality, the number shown on the plan would in my view be excessive. Also in time the roots would make the pavements uneven making the high Street hazardous.
- I query the wisdom of providing extra seating on the build outs (seven benches are shown) for two reasons: one is the juxtaposition of seats to moving traffic flow which is noisy and polluting, and the other is the likelihood of their occupancy by homeless sleepers at night. Single seats around the base of some of the trees might be more acceptable.
- I cannot support street trees being planted in planters as shown. The previous proposals were for planting directly into the ground and must be reinstated. Trees in planters would not look as good, are far less likely to survive and will need a large amount of maintenance/watering. I suggest that as part of the works there could be additional parking bays created elsewhere on the High Street and in our side streets.

- Trees and seats are all very nice but are they going to encourage people to come to Barnet High Street. What is needed is better (free) parking, and lower business rates to entice traders to come and rent the shops.
- I've not noticed a huge problem with lack of bike parking, though obviously this is useful.

Other comments

- There has been much work done recently to de-clutter the High Street, yet these proposals will have the exact opposite effect.
- With regard to the right turn out of Moxon Street into High Street, I understand that the markings will remain unchanged however any additional improvements to easy right turning traffic would be appreciated.
- Concern with medium/large lorries using Union Street as a short cut to Wood Street.
- I think that there is a strong case for Union Street to be an ACCESS only road to discourage through traffic. At the High Street end of Union Street there is a danger to pedestrians due to the narrow footway - front doors open onto the pavement, wheelie bins are left outside, kerbstones are damaged from lorries mounting the pavement and pedestrians are often forced into the road.
- How would traders' rubbish be dealt with – its storage and collection by vehicle, which would need to stand in the moving traffic flow.
- Would it be advisable to erect as appropriate some bollards on the build outs for security purposes?
- I strongly object to the apparent secrecy around the implementation of plans that have not been put to the Area Committee.
- Perhaps the Council would consider implementing guidelines as to how many estate agents, charity shops, opticians and hairdressers are granted new trading permits in this prime stretch of High Street to go alongside the improvements to its aesthetics.
- Since the ability to turn from Wood Street to the High Street and vice versa, these roads are now more regularly used by traffic coming off and onto the High Street. With the construction work, as local residents we have seen and feel the impact of large lorries accessing and parking in Union Street and the impact this has on the one way traffic.
- Incentives to draw more independent outlets to the High Street area are needed.
- The major problem with the High Street is the poor performance of the shops due to high business rates and insufficient customer footfall. Your plan does nothing to help this issue but will make it worse. Customers will visit nearby shopping areas, in preference to Barnet because they can park their cars. Removing 8 or 10 parking spaces will result in 8 to 10 fewer potential customers throughout the day.
- May I suggest that the 'consultation' would have better been a SURVEY of local people's wishes and needs.
- There was a missed opportunity to create an outdoor café area outside what is currently Guns and Smoke. That would be a good addition to the life of the area.
- I would ask that you consider a 20mph zone in the area to complement the proposals.

- Your website says that as a local resident I should have received details of the scheme and an invitation to respond. I have not and therefore question whether the consultation has been carried out properly.
- Surely our Council Tax would be better spent on turning a lacklustre and frankly embarrassing High Street into a vibrant shopping area. As things stand there seems to be a concerted effort to discourage anyone from driving to Barnet. Hardly any decent shops and ridiculously expensive parking. I would suggest you channel Council Tax payers money into encouraging retailers to want to set up shop. And in turn encouraging the public to want to visit Barnet.
- As a stalls coordinator for the Barnet Christmas Fayre I have a further interest in the scheme. The proposals as they stand will impact negatively on the event, but an uncluttered wider pavement would perhaps allow market stalls to be sited on the pavement, both at the Christmas Fayre and at other times of the year.
- There has been absolutely no local agreement about these plans. The Town Team purport to represent Barnet traders, The Barnet Society and other Barnet residents simply DO NOT have a mandate to claim this. Where are the minutes of the meetings of The Town Team? They have no authority to claim any kind of mandate from local people.
- Much has been made of the reduction in pollution that these proposals will achieve. I believe this will have minimal effect if at all, as it will make no difference to the number of vehicles passing through Barnet High Street and will actually increase the number of delivery vehicles, often HGVs in Union Street and Salisbury Road.
- I object to the proposal on the grounds that this so-called consultation is flawed. The information which you have provided to the public is selective and one-sided and you have not provided the information needed to come to an informed view. You say “removing much of the parking on the western side of the High Street” when the reality is that it incorporates the removal of ALL of the parking on the western side. In addition it would also involve the removal of two parking bays on the eastern side of the High Street PLUS two parking bays in Union Street and two in Salisbury Road. In total this would amount to the loss of 15 parking bays in the heart of the High Street. Whilst you have provided a drawing setting out what is proposed, how are members of the public supposed to be able to understand the drawing? The key issue is the trade-off between parking and pavements.
- The Spires is undergoing change to bring the shopping centre greater custom. These improvements should be matched in the public domain to create a better experience in the High Street to help bring greater footfall to the town in general. We understand that there is some confusion about some of the details around loading bays but feel these issues are very minor compared to the benefits of the scheme. We believe that what Barnet High Street must embrace is change – change to becoming a new kind of destination based on leisure and ‘retail recreation’ to match the shopping done in The Spires.
- There is no need to extend the pavement as the streets are not overflowing with people. There is not even a cycle lane, at least add a cycle lane. There has been at least one cyclist death in the last two years and you want to make the road narrower. The High Street and surrounding roads are gridlocked every morning. Take a proper look at roads and traffic flow to use this funding wisely and not flippantly. What about a bus bay? Buses stopping and blocking flow of traffic rather than parking cars. Or better still no bus stops in the main high street area. What about using funding to create a unit for a department store? The last

'improvement' around the church passage area is now un-kept with empty flower beds – not an improvement. Provide free parking. Other shopping area like Borehamwood and London Colney do and this is where I go despite living in High Barnet.

- Shops and residents cannot afford the exorbitant prices in Barnet. What we need is affordable premises selling everyday goods and foods at affordable prices.
- Despite living virtually opposite the site of proposed loading bay, I did not receive a hand delivered letter.
- Salisbury Road and Union Street are narrow, these roads & the one leading to the back way to Waitrose are dangerous & many people trip up. REPAIR these broken pavements & spend the money on what is a real problem.
- The main issues with High Barnet are:
 - Parking is too expensive
 - High rent & rates – this prevents independent businesses from opening

Union Street Residents Association

USRA has only just heard of a proposal to widen paving on the west side of the High Street which, according to the Barnet Society website, would reduce parking by seven bays and more alarmingly, a suggestion that loading bays would be sited in Union Street and Salisbury Road. See the attached printout. Such a proposal ignores the fact that both Union Street and Salisbury Road are both very narrow at the High Street end, Union Street especially so. It is also the fact that pavements (which are in a dreadful state of repair post the OWCH development,) are very narrow at that end of Union Street and are obstructed by wheelie bins as a consequence of the policy to provide bins to households with no off-street spaces to store them. Furthermore, the sewer collapsed adjacent to Nos 42 - 46 Union Street in 2013 thanks to the kind of heavy lorries likely to be parked in the suggested loading bay. The experience of the two year OWCH development indicates the likely effect on Union Street should a loading bay be sited there. When large vehicles park at the narrow end of the street, other traffic often passes along the footpaths, causing damage and risk to pedestrians.

Therefore members of USRA and residents strongly lodge this objection to the proposal to site a loading bay in Union Street.

Response from Chipping Barnet Town Team

I am writing as Secretary to the Chipping Barnet Town Team, who have played a large part over the last three years of developing this part of the 2013 Town Plan. As a group of stake-holders in the town - the Team includes representatives of the Barnet Society, Barnet Residents Association, SPACES (Sebright, Puller, Alston, and Calvert Roads), Love Barnet, Friends of Barnet Market, Churches Together and the disabled community, and is regularly attended by Theresa Villiers, our local MP.

We read the latest proposal with interest and have the following thoughts:

- In light of hostile responses, in the town, to aspects of the build-out programme, we have sampled traders with respect to their delivery routines – 15 vans/day between Church Passage and Carluccios. None of the traders use large lorries for their deliveries.

- We feel that this negative reaction is in part due to lack of awareness-raising by the Town Team and others. We regret that, as a group that has been closely involved in the development, we

received no advance notice of the release date for the consultation, denying us the opportunity to remind our members of the original reasons for the build-out, namely the planting of trees to enhance the High Street appearance and experience. This was not made clear in the released discussion document, which refers to trees in planters, which we have argued against throughout.

- The main concern appears to be the perceived effect on Union Street and Salisbury. The High Street traders we have talked to are happier about the build-out. Perhaps it might be possible to allow deliveries on the High Street (before 10:00 say).

- there are undoubted benefits of this project which are appreciated by the Town Team, especially in this chance to tie the two ends of the High Street together and to take advantage of the encouraging developments of the Spires, to feed into a revived High Street retail mix. However, the consultation emailed document did not sell the project well.

- So, finding a compromise on loading bays would help. It would allow Town Team and Council Officers to be seen to be listening to side-road residents and would certainly help sell the project.

- Union St is an ongoing problem for loading and unloading, in that it already happens informally. We feel it would not damage the scheme by relinquishing the Union St loading bays and keeping the High St bays instead. A similar situation exists on Salisbury - putting a bay there might help, but dropping that bay as well would be a better idea and a solution to the main issue that has been raised against the project.

Response from Barnet Residents Association

The scheme has been supported by High Barnet Town Team and in case you have not seen it a copy of their statement is at the end of this submission.

You will be aware that a petition has been run in a number of shops opposing the build-outs and has attracted a large number of signatures. We would caution against giving too much weight to this. It has been presented as though the council is withdrawing parking spaces and putting loading bays in residential streets without any good reason. The promoters have told people there will be less trade and loss of jobs, for which they have no evidence (from similar schemes for example), and claim that traders are against the scheme, implying overwhelmingly so, when in reality only a minority are. We have spoken to a dozen traders in the immediate area and in The Spires, of whom half are in favour of the scheme and the rest at worst neutral. It is very difficult to get responses from traders as many shops are just staffed by people who have no authority to express a view, and as we have found in the past, it is difficult to get traders to take positive steps to let their views be known. But of course at its heart this scheme is about boosting the trading performance of our shops, and we urge that you consider very carefully any reaction you have had from traders. We know of just one trader who has been vociferous in opposition. Indeed that is the one outlet along the stretch in question where there might be a significant car-borne 'pop-in' trade, though we believe it is being grossly overstated. We estimate about 15 vans a day deliver to the 23 businesses on the stretch in question, and several of these already park on yellow lines in the two side roads. Hardly the hordes of lorries the petition promoters claim. To have any credibility the petition should be supported by hard evidence, not just unfounded assertions.

There is an absence of reliable information on the usage of the seven parking spaces in question and the potential extra traffic that might be generated in the side streets. We did a snapshot check one morning and in one hour just two drivers using the seven spaces went into premises along that stretch. The majority headed for The Spires and some elsewhere. Significant numbers of blue badge holders were parked for very lengthy periods so clearly they were not just stopping to pop into the adjacent shops. We do however recognise that significant numbers of blue badge holders use these

spaces. Whilst the future of the town centre should not be determined just on the needs or wishes of blue badge holders, we suggest consideration is given to providing more dedicated bays, perhaps on the side opposite.

We would not expect you to take our snapshot assessment as gospel but it does demonstrate a reality far removed from what the opposition claim. In retrospect we think it would have been sensible for you to have conducted a short survey to establish the facts of usage and van movements. If you do consider the petition has credence than we suggest this is essential before going any further.

On loading bays the Town Team does have doubts about putting them in the side roads. In Union Street the designated spot does seem very narrow and we ask you to reassess this. There is also a doubt whether vans turning into Union St will travel as far as the bay as they will be able, as they often do now, park on the yellow lines nearer the High St. There is also some informal parking on Salisbury Rd where there are rear entrances to some of the shops on the opposite side to the proposed bay. So the vans here may still choose not to park in the new bay. Our feeling is that usage here will be low and it would better to leave the two public parking spaces and continue with the informal parking as now. This leads us to the conclusion that on balance leaving the existing loading bay on The High St would not compromise the scheme unduly.

We continue to support maximising the build outs by removing the seven parking bays. We have difficulty understanding the reason for the hatching immediately to the north of Salisbury Rd and ask that you look again at whether this could be built out instead. We also find some attraction in a suggestion that the build outs be 2.4m rather than 2.6m, allowing for a helpful widening of the carriageway. We also ask that the paved areas crossing Salisbury and Union St are raised with a steep ramp each end and stronger colours. The existing crossing on Union St appears to be too much like it is just a continuation of the road and drivers treat it is the way.

We do know that schemes of this kind often generate opposition because invariably something tangible is being removed (parking spaces or a road closure) and replaced with something intangible. So it does need persuasion to get public perception on side, and in retrospect we considered not enough has been done to do this. That such schemes do go a long way to arresting and reversing the decline of town centres is well attested. It is a matter of keeping faith with the scheme in High Barnet where we still consider radical measures are needed to deal with the evident decline over many years. As for the opposition, what are just assertions should be challenged to produce evidence of 'overwhelming' trader opposition and meaningful assessments of the pattern of loading activity and use of the seven parking bays for accessing the shops nearby. Indeed, as we have said above, an independent survey would be the best way to settle this.