

Environment Committee Public Questions/Comments– 13 July 2017

| Question Number | Item Number | Raised by | Question Raised | Answer |
|-----------------|------------------|--|---|--|
| 1 | 13 Appendix A | Jon Dix | Why have there been so many enforcement fines issued in Golders Green & North Finchley compared to East Finchley & Whetstone – are certain areas being singled out for special treatment? | Environmental enforcement activities have been undertaken in areas that were originally approved by the Environment Committee on the 8th March 2016, with specific attention being placed on areas of high footfall such as key retail centres and transport hubs. The trial will continue to be operated on a borough-wide basis, ensuring that all areas receive support in terms of litter reduction. |
| 2 | 15 | Andrea Garman Coordinator Barnet, London Cycling Campaign | <p>Item 15: Tackling Air Pollution Around Schools</p> <p>1. <i>“With reference to paragraph 1.11: The concepts of pedestrianisation around school entrances, or indeed entirely closing streets during school opening and closing times (known as “School Streets”) could be applied uniformly to all schools in the Borough. Could the Environment Committee confirm if this has been investigated, and provide details of any such investigation or decision not to?”</i></p> <p>2. <i>“With reference to paragraph 1.17: Does the Environment Committee have evidence that non-segregated cycle tracks and Advanced Stop Lines provide enough security to allow the Borough’s children to ride among cars, and if so can they provide it please?”</i></p> <p>3. <i>“Has the Environment Committee considered banning the parking of all cars within a 500m radius of a school during school drop off and pick up times as has been done at schools in Hackney?”</i></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pedestrianisation around the boroughs 118 schools entrances or closing down streets during school access has not been investigated. 2. Non segregated cycle tracks and advanced stop lines do provide ways of giving space to cyclists, we are not aware of specific research on this in Britain with regards security of children cycling. 3. The Environment Committee have not considered the banning of all parked cars within a 500m radius of schools during pick and drop off. |

| | | | | |
|---|----|---------|--|--|
| 3 | 15 | Mr Levy | <p>1. Please will this Committee consider the proposals made in a 43-signature petition recently submitted to Barnet Council [recently heard by the F+GG Residents Forum]?</p> <p>See Appendix A</p> <p>2. What recommendations were made by the Air Quality Champion, apart from his/her actions, and what is the Council's response to each of those recommendations?</p> | <p>There is a lot of information concerning work to do with schools and improving air quality and is an item on the agenda for 13th July Environment Committee.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <p>1.1 There has been a recent survey of 9 schools to reduce engine idling.</p> <p>1.2 The response times for on-going nuisance from smoke is 1 hour for dark smoke and 4 hours for white/light grey smoke. Environmental Health have done 2 recent formal investigations and cautions for dark smoke offences in the last 6 weeks. Only dark smoke offences are prohibited, it is not an offence to have a small white smoke bonfire unless there is excessive smoke entering habitable premises with evidence of a Nuisance.</p> <p>1.3 There is monitoring of call volumes and accessibility which is reported within the Re contract performance KPI's and monitored by the Barnet Commissioners.</p> <p>1.4 LB Barnet currently operates a green waste collection on a fortnightly basis. Those with excess garden/allotment waste can take it the Summers Lane Recycling Centre.</p> <p>2. The Air quality Champion was funded by the Mayors Air quality Fund 2014-16, he was recruited internally and was a young graduate, who with Public Health guidance and funding promoted sustainable and active travel as part of the air quality action plan.</p> <p>The Deliverables of the project were:</p> |
|---|----|---------|--|--|

Environment Committee Public Questions/Comments– 13 July 2017

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>At least 22,666 people were engaged with (excluding leaflet drops).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • including 66 schools/institutions in Barnet and Harrow delivering lessons on air quality/active transport, anti-idling and road safety/active transport days. • Engaged 35 businesses regarding smoke control and sustainable transport • Funded theatre education in 45 schools • Provided funding for three community air quality projects to commence in April 2016 with mapping for change. • Delivered at least one air quality lesson to upwards of 600 primary pupils • Advised 189 drivers of anti-idling at 10 schools over seven days and stopped 64 instances of idling. • Engaged with 520 residents, staff and students at a multi-agency (Council, police and fire) at Ayesha Community School on air quality, idling, road safety etc. • 5 schools given an 'Air Quality Award' (Roxeth, Chalgrove, Courtland, Northside and St Joseph's) to acknowledge the commitment to improving air quality education for students, staff and parents. |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Environment Committee Public Questions/Comments– 13 July 2017

| | | | | |
|---|----|---------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>The lessons learnt for the future was more of a focus to be had on promoting sustainable transport to businesses with lots of commuters entering Barnet. This was part of a future bid for Mayors air quality funding 2016-19 but was unsuccessful.</p> <p>There is a report regarding the air quality champion 2014-16 that can be provided on request scientificservices@barnet.gov.uk</p> |
| 4 | 12 | Mary O'Connor | <p>Many of the sites mentioned in item 12 "Implementation of the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy" contain or are close to SINC's (Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation). Before funds are spent on master plans can ecological surveys of these sites be conducted by qualified personnel to determine the current condition of these sites and to establish base data of them?</p> | <p>Site specific ecological surveys will be undertaken as part of the master planning process.</p> <p>The Council will also update the borough wide Biodiversity Action Plan in the run up to the Local Plan review.</p> |
| 5 | 12 | Tirza Waisel | <p>Regarding Recommendation 3 in the Summary and also 1.28 in p. 136:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the 'ring fenced funding' meant for currently? • Where does it stem from, how much money is it and how has it been used so far? • What do you mean by 'releasing' it? Why do you want this released? What do you intend to use it for if it's released? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The funding is ring fenced to improvements to Victoria Park; • A capital receipt from the sale of the Park Lodge building amounting to £623,000; <p>The inclusion of this amount in the capital programme to be used for planning and delivering improvements to the park</p> |
| 6 | 7 | Don Urquhart | <p>To the Govia person whether blue badge holders have to pay to park at New Barnet station. I have called Barnet Council, National Rail, Thameslink who are all very polite but do not know the answer.</p> <p>Telephone calls and emails to Indigo the car park</p> | <p>The Council do not operate this car park, however we have reviewed the information provided on Network Rail's website and it seems to indicate that Blue Badge holders are not expected to pay the car parking charges. This is usually indicated on the signage at the car parks and if that is not the case it may be prudent to check that</p> |

Environment Committee Public Questions/Comments– 13 July 2017

| | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---------------|---|---|
| | | | operator are routinely ignored. | the website details are still current. We will also forward on this question to our engagement colleagues at Govia to see if they are able to respond with information. |
| 7 | 13 Appendix A | Jon Dix | 429 fines were issued for Duty of Care offences to businesses. I understand that the procedure is as follows: "If we suspect a business is not dealing with its waste correctly, we can issue a notice requiring the production of waste transfer documents. Failure to produce the documents results in the issue of a fine." I understand that some small businesses have been fined not because they could not produce the documents but because they could not produce them within the timescale, sometimes due to the manager being on holiday. Do you think this is fair? | All businesses have a Duty of Care under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to take all reasonable steps to keep waste safe and arrange for its legal disposal. This applies to waste and recycling of any nature associated with a business, from a business premises, a work place or even a residential property used as a business premises. Business' who have a Commercial Waste Agreement with a registered waste contractor or waste authority to ensure that waste is disposed legally, will be given waste transfer documents. These documents can be requested at any time by the council or its agents. Failure to produce the documents in the specified time results in the issue of a fine. Business can find more out about their responsibilities at http://www.rightwasterightplace.com/ . As set out in <i>The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011</i> , waste transfer documents must be produced 'to an officer of the Environment Agency or a waste collection authority on demand within 7 days'. Where a business highlights a specific issue, such as key staff being absent, during conversations with the Environmental Enforcement Officers, we try to adopt a common sense approach were possible to enable the businesses to comply with the relevant legislation. |
| 8 | 12 | Mary O'Connor | Does Barnet Council have any staff with ecological expertise sufficient to evaluate these sites? | The Council does not employ an in-house ecologist. It works with qualified organisations such as the London Wildlife Trust with regard to such evaluations |

| | | | | |
|---|----|--------------|---|--|
| 9 | 12 | Tirza Waisel | <p>To Item 1.28 p. 136 in the Public Reports: '1.28 : Victoria Park which is assessed within the POSS as high quality/high value, has a number of motivated stakeholders who have recently formed a Friends of Victoria Park Group.'</p> <p>I am a regular user of Victoria Park, and I am glad the committee recognizes its 'high quality/high value'. Anyone passing through Victoria Park, at any time will see how well and how diversely it is used by the local community and beyond. As a daily user of the park, I am surprised that I don't know of the Friends of Victoria Park Group group. I haven't seen any posters or flyers inviting park users to join it or informing them of its existence.</p> <p>A. Can you please disclosed who this mysterious group is and how can local residents and park users – who are clearly stakeholders – join it?</p> <p>B. What are the 'park Improvements' that you have in mind?</p> <p>C. Why are the park's toilets been locked?</p> <p>D. Since this committee is now in charge of the park, will you instruct immediate opening of the toilets for public use? This will be one big improvement that will cost the council very little, only in toilet paper, soap and cleaner's wages.</p> <p>E. How do you intend to consult the park users? Why was there no publication IN THE PARK regarding these developments?</p> <p>F. When do you intend to consult the park users?</p> <p>G. Will you consult the park users before or after the 'appointment of appropriately experienced and qualified external consultants'?</p> <p>H. Why do you need to hire external consultants?</p> | <p>A. recently formed by a number local residents and members of other local stakeholder groups.</p> <p>We will encourage the Friends Group to put up notices in order to assist with local residents to be kept informed and engaged, the group can be contacted at FOVPFinchley@gmail.com</p> <p>B. These will be defined during the master planning stage in consultation with park users and stakeholders</p> <p>C. Unfortunately the toilets have been subject to vandalism requiring them to be closed. The Greenspaces team are working with its contractors to secure quotations to repair the toilets and will reopen them as soon as possible.</p> <p>D. As noted above the toilets have been closed to due to vandalism and will be reopened as soon as they can be repaired and made safe.</p> <p>E. The council will work with local stakeholders to design a high level concept master plan for Victoria Park this concept will then be put out for full public consultation.</p> <p>We would look to host consultation drop in sessions in the park, we will utilise posters and leaflets to signpost residents to the online engagement and consultation portal, paper copies of the consultation would be available upon request and of course we would also accept comments through email, telephone and letter.</p> |
|---|----|--------------|---|--|

Environment Committee Public Questions/Comments– 13 July 2017

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------|--|---|
| | | | <p>How many??? Consultants are short-sighted as they don't know the area and its history and social composition and needs, they cost heaps and do not stay around long enough to consider the long-term effects on all aspects of the community life. Obviously internal Barnet Council staff expertise is required or London Assembly expertise. Please explain the arguments for spending money on external experts rather than consulting the council staff who take care of the park for years and know it.</p> <p>I. How much money are you proposing to waste on these external consultants?</p> | <p>There has been no consultation as yet as no decisions have been taken or concepts developed at this stage.</p> <p>F. Subject to the appointment of appropriate consultants; early 2018</p> <p>G. We would look to consult with residents once an initial concept has been developed which would be the key output of the external consultant. As such this would be after the consultant has been appointed.</p> <p>H. The Council does not employ landscape architects. Council staff, together with users of the park and stakeholders will be fully engaged in the master planning and delivery processes to ensure that local knowledge is maximised</p> <p>I. The engagement of consultants to master plan the improvements to Victoria Park is not a waste of money. The appointment will be made through a competitive tender exercise to ensure value for money, at the conclusion of which the cost of the work will be quantified. The Council anticipates maximum expenditure of £60,000 on the engagement.</p> |
| | 13 Appendix A | Jon Dix | <p>What basis do the NSL staff have for suspecting so many businesses of failing the duty of care or are they simply asking any business in the hope of generating income.</p> | <p>Environmental enforcement activities have been undertaken on a borough wide basis in areas that were originally approved by the Environment Committee on the 8th March 2016, with specific attention being placed on key retail centres. The Council is committed to supporting local businesses to thrive within the Borough, and works with businesses and lobby groups to keep</p> |

Environment Committee Public Questions/Comments– 13 July 2017

| | | | | |
|----|----|---------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>local shopping areas clean. Unfortunately we get many complaints regarding dumped commercial waste and fly tipping and so, as part of the environmental enforcement trail we will proactively check any business that we do not know to have a valid waste contract. This acts as both a deterrent and an educational tool as the Council officers can inform businesses of their legislative obligations as well as sending out a clear message regarding environmental enforcement.</p> <p>There has been a strong emphasis on educating establishments and businesses about their commercial waste duty of care requirements. As a result, the Council has become part of the national campaign 'Right Waste Right Place?' This campaign aims to help sole traders and small businesses understand their responsibilities around waste and recycling. As such, a link to this campaign has been placed on the Councils commercial waste web page to help publicise it. An easy to understand brochure 'A simple guide to duty of care for your waste' has been created by the council to educate businesses about their commercial waste duty of care obligations.</p> |
| 10 | 12 | Mary O'Connor | <p>I would like an explaining of how Darland's Lake Nature Reserve was assessed as low quality/low value when it is a valued wildlife habitat and has a variety of desirable flora.</p> | <p>The Parks and Open Spaces Strategy assessed sites on a number of criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usage; • Demographics; • Health; • Education; • Green Infrastructure; • Place; <p>Whilst the site scored highly for its Green Infrastructure contribution, the final assessment was an amalgam of all these criteria</p> |

Environment Committee Public Questions/Comments– 13 July 2017

| | | | | |
|----|----|--------------|---|--|
| 11 | 12 | Tirza Waisel | <p>Regarding 1.29 – Darland's Lake:</p> <p>I heard that <u>Thames21</u>, who are involved with The Thames and all its tributaries so includes Darland's Lake Nature Reserve, and host the Brent Catchment Partnership, have been working with each of the Local Authorities and other partners in the Brent area to try and enhance the river. They are working in partnership with Harrow, Ealing and Brent and have approached Barnet council too, but had very little response from Barnet Council to date. Would you agree that it is in our interest to work in such partnerships to preserve and enhance the enjoyment of the waterways in our borough? Can you explain why Barnet does not participate in this initiative and what will you do in order to join it now?</p> | A member of the Greenspaces Team is a member of the Brent Catchment Partnership. |
| | | Jon Dix | <p>On 30 May 2017, 15 Duty of Care fines were issued to businesses on one small stretch of North Finchley High Road. Do you think this looks like a well regulated practice or money grabbing attack on local traders?</p> | Efficient use of resources means that when the enforcement officers are carrying out Duty of Care checks in a location, they will visit all businesses in a proactive approach. This ensures that all businesses are treated equally. All businesses have a Duty of Care under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to take all reasonable steps to keep waste safe and arrange for its legal disposal. This applies to waste and recycling of any nature associated with a business, from a business premises, a work place or even a residential property used as a business premises. Businesses who do not have waste disposal arrangements in place and dispose of it through household waste streams, fly tipping or public litter bins, are effectively avoiding a direct cost of doing business within the Borough, with the costs falling to local residents. Since the trial commenced in July 2016, 68 businesses have been visited to check their |

Environment Committee Public Questions/Comments– 13 July 2017

| | | | | |
|----|------------------|---------------|--|--|
| | | | | duty of care requirements on High Road, North Finchley. Specifically in May 2017, 35 businesses have been visited to check their duty of care requirements on High Road, North Finchley. |
| 12 | 12 | Mary O'Connor | Darland's Lake Nature Reserve is a source of the River Brent, but it also contains many invasive species including Giant Hogweed, Himalayan Balsam and Japanese Knotweed, the treatment of which will prevent further spread downstream of these and other invasive flora in the area. As such, is it not essential that this remains the responsibility of Barnet Council as what other organisation would have the ability to control these before they spread more and require additional funds to eradicate. Thames21 host the Brent Catchment Partnership and with the support of local councils wish to fund a Development Manager to take forward the restoration and improvement of the River Brent. With Ealing and Harrow having agreed and Brent considering funding this £5,000 each year for the next 3 years, will Barnet Council also consider matching this funding? | <p>The council is aware of the presence of the invasive species within the proposed area and would work with the operator of the site to ensure these are managed correctly.</p> <p>The council is aware of the proposal for a Development Manager and is awaiting further information before a decision can be taken.</p> |
| 13 | 13 Appendix A | Jon Dix | Given that 43% of fines (by value) are unpaid are you confident that the green light rating is appropriate? | <p>The percentage rate of FPNs that have been paid, in relation to the overall amount of FPNs issued throughout the duration of the trial is approximately 57%. This, however, does not take into account that a number of FPNs that have been issued are still in the payment period and could still be paid. If we take this into account, the percentage rate is approximately 71%. (The table below highlights this)</p> <p>This information was included in the trial summary report that was presented to Environment Committee on March</p> |

Environment Committee Public Questions/Comments– 13 July 2017

| | | | | |
|----|---------------------|---------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>2017. From this, approval was given by Members to procure a longer term enforcement contract. This will enable the expansion of environmental enforcement, thus ensuring that we can reduce demand on the Councils cleansing services and Keep Barnet Clean.</p> <p>Moreover, the council is taking a 'no nonsense' approach to environmental crime and is prosecuting defendants who do not pay their fines. Since the environmental enforcement activities commenced in July 2016, approximately 250 individuals have been successfully prosecuted at Court. Fines for these individuals vary, dependent upon the specific circumstances of the case, ranging from £300 -£400.</p> |
| 14 | 12 | Mary O'Connor | <p>Why is Barnet Council persisting with using S106 money to turn Dollis Valley Greenwalk into a cycleway transport corridor? My understanding of previous sections was that all the funds came from Transport for London. Does Barnet Council fund part of the cost and if so what percentage or amount?</p> | <p>1.26 of the report refers £300,000 of Section 106 monies to be spent on 'Dollis valley Greenwalk Cycle and Pedestrian Route Contribution', this is a specific S106 contribution that was secured from the Dollis Valley Estate for the purpose of improving cycle and pedestrian infrastructure in the local area.</p> |
| | 13 Appendix A | Jon Dix | <p>Is the cost of the NSL staff covered by the amount of fine income actually received and what are the specific figures.</p> | <p>At the beginning of the Street Scene Enforcement trial, a one off initial start-up fee of £9,950 was paid to NSL. This has enabled NSL to install the relevant infrastructure to carry out the trial. Moreover, all other financial overheads up until any prosecutions are being paid for by NSL included staff cost, payment systems, administration, uniform and cameras, back office functions etc. All financial revenue generated through the payment of Fixed Penalty Notice (FPNs) is retained by NSL to cover all the operational costs of undertaking the trial. Further financial information in relation to the trial can be found in the Environment Committee papers from</p> |

Environment Committee Public Questions/Comments– 13 July 2017

| | | | | |
|----|------------------|---------------|---|--|
| | | | | March 2017. |
| 15 | 12 | Mary O'Connor | Victoria Park, Finchley is a charity, number 5053515. As such, the Environment Committee has no authority to request the release of the charity's funds. It certainly does not have any authority to delegate anything to the Strategic Director Environment regarding Victoria Park or agree to a master plan. Can it be recorded in the minutes of this meeting that the Environment Committee has no authority to request anything of this charity and will refuse Recommendation 3 that should not have been presented to this meeting? | <p>The inclusion of the £623,000 from the sale of the Lodge into the Capital Programme was approved at the June Policy and Resources Committee. The report to the Environment Committee is seeking approval to take the master plan and park improvements forward as a project for delivery. The funding will only be spent in relation to the enhancements and improvements to Victoria Park as per the previous approvals.</p> <p>As set out in <u>section 5.3 of the Full Council report the disposal of the former Park Keepers Lodge</u> Victoria Park Recreation Ground, including the Lodge, was transferred to the Council in February 1900, to be held on trust as a public ground for the purposes of the Recreation Grounds Act 1859 and is held on charitable trust. The Council is the sole corporate trustee of Victoria Park.</p> |
| 16 | 13 Appendix A | Jon Dix | Have NSL staff got a target of fines to achieve? | <p>The contract between the Council and NSL does not include a target of FPN's.</p> <p>The Environment Committee on the 8th March 2016 approved the trial of Streetscene enforcement through a third party specialist supplier.</p> <p>The Environment Committee on the 15th March 2017 approved the procurement of a street scene enforcement contract with the view of an income share model.</p> |
| 17 | 12 | Mary O'Connor | Barnet Council claim that there is no money for Parks and Open Spaces despite Council Tax of over £146 million in this and coming years. With the need to conserve money and residents' satisfaction of Parks | The Council regards the protection, improvement and enhancement of the natural environment of Barnet as a key principle underpinning the Greenspaces Investment Programme. |

Environment Committee Public Questions/Comments– 13 July 2017

| | | | | |
|----|---------------------|---------------|--|---|
| | | | and Open Spaces declining, has the Environment Committee considered a change of approach from the need to “improve” Open Spaces to as mentioned in 5.2.7 “seek to protect, improve and enhance the natural environment of Barnet”. Rather than looking to “improve the site” and a Greenspaces Investment Programme could the Environment Committee instead consider better understanding the ecological value of these Open Spaces by producing a report detailing the ecology of these sites with a view to enhancing them, as opposed to developing them? | |
| | 13 Appendix A | Jon Dix | Why have so few fly tipping fines been issued. Is it because there are so few fly tipping incidents or that fining businesses is so much easier to collect. Has the collection of fines become the driver of the service rather than what creates greatest nuisance. | If an incident of fly tipping is not witnessed by an enforcement officer, a member of the public or captured on CCTV, then it may not be possible to find the perpetrator. Investigations have been carried out, both by Barnet and stakeholders such as the Police and in a recent incident two vehicles were seized and are due to be destroyed. Officers are working with partners to look at how we can carry out more joint operations to catch the perpetrators of environmental crime. Investigations are often complex and this is reflected in the number of enforcement actions that have been taken. |
| 18 | 12 | Mary O'Connor | The Parks and Open Spaces Strategy identified the lack of safe toilets as the number one priority. Of the many sites mentioned in this item, how many will have toilets within the next year? | Of all the site listed within item 12 only Victoria Park currently has toilets (see Q 9C for update regarding vandalised toilet facilities) of the other sites it is anticipated that Barnet Playing Fields and West Hendon Playing Fields would have public toilets included within their design, delivery timelines are yet to be set. |

Environment Committee Public Questions/Comments– 13 July 2017

| | | | | |
|----|----|---------------|--|--|
| 19 | 14 | Mary O'Connor | Item 14: Forward Work Programme: Given that the present Copthall Plan is less than one year old, why is a “Copthall Master Plan” in the “Committee forward work programme” for 11 January 2018 meeting? How will it differ from the present Copthall Plan? | <p>The forward plan entry relates to consideration of the proposed master plan.</p> <p>The current Copthall plan is a Planning Brief. The master planning process is required to deliver the vision within the Planning Brief.</p> |
| 20 | 14 | Mary O'Connor | As it is in the Green Belt and also some areas are SINCs, the Copthall Plan’s essential omission was a detailed Ecology Report of the total Copthall area. Can I have an assurance that this will be in the new Copthall Master Plan and if not, why not? Will there be a public consultation? | <p>As in the earlier response to Question 4, the Council will undertake an Ecology Survey of the Copthall study area.</p> <p>The master plan proposals will be subject to a public consultation.</p> |

| Month | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Total |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Percentage of FPNs Paid at Client Report | 66.60% | 66.10% | 48.90% | 57.80% | 58.40% | 57.50% | 44.10% | 65.50% | 60.10% | 51.20% | 52.50% | 57.15% |
| Percentage of FPNs Paid After a Month | 66.60% | 79.40% | 67.10% | 76.50% | 79.30% | 77.30% | 74.80% | 71.20% | 68.70% | 62.00% | 65.80% | 71.7% |

Environment Committee – 13 July 2017

Public Comment and Ward Members (3 minutes per comment)

| Item No | Public Comment Request |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Item 14 - Brookside Walk lighting | Philip Strom Dovi Heller |
| Item 12 & 14 | Mary O'Connor (Cathy Pash – Substitute) |
| Item 13 | Jon Dix |

Appendix A – Extract from Finchley and Golders Green Residents Forum

FINCHLEY & GOLDERS GREEN RESIDENTS FORUM

VENUE: Henrietta Barnet School, Hampstead Garden Suburb, London NW11 7BN

Wednesday 5th July at 7pm.

Chairman: Councillor Shimon Ryde
Vice Chairman: Councillor Reuben Thompstone

ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED AT THE FORUM MEETING

Items must be submitted to Governance Service (f&gg.residentsforum@barnet.gov.uk) **by 10.00am on the fifth working day before the meeting**

(For this meeting this will be Wednesday 28th June 2017).

| | Issue Raised | Response |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Petition: Improve air quality in Barnet Submitted by: Mr Levy Signatures 43</p> <p>We the undersigned petition the council to deliver continued actions to improve air quality including: (i) to relieve traffic congestion around schools and educate at and around schools against engine idling; (ii) for parking wardens to advise those they see engine idling not to do so unnecessarily; (iii) much more stretching targets for responding to smoke pollution incidents; (iv) monitoring to ensure those who try to call Environmental Health can get through easily; (v) modestly priced collections of excess green garden/allotment waste, to discourage burning.</p> | <p>To be dealt with in line with the Council's constitution:</p> <p>The Lead Petitioner will be given three minutes to present the petition to the Forum. Following the presentation the Residents Forum Chairman will decide to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Take no action;• Refer the matter to a chief officer to respond to within 20 working days; or• Refer the matter to the relevant Area Committee (if funding is required) |