

## **Appendix 1 – Statutory Consultation Report**

### **Consultation Responses to Statutory Consultations**

#### **1. Statutory Consultation**

##### **1.1 Mill Hill Park – 28 Nov – 24 Dec 2019**

A total of 31 representations were received; 28 were received via email and 3 via written letter. Copies of the emails have been provided section 2 of this document with any personal information removed. The three letters have not been included in this document as they contain personal information although the key points raised were extracted and included in the analysis contained below;

###### **1.1.1 – Summary of responses**

View	Number	%
Support	4	13%
Objection	26	84%
Neutral	1	3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

###### **1.1.2 – Summary of comments in support of the proposals**

Supporting Comments		
Protects use for parks users	2	6%
Car park is often full	2	6%
A CPZ is needed for this area	1	3%

###### **1.1.3 – Summary of comments in objection to the proposals**

Objection Comments			Response/Mitigations	
Will impact local residents	12	39%	In parallel the Highways Team undertook an informal consultation regarding on street parking in this area.	

<b>2 hours free is not enough</b>	3	10%	2 hours free of charge was designed to allow users to visit the park and its facilities with the need to pay.
<b>Will have a negative impact on genuine parks users</b>	6	19%	The main purpose behind the plans is to safeguard the car park for parks users.
<b>Will affect Bowls Clubs members</b>	1	3%	The Bowls Club, Nursery and Café Staff will be provided access to an area of the Wise Lane Car Park for their use.
<b>The car park is a free public amenity</b>	5	16%	The main purpose of the car parks is to service Mill Hill Park and the car park is often full by non-parks users.
<b>Should not include weekends</b>	2	6%	The proposals include Saturdays in order to safeguard the car parks for parks users at this time too.
<b>Charges are too high</b>	1	3%	The charges are in line with other parks car parks proposals or existing tariffs.
<b>Approach to the consultation</b>	15	48%	<p>The council followed the Statutory Traffic Management Order Process;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Notice in the local paper</li> <li>- Notices were displayed in the car parks</li> </ul> <p>Additionally;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Highways Team noted the proposals as part of the informal consultation regarding on street parking in the area.</li> <li>- The 21 day consultation was extended by a further six days following concerns raised by local residents and the Residents Association.</li> </ul>

#### 1.1.4 – Summary of suggestions received through the consultation

Suggestions			Response/Mitigations
<b>Restrict charges for one hour per day</b>	7	23%	This approach could be confusing if users come to the park at different times.
<b>Income should be ring fenced for Mill Hill Park</b>	2	6%	The income received will be paid into the Greenspaces budgets and will offset the management and maintenance costs for the parks and open spaces portfolio.
<b>The use of Auto Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) Cameras for enforcement</b>	1	3%	Local authorities are not permitted to enforce car parks through ANPR cameras.

## **1.2 Old Courthouse Recreation Ground – 8 Aug – 7 September 2019**

A total of two representations were received in relation to Old Courthouse Recreation Ground Copies of the emails have been provided section 2 of this document with any personal information removed. Below is a summary of the responses received;

### **1.2.1 – Summary or responses**

<b>View</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Support</b>	0	0%
<b>Objection</b>	1	50%
<b>Neutral</b>	1	50%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **1.2.2 – Summary of comments in support of the proposals**

<b>Supporting Comments</b>		
<b>Protects use for parks users</b>	1	50%
<b>Regularises the opening of the park</b>	1	50%

### **1.2.3 – Summary of comments in objection to the proposals**

<b>Objection Comments</b>			<b>Response/Mitigations</b>
<b>Will impact users of the high street</b>	1	50%	Whilst it is acknowledged that the car park is often used by visitors to the nearby High Street, the car park is fundamentally available to provide and support access for users of the park.
<b>30 mins free is not enough</b>	2	100%	The proposed model of 30 minutes free of charge is currently available in Hendon Park, which is also located near to a High Street.
<b>Will have a negative impact on genuine parks users</b>	1	50%	The proposals have been designed to safeguard the car park for genuine parks users
<b>Timing of the consultation</b>	1	50%	The council followed the Statutory Traffic Management Order Process; - Notice in the local paper - Notices were displayed in the car parks
<b>Parking should be free in parks and open spaces</b>	1	50%	The main purpose of the car parks is to service Old Courthouse Recreation Ground and the car park is often full by non-parks users.

#### 1.2.4 – Summary of suggestions received through the consultation

Suggestions		Response/Mitigations	
<b>1 Hour free of charge</b>		2	100% The proposed model of 30 minutes free of charge is currently available in Hendon Park, which is also located near to a High Street. As outlined within the consultation response, there is currently a dedicated car park to the High Street on Moxon Street which offers one-hour free parking. As such, there are no amendments proposed to the charging structure outlined.

#### 1.3 Scratchwood Open Space – 8 Aug – 7 September 2019

A total of one representation was received in relation to Scratchwood Open Space which can be found in section 3 of Appendix 1. Below is a summary of the response received;

##### 1.3.1 – Summary or responses

View	Number	%
<b>Support</b>	0	0%
<b>Objection</b>	1	50%
<b>Neutral</b>	0	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>

##### 1.3.1.1

Objection Comments			Response/Mitigations	
<b>Will have a negative impact on genuine parks users</b>			1	100% The proposals have been designed to safeguard the car park for genuine parks users.

##### 1.3.1.2

Suggestions			Response/Mitigations	
<b>2 Hours free of charge</b>			1	100% The proposed tariff has been developed in order to discourage the car park being used by those that do so for anti-social purposes
<b>Charge in bands of 2-4 hours and over 4 hours</b>			1	100% The proposed tariff has been developed in order to discourage the car park being used by those that do so for anti-social purposes

## 2. Consultation Responses Received

No:	Park	Comment	Opinion
1.	Mill Hill Park	<p>Subject: Mill hill park changes</p> <p>Hi</p> <p>I wanted to write in support of the proposed changes to the car park at mill hill park. Currently the car park is full of cars from first thing in the morning leaving it unable to be used to visit the park. Making it 2 hours free and then paying for further use is totally reasonable and allows you to use the park for a normal amount of time and allowing for extra.</p> <p>It's 100% the right thing to do and I support it wholeheartedly.</p> <p>Many thanks</p>	Supports
2.	Mill Hill Park	<p>Subject: PLEASE DO NOT DO THIS</p> <p>If they do this, the next thing they'll do is introduce resident permit holding for poets corner. It's a revenue generating activity as far as I'm concerned.</p> <p>There isn't a problem at the moment. The car park although full, isn't really a problem for the very local residents. As soon as restrictions go in there, commuters will park on poets corner which will "create a problem" for the residents. Then, parking restrictions come in .... Which might not seem so bad now - but when you have family and friends wanting to pop in etc and you're paying for a visitor permit every time it will be frustrating.</p> <p>Currently, if you are visiting the park and need to drive and the carparks are full, you can park anywhere in the surrounding roads. So there isn't even a real issue there.</p> <p>The council just recently put parking restrictions in where I live in Colindale and it's an absolute nightmare as far as I'm concerned. Don't get fooled in to thinking it will be better. There was no problem in our residential streets and now there is. And they said they did a full consultation, which they definitely didn't. First time I heard about it was when I got a letter saying the restrictions were being put in. By which time it was too late to contest!</p>	Objects

		How many of you actually use that carpark regularly so you can visit the park? Versus how many of you use the roads in poets corner daily because you live there? Which is more important to you?  (And I am usually a supporter of the overall work that local councils do for their communities).	
3.	Mill Hill Park	<p>Subject: Daws Lane Car Park</p> <p>I have been advised by Val Duschinsky that I may email my views to you on the proposed charges in Daws Lane Car Park as the Chairman of The Friends of Mill Hill Park.</p> <p>I am disappointed in the short time allowed for remarks and objections and the lack of information available.</p> <p>1 The two hours free parking is too short a time for families to enjoy an afternoon of relaxation and sport . The time should be increased to three hours at least. I can also see arguments breaking out as people vie for spaces.</p> <p>2 There is already enormous pressure on the roads in Poets Corner which will only increase as people try to park there to avoid paying the charges.</p> <p>3. Is there any guarantee that the monies collected will be used in Mill Hill Park as I believe has been claimed.</p> <p>I am not in favour of the proposed charges. This is my individual opinion and does not represent the collective views of the Friends of Mill Hill Park Committee, who may email you with their own ideas.</p> <p>Regards</p>	Objects
4.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> New Car Parking Charges Daws Lane/Wise Lane</p> <p>It seems Barnet goes out its way to upset the residents of this borough.</p> <p>There can be no reason to suddenly start making a parking charge other than greed on the behalf of the council.</p> <p>I object to any charges as it will prevent young and old people making use of the play ground, visiting this public amenity, playing tennis, football or watching the Bowling Club. Also parents with children at</p>	Objects

		<p>the school will have fund each and every visit to it. As usual vehicles will start parking in residential streets and this will escalate in further expansion of the CPZs.</p> <p>The council seem to forget that we already pay for this park and parking via our massive Council Tax payments.</p> <p>We shall be complaining to our councillors and our MP to stop this charge.</p>	
5.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> Charging for car park at Mill Hill Park</p> <p>Good afternoon.</p> <p>I am writing in response to information that I have been given about charging for parking at both Mill Hill Park carparks. I am not 100% sure that my information is correct but based on what I have heard I would like to make a few comments.</p> <p>As I understand it there will be free parking for up to 2 hours at the park which I am not completely against.</p> <p>My only real concern is for the elderly people that use in Mill Hill Bowls club. For many it is an important place for socialising and keeping fit. A game of bowls lasts more than two hours so it would mean that Mill Hill Bowls club members would have to pay every time they went to the Bowls club.</p> <p>I do not feel that this is an acceptable way to treat the older residents of Mill Hill community.</p> <p>In addition many older Mill Hill residents use the car park to gain access to the limited bus routes that we have. This would be in again they could not get the bus to Barnett or Edgware hospital which is badly serviced as it is.</p> <p>Maybe they could be given a get out of car park charges sticker to attach to their cars when they pay their bowls club Subscription.</p> <p>In addition many older Mill Hill residents use the car park to gain access to the limited bus routes that we have. Having to pay for the service seems very unfair.</p> <p>I would be interested to be given the correct facts if the information I have is not accurate.</p>	Neutral
6.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> car park charges</p> <p>I am writing to object to the Council's plan to start charging for car parking in Mill Hill park. I belong to the bowls club in the park and it would be a great expense to us and to visiting teams if we have to pay</p>	Objects

		<p>to be able to park. Our matches last for 3 hours or more with teams arriving a good hour before hand and leaving at least half-an-hour afterwards. What sort of concessions would be available to us as a club and our visitors? Our club is open all year round with the car park being used by us all the time and would be a costly extra expense to our members if any charges were to be enforced.</p>	
7.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> proposed parking charges in car parks in mill hill park</p> <p>The large car park generally has cars parking in it from 6 in the morning and is usually full by late morning. by bringing in charges will mean those using the car parks will i suspect park in the surrounding roads. I live in Byron rd .controlled parking is a necessity . and has been for a long time.parking is difficult at anytime of the day so I'm more than happy if the proposed changes are successful. yours sincerely</p>	Supports
8.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> Daws Lane, Parking charges</p> <p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>Since Daws Lane Car Park was refurbished, people kept to the parking within the designated places. Now people are leaving their cars parked overnight, parking in the yellow lines, which means on many occasions you cannot manoeuvre your car around to get out of the car park. It is full of commuters who leave their cars there all day long, which leaves so room for people to park for a short space of time, like taking children into the park or visiting the shops opposite. The car park is even full over the weekend. If charges are to be enforced, then obviously the car park has to be monitored. As a resident who lives in Mill Hill I feel very strongly about the ongoing situation.</p> <p>I did not see any signs in the car park informing us about the consultation that was going to take place. The residents should have been better informed.</p> <p>To summarise I am certainly very much in favour of car park charges.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p>	Supports
9.	Mill Hill Park	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 9<sup>th</sup> December regarding the proposed CPZ in poets corner and the proposal to charge for parking in the car parks serving Mill Hill Park.</p> <p>As the amount of time allowed to respond is very short I am writing today about Mill Hill Park.</p>	Objects

		<p>I have several comments the gist of which is that I am against the introduction of charging for either of the car parks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I believe the park was given to the community and it would be against the spirit of that gift should there be a charge for using what should be a free public amenity</li> <li>• I understand that something needs to be done to reduce the amount of all day parking and I don't know the answer to that except to perhaps have the same principle as the current CPZ and not allow parking between 11 and 12 or even 11 and 11.30.</li> <li>• If you decide to introduce charges then they should be just Monday to Friday, definitely not including Saturday. It is not difficult to spend more than two hours at the park on a lovely sunny day and if cricket is played at the park it would not be fair to expect the players to spend £6 each on parking.</li> <li>• I object to any of the spaces being used by staff or parents using the Etz Chaim school as provision should have been made at the time of the school being built. If the school does not have sufficient space for staff parking or for parents at pick up and drop off then they should use public transport or, as we were told when the school was proposed, walk.</li> <li>• I do have sympathy for the workers at the Post Office and provision should be made for them in some way.</li> </ul> <p>I strongly believe the park should be free to use for all members of the community and that making a charge of any sort for parking is making a charge to use the park which I object to.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p>	
10.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> Car Park at Mill Hill Park</p> <p>To whom t may concern.</p> <p>The car park at Mill Hill Park does require improved management, however, it should remain free.</p> <p>It should be possible to instigate a parking system that prevents people from parking all day so that children can utilise the facilities at all times.</p> <p><b>KEEP THE CAR PARK FREE.</b></p>	Objects
11.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> Proposed parking charges in car parks in Mill Hill Park- Daws Lane and Wise Lane</p>	Objects

		<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I am writing to OBJECT to proposed parking charges in car parks in Mill Hill Park- Daws Lane and Wise Lane. The car park should be free for people wishing to use the park's facilities. The council should be encouraging residents to use green spaces for healthy outdoor sports and activities not discouraging them with parking charges. Older people have difficulty using the council's telephone payment system or credit/debit card pay and display machines which could discourage them from using the park. Finally, parking charges in the car park will result in computers parking in the surrounding roads making it difficult for residents to find available kerbside space.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>	
12.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> PROPOSED CHARGING FOR PARKING IN THE TWO MILL HILL CAR PARKS - DAWS LANE &amp; WISE LANE</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I would suggest there be one hour free parking before any charges are incurred so as to allow for regular dog walkers to be able to walk their dogs without incurring a daily charge and residents to enjoy the park. This would also stop commuters parking in either car park all day.</p> <p>30 minutes free parking would also be a good idea in Mill Hill Broadway and would go a long way to helping local shops.</p>	Supports
13.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> YOUR LETTER ON PROPOSED PARKING CHARGES IN CAR PARKS IN MILL HILL</p> <p>Dear Traffic and Development Design Team</p> <p>Thank you for your undated letter received here on 10th December 2019.</p> <p>We have the following comments about your proposals for parking charges in the Daws Lane and Wise Lane car parks.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land of Mill Hill Park (which includes the Daws Lane and Wise Lane car parks) was given to the residents of Mill Hill in perpetuity. Any funds raised should therefore be specifically for Mill Hill and not absorbed into the Barnet authority. Mill Hill Park would be a natural beneficiary.</li> <li>2. The policy of short stay parking being free and long stay being charged has unfortunate consequences. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Long stays will be driven mostly into Poets Corner. This means that Poets Corner residents will be coerced into seeking a CPZ. CPZs isolate communities by making it difficult for visitors to park without anxiety and they cause additional</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	Objects

		<p>stress to care workers, tradespeople and all needing to deliver important services. With a growing elderly population, these services will be in greater demand and a CPZ will discriminate against the most vulnerable among residents. The no-parking time bands employed by CPZs encourage fine-avoiding traffic movements – this is stressful and environmentally damaging.</p> <p>(ii) For the Mill Hill economy to be encouraged, the proposed two hours of free parking is insufficient for people to enjoy shopping, perhaps a gym session and a meal in Mill Hill.</p> <p>(iii) The proposed scale of charges places a burden on those wishing to park for work including low paid local workers, those commuting from Mill Hill station and even the less mobile who need to drive to an appropriate bus stop. All groups are important to the diversity of our community and passing trade. The current system allows vehicles to be parked for a working day which means they are neither mobile nor searching for new spaces. This is already as good as it can be for air quality and general stability.</p> <p>(iv) Travelling to work is now the single highest causes of stress among those working in London. Car parking policies should be directed toward easing the burden on those working to support the economy. Commuters are not a nuisance and they should not be seen as fair game for parking charges. Our free long term car park has encouraged responsible parking rather than the cluttering of residential roads. Free short stay parking will do nothing to discourage unnecessary traffic movements such as school runs. These should be your target for charges because such traffic movements at busy times of day are particularly environmentally damaging and expose children to poor air quality. The Daws Lane traffic is frequently stifled at school drop off and collection times.</p> <p>3. We believe that a more environmentally-friendly approach with better community outcomes, would be to charge for short stays (for example less than 30 minutes) and allow long stays to remain free. APNR technology is capable of handling this. Any charges including penalty charges should be open and transparent and directly reimbursed to Mill Hill park, the area to which the land was given in perpetuity as a community asset and covenant for Mill Hill Residents.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposals. We hope you will give due weight to our views in your response. Kind regards</p>	
14.	Mill Hill Park	<b>Subject:</b> Consultation on charging for parking at Mill Hill Park car park.	Objects

		<p>I have been advised by the Mill Hill Residents Association that there is a live consultation that closes tonight on introducing parking charges at Mill Hill Park. I have just visited the Council website and used the search facility but have been unable to find any details.</p> <p>I would like to register my objection to the introduction of charges as I believe that the park is a valuable resource for others living in the local area who are not lucky enough to live within walking distance of the park and who wish to bring equipment to play sports, have picnics, walk their dogs etc. which is not always possible using public transport. There are few activities and facilities that are free to families on low incomes and I would not wish to see them deterred from using the park due to the introduction of car parking fees.</p> <p>If the Council's concern is to deter commuter parking this could be addressed by introducing a requirement to display a timed ticket for just one hour in the day e.g. 2-3pm</p> <p>I trust that you will consider my objection in this email as I have not been able to check that this is the correct method to raise my objection due to lack of access to information available on the website or local publicity.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>	
15.	Mill Hill Park	<p>Subject: Daws Lane car park</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I would like to take part in the consultation for charging at Daws Lane car park. I am very much against this as the park is used by many people and free parking encourages people to use it.</p>	Objects
16.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> Charging for parking at daws lane car park , I do not think this is in the interest of mill hill or its residents or visitors. A Mackenzie</p>	Objects
17.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> Daws Lane car park</p> <p>Dear Parks department</p> <p>I am concerned that I have received no notification of the Barnet Council consultation on bringing in charges to the car park in Daws Lane, and possible residents parking on Poets Corner.</p>	Objects

		<p>I have, however, received notification of planning permission for developments some distance away.</p> <p>When are you planning to alert residents to these possible changes? As a resident of Marion Road, I will be affected hugely by such plans and have a right to know what's happening and have my voice heard.</p> <p>Looking forward to hearing from you,</p>	
18.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Importance:</b> High</p> <p>I am writing to strongly object to LBB's current consultation on introducing parking charges into the Daws Lane car park.</p> <p>I believe that LBB has failed to consult properly for a number of reasons. Firstly the consultation must take place while the proposals are still at a formative stage and this is not the case with Daws Lane Car Parking Charges – LBB are way beyond the formative stages.</p> <p>I also believe that LBB has failed to consult and provide information which is accurate and sufficient to enable those consulted to make a meaningful and educated response.</p> <p>As your Legal Department will know, the High Court found that the London Borough of Barnet did not consult properly in the proposed re-opening of Partingdale Lane (Partingdale Lane Residents Association –v- London Borough of Barnet). The Judge found that the Council had pre-determined the reopening of Partingdale Lane without an adequate consultation process. Consequently a High Court judgement was made and Barnet Council not only had to pay their own costs of many thousands of pounds but also that of the Plaintiff. This was a complete waste of taxpayers' money simply because Barnet Council had failed to go through a legitimate legal process and it appears the Council is about to make the same mistake.</p> <p>Please now act in a correct and legitimate way with regard to this</p>	Objects
19.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> Objection to the Consultation Process for the Daws Lane Car Park Charges</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I would like to register my objection to the so-called Consultation regarding the Daws Lane Car Park charges.</p>	Objects

		<p>In my mind a consultation is by definition something that involves dialogue at the initial stages of planning not as an afterthought to a fait accompli.</p> <p>I would expect to be offered the opportunity to indicate whether I felt there was even a problem to solve in that car park and subsequently to be invited to offer any suggestions for remedying any issue that was identified. Finally all those concerned should be able to consider the suggestions and to debate which, if any, should or could be implemented.</p> <p>The short notice period coinciding with the start of the holiday season implies that the Council is hoping that no one will be aware of the decisions being discussed and that no objections or suggestions will consequently be forthcoming. This is a rather underhand tactic that undermines the democratic agenda of local government.</p> <p>If this is not the case then I would expect the consultation to be paused and re-started in the New Year at a time when normal business has resumed and with a notice period that provides sufficient time for residents to engage in a meaningful dialogue with the Council.</p> <p>Regards,</p>	
20.	Mill Hill Park	<p>Subject: Dawes lane car park</p> <p>In line with the High Court ruling that consultations need to be instigated at the formative stages of any new proposals put forward and that residents need sufficient information, it seems rather churlish of the Council has not yet provided ALL the information needed for us to have an opinion and instead award JUST ONE WEEK'S extension to consult. This does not replace our need for information and instead could be construed as giving no more than 'lip service' to the Court, without applying the Court's absolute decision to give proper information and then consultation time.</p> <p>The Dawes lane Car Park has for many years been an exclusion zone to residents as all the bays are taken up early morning by commuters. If the Council levied a charge on them for just one hour ie during lunchtime it would free up the bays for residents who need more parking spaces than the limited ones already provided. This would be enough. No need to charge all day, 6 days a week to free up spaces properly.</p> <p>This whole process needs to go to debate which will only be satisfied by instigating a NEW,FULL consultative process!...</p>	Objects
21.	Mill Hill Park	Dear Sir,	Objects

		<p>I am writing as a committee member of Friends of Mill Hill Park to express my views about the proposed parking charges in the car park.</p> <p>I feel that if it is necessary to implement this charge 2 hours parking time will not give those who drive there enough time to enjoy the many activities available, especially in the summer. I am wondering if the charge applies to weekends. If so it will curtail the use of the park considerably.</p> <p>As a long time resident I have always been aware of a covenant that was made for the park to be For the community to use and enjoy.</p> <p>Would it not make sense to have restricted parking at certain times thus leaving spaces free for locals. Limiting time in the park which is enjoyed by many is another facility taken away from the residents of Mill Hill.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>	
22.	Mill Hill Park	<p>Subject: Daws Lane Parking Consultation</p> <p>I am writing to object to this legally flawed "Consultation". The High Court ruling against a case Partingdale Lane v LB B said "the consultation must take place while the proposals are still in the formative stage." This is in no way the formative stage. More like a fait accompli stage! The High Court also stated that "those consulted must be provided with information which is accurate and sufficient to enable them to make a meaningful response". This is in no way the case as xxxxxxxxx Chair of Mill Hill Residents Association has spelled out.</p> <p>There is so little time left in this mess of a consultation that I will not write more at this point. It must be better thought out and started again. Some residents have suggested they haven't had time to respond at all at this highly pressured time of year and the ridiculously short period given.</p>	Objects
23.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Re: Objection to the Daws Lane Car Park Consultation from the Friends of Mill Hill Park</b></p> <p>Following my objection to you in my personal capacity as a resident of Mill Hill, I am now in a position to further object to the Daws Lane consultaiton, this time in the name of the <b>Friends of Mill Hill Park</b>.</p> <p>After receiving majority support from my committee, we officially object to this consulatation on the following grounds:</p> <p>The written reason for these charges is to "effectively manage the car park". If this means to prevent commuters (and others) from parking all day in the car park, then we feel that charging all day including Saturdays is far too severe a solution. This kind of excessive charging will amount to another taxation on motorists and is not necessary to achieve your stated objective.</p>	Objects

		<p>There are other ways of preventing all day parking – by charging for just one hour in the day (for example from 11am-12pm), by introducing a CPZ of sorts (also for an hour like there is already in so many part of Mill Hill) or by limiting free parking to a longer period (4 or 5 hours) with no return for one hour, etc. These other types of mechanisms are in place in many other parts of the UK so we don't see why you need to implement such wide ranging charging hours in our park – unless, of course, the real reason to use this as a way of generating extra revenue.</p> <p>Further, we object to the fact that we were at no point consulted at the beginning of this process to get our views of the nature and extent of the alleged problem in the first place and to find out our ideas and thoughts for different types of solutions to be considered and looked into. To be honest, we feel that our park users and our residents have been excluded from your decision making process from the start.</p> <p>We trust that you will take note of our objections.</p>	
24.	Mill Hill Park	<p>Importance: High</p> <p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I have just been told that there is a proposal to charge for parking at Mill Hill Park car park. I understand that there has been some sort of consultation period which has expired or is about to expire. As a resident of a very nearby road this is the first I have heard of this. I do not receive any copies of the local newspaper and have not been informed by any other means of this until now. (I may add that likewise I was not in any way informed of the stopping of the green waste collection either). I found out about that from a friend who lives on the other side of the Borough. The timing of this proposal does seem rather suspect given that the Christmas period is so imminent and I do feel that people local to the proposal should be informed and given an opportunity to air their views in a more positive way than has been the case this time.</p> <p>I do not think any purpose would be served by charging for parking for Mill Hill Park and that it would actually have a malign influence on the use of the park if families have to pay to use it. The only improvement charging would make is to the coffers of Barnet Council and I cannot see how it would benefit the park or its users in any way.</p> <p>I really feel let down by a Council that I voted for to represent my interests when it appears that my interest has been totally ignored by lack of information.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>	Objects

		<p><b>Subject:</b> Re: Daws Lane Parking</p> <p>Dear Sir, I have now returned home from a very serious operation in hospital and on my first outing to Mill Hill park last Sunday 29th December I looked for your notice, a photo of which you attached to your previous reply. I looked from Daws Lane pavement and it was invisible. I then looked just inside the entrance to the car park. I found it crumpled and immediately behind the large notice for the car park. If one is walking into the car park one would only see it if one was coming from the direction of Wise Lane. If one was driving one would pass it without seeing it at all as one would be looking for hazards within the car park. I really see this as underhand and cannot see how this informs the general public that there is any form of consultation. If you request it I will send photos. Yours faithfully.</p>	
25.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> Parking Charges at Mill Hill Park</p> <p>I noticed in the Barnet Times that you are carrying out a consultation re introducing parking charges in Mill Hill Park.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please can you forward us full documentation regarding this consultation as urgently as possible so that we have time to study it , talk to our residents and members, and still have time to respond. 21 days is very little time so you need to send us the documentation very quickly please.</li> <li>2. Also, please can you let me know why so many other consulations are published online of the LBB website for residents to see ... but not this one? Surely ALL consultations should be published online, not just select ones?</li> </ol> <p>Regards,</p> <p><b>Subject:</b> Parking Charges at Mill Hill Park</p> <p>Firstly, thank you for your time and for the meeting the other day. I look forward to working with you and your team to develop ideas that can get more residents more involved in community building projects.</p> <p>On the matter relating to the car park consultation, as I mentioned, I have been talking to a lot of residents and our members and have been compiling a list of comments and concerns that I am hearing. I am planning on sending this list to our membership database later today and will add any further comments that I receive before sending it to you.</p>	Objects

	<p>I know you said that the consultation started on 28<sup>th</sup> Nov but it is not actually clear how to count. For example, is the 28<sup>th</sup> day 1 or is the 29<sup>th</sup> day 1? Also, is the last day up to midnight or up to midight the day before?</p> <p>To make life easier can you confirm the last day of the consultation and can you confirm the deadline time too?</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p><b>Subject:</b> RE: Parking in Mill Hill Park</p> <p>Thanks for your reply to Mr XXXXXXXX's concerns.</p> <p>I must admit that I am very confused by your reply.</p> <p>You keep saying that there is no further information available. However, as I told you already last week when we met, in the public notice that was placed in the Barnet Times it clearly states that there is a <b>copy of the proposed orders</b> that can be requested that includes <b>details of the Council's Statement of Reasons for proposing to make the Orders</b>. That is what you guys wrote, not us. So where is that information that you refer to in your published notice for public viewing? You keep telling us that this does not exist! So why it is written that there is?</p> <p>For this consultation to take place and to be legal, that advertised document with that type of information is very important and should be freely and quickly available to anyone requesting it. All that has been provided in the newspaper is a short executive summary of the intended outcome and proposed decision following whatever internal deliberations you have undergone internally on your side. What you have not provided yet is a proper document outlining the exact problem that you are trying to solve in the first place and what solution options you are formulating to try to address whatever the problem is that you are trying to solve. There is no document detailing the background information, no reasons, no options for formulating solutions, nothing!</p> <p>Without this information in a formal consultation document and in writing, a full public consultation is simply not possible and cannot start to take place. A little note on the lamp post and in the newspaper is nothing more than a notice of a proposed decision and simply not sufficient information for the public to have a meaningful consultation.</p> <p>So I am afraid that I agree with Mr XXXXXXXXXXXX on his point.</p> <p><b>Subject:</b> RE: Parking in Mill Hill Park</p> <p>Thanks for sending over part of the additional information. What is interesting is that your document actually provides less information than the notice in the newspaper. The advert says to contact LBB if you want MORE information, not LESS!</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Also, in this document it states that the reason is to manage the car park, while you have made it clear to me that the reason is to generate income for the upkeep of the parks. I am sure you will appreciate that these are two very different reasons that will generate two very different sets of responses from residents.</p> <p>Matt, please don't take this personally as I appreciate that you are simply relaying what you have been told, but I (and many of my residents and MHRA members) really think that this consultation process is very flawed and needs to be properly prepared before any real and meaningful consultation process can even begin.</p> <p>Would you like me to forward you a list of points that need to be considered and included into any information that is made public before any meaningful conversion / consultation with residents can start to take place?</p> <p>I appreciate that the first response from the people on your side might be a resounding NYET but I really think that the process of the consultation process itself is far more important than the result, and I firmly believe (supported by High Court decisions) that this process has been seriously compromised and will negatively impact on the democratic process itself.</p> <p>I am happy to work with you on this and I feel that all of us will benefit and win as a result of what I am proposing and offering.</p> <p>What do you think?</p> <p><b>Subject:</b> RE: Parking in Mill Hill Park</p> <p>Thanks for your email.</p> <p>Without knowing exactly what the background and reason is for your proposed solutions of charging, it is really hard to know how to respond. For example, if the reason really is that of managing the spaces better, then a non-financial solution is probably better for residents and cheaper for the Council to setup and implement.</p> <p>However, if the purpose of the proposals is to generate revenue then this becomes a very different type of consultation with very different types of response.</p> <p>So not knowing the real reason for this charging is hindering any meaningful discussion and therefore hindering the democratic process itself.</p> <p>Further, according to the High Court ruling against LBB that I referred to in a previous email, for a consultation to be meaningful and legal, it must be done at the <b>formative</b> stages of the process. In this case, the solution has been decided already by LBB, with all the details very well developed already. This consultation is nothing more than LBB putting its solution on the table for approval or rejection by the residents. So we are way past the</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>formative stages of this decision making process and, according to the High Court, this would not pass the criteria for being a legal consultation.</p> <p>So when you say that you want us to respond, I can only repeat that I am not sure what you are asking us to respond to.</p> <p>All the best,</p> <p><b>Subject:</b> Daws Lane Parking Charges Consultation</p> <p>Following our conversations on the matter, below is the official response from the <b>Mill Hill Residents’ Association</b>.</p> <p>*****</p> <p>Following an internal consultation process with our membership and residents, the Mill Hill Residents Association objects to the proposed charges at the two car parks in Mill Hill Park.</p> <p>Below are some of our concerns:</p> <p><b><u>The proposed charges are not necessary to achieve the official stated objective of effectively managing the car park</u></b></p> <p>According to you (and after I confirmed this with you) the official reason for these proposed charges is to “effectively manage the car park”. If this means to prevent commuters (and others) from parking all day in the car park, then we feel that charging all day (including Saturdays) is far too severe and excessive a solution. AS a result of this kind of overkill charging, we feel that this will really amount to not much more than yet another form of taxation on locals and on motorists and is, in our opinion, not necessary to achieve your stated objective.</p> <p>There are other ways of preventing all day parking - by charging for just one hour in the day (for example from 11am-12pm), by introducing a CPZ of sorts (also for just one hour, just like already exist in so many parts of Mill Hill) or by limiting free parking to a longer period (4 or 5 hours) with no return for one hour, etc.</p> <p>There are a number of such alternatives that will be just as effective and these types of alternatives are already in place in so many other parts of the UK. So we don’t see why you need to implement such wide ranging charging hours in our park to achieve your states objectives of managing the car park – unless, of course, the real reason for these charges is to generate additional revenue (commonly known as taxation).</p>	
--	--	--

	<p><b><u>The proposed charges will just transfer the problem away from Mill Hill Park towards the adjacent streets, such as Poets Corner</u></b></p> <p>Many of our members have expressed concerns that those commuters and others, who might be deterred from parking in the Mill Hill Park by these proposed charges, will simply move towards Poets Corner and other adjacent streets to park all day.</p> <p>So, while these charges are not required in order to resolve LBB's stated problem in the first place, they will create and augment the same problem in the adjacent streets, making it even more difficult for those residents, who live in those adjacent streets, to park in their own streets without paying LBB further fees for a CPZ (or other solutions).</p> <p>We are aware that LBB has started a consultation of sorts regarding a CPZ in Poets Corner but we assert that until there is an agreed solution that will protect the residents of Poets Corner and in a manner that is agreeable and satisfactory to them, there should be no further discussion of charging or restricting parking in the car parks in Mill Hill Park.</p> <p>The two issues should be discussed and agreed as one, and at the same time.</p> <p><b><u>We object to the consultation process itself, which we feel is flawed, not legal and is contributing to the erosion of trust in our Council and the erosion of the democratic process:</u></b></p> <p>We are very concerned that the consultation process itself, as carried out by LBB, is flawed and not legal and, as a result, has compromised the democratic process in many ways.</p> <p>Below are some of our concerns regarding the consultation process itself:</p> <p><b><u>The process disregards a High Court Ruling</u></b></p> <p>The <b>High Court</b> ruled against LBB in a case called <b>Partingdale Lane v LBB</b>. Like us, they too claimed that their consultation was legally flawed and the High Court agreed with them and ruled against LBB.</p> <p>In its ruling, the High Court stated that for a consultation to be a legal, it must satisfy two important criteria:</p> <p><b>Criteria 1: “that the consultation must take place while the proposals are still at a formative stage”.</b></p> <p>In the case of the Daws Lane Car Park Charges, it is clear that LBB is way beyond the initial formative stages of this process. They have already decided on the nature of the problem (without consulting with us first to see if we even agree that a problem exists in the first place) and they have already decided upon a solution (without consulting with us and without discussing different options with us first). Furthermore, it is clear from the working of the notice that most (if not all) of the details of LBB's solution has already been worked out. This includes, for</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>example, how this will work, what days and times charges will be levied, how much will be charged, which stakeholders and groupings will be exempt from these charges, etc.</p> <p>And all this formative stage decision making was carried out without consulting with us first.</p> <p>So on this point, LBB does not meet the High Court's criteria for this consultation being legal.</p> <p><b>Criteria 2: “those consulted must be provided with information which is accurate and sufficient to enable them to make a meaningful response”.</b></p> <p><u>Let's look at the requirement for “sufficient information”:</u></p> <p>In the notice that was published in the Barnet Times, it provides certain details and then states specifically that there is further information.</p> <p>To this end, we asked LBB for this further information and more details many times and each time we were told that there was no further information. Eventually, after many emails insisting on this information, LBB finally agreed (and only about a week before the end of the consultation period) that there was indeed a further document with information, which they sent us.</p> <p>However, unfortunately this document actually provided LESS information than the notice in the Barnet Times, not MORE.</p> <p>So where is this advertised “more information”? And why has it still not been produced for inspection by residents during the consultation period? It is now the end of the consultation period and still no “further information” (as advertised) has been forwarded to us.</p> <p>Moreover, we subsequently discovered additional documentation that LBB did not divulge that shows that the information that they provided in the notice in the Barnet Times and in subsequent emails to us is actually not accurate (see below in the section about accuracy of information)</p> <p>On a related matter, it is also our understanding that there is a covenant covering the park and we were provided with no information regarding this covenant and how it could affect any decisions made by the Council. From our understanding, no legal opinion has yet been sought or indeed provided by Harrow Legal to ascertain if this has any bearing on the Council's intention to charge or any bearing on which stakeholders need to be exempt from these charges. For example, there is an assertion that Etz Chaim School and 80 Daws Lane are also, according to the covenant, full stakeholders in the park and we understand that a proper legal opinion has not been sought yet.</p> <p>As there is so much relevant information that is still missing, we feel that the High Court's criteria for “sufficient information” has not been met.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p><u>Let's also look at the requirement of "information which is accurate":</u></p> <p>Despite the fact that we requested further relevant information, and no further information was provided, near the end of the consultation process we discovered a document that LBB did not provide which shows in writing that the real reason for these charges has nothing to do with their stated objective of "managing the car parks".</p> <p>The document is the Minutes of the Environment Committee meeting about a year ago. (<a href="https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s50629/Car%20Park%20Charging%20-%20Parks.pdf">https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s50629/Car%20Park%20Charging%20-%20Parks.pdf</a> ).</p> <p>In this document it makes clear that the purpose of these charges is to generate a predicted £150,000 per annum for the upkeep of the parks. <b><i>There is no mention of the management of parking spaces at all</i></b>, only mention of revenue generation.</p> <p>From our reading of the above, not only is this consultation not legal according to the High Court's ruling requiring the provision of accurate information, but it is also misleading. Misleading because LBB claims that the purpose of the charges is to "better manage the parking spaces" when, according to the Minutes of the Environment Committee, it is really a tax on parking spaces to generate extra revenue from people using the car parks.</p> <p><u>Why is this important?</u></p> <p>An important element of any consultation for the Mill Hill Resident's Association is that it is not only legal but that it is seen and felt to be open, inclusive and democratic. What matters to us is that the consultation process itself in this case is flawed and disorganised and does not serve the democratic nature of the fundamental purpose of a consultation.</p> <p>As mentioned above, the problem with LBB carrying out this consultation in this manner is that it impedes and obstructs the democratic process and excludes residents from having a full and meaningful "discussion", which is the entire purpose and real intent of any consultation.</p> <p><b><u>Lack of Publicity and Lack of Promotion of this Consultation</u></b></p> <p>While our concerns above are directly related to the High Court's rulings and strongly suggest that this consultation is not legal, we are also very concerned about the way that LBB has proactively decided to keep this consultation as quiet and as hidden as possible.</p> <p>Yes, a notice was placed in the Barnet Times but we all know that there are a considerable number of residents who do not get this newspaper anymore and do not read it. So, exposure here is far too limited.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>And yes, a small notice was placed on a lamp post in an obscure part of the car park in Daws Lane parking lot but almost no one walks past that particular lamp post that is inside the car park itself and not on a pedestrian walkway. So here again, exposure is extremely limited.</p> <p>So, while this might have ticked off the bare minimum of the legal requirements for a consultation, we all know that it is not enough.</p> <p>The result is that a significantly large number of residents were simply not aware of this consultation (and still aren't) and so could not participate.</p> <p>We question why our Council made such a proactive decision not to make more people aware of this?</p> <p>For example, we know that our Council has a very active social media communications programme and invests a lot of time and budget (our tax money) to promote a large number of positive messages to inform us how good they are and how effective they are as a Council. We see our Council invest in communications regarding how well they clean our streets, how amazing they are upgrading playing fields, and so much more.</p> <p>However, what we did not see was any promotion of this consultation in its social media communications programme to inform more people of this consultation and make them aware of the fact to enable them to participate.</p> <p>Why not? Surely for a Council that is so savvy on social media, they could (and should) be using their social capabilities (and our tax money) to inform as many of us residents as possible about important consultations such as Daws Lane that would have such a considerable impact on our pockets?</p> <p>This glaring omission in LBB's social media communications programme further strengthens our feeling that LBB has made some very proactive decisions to keep this consultation as quiet as possible so that as few residents as possible are aware of this.</p> <p><u>Why this is important?</u></p> <p>Many residents have expressed anger as they were simply not aware of this consultation and they feel very strongly that their Council has tried to keep this consultation as hidden as possible.</p> <p>This is important to note as it gives out a very strong message to residents that their Council does not really want them to know about and get involved in these types of consultations.</p> <p>In our opinion, this kind of behaviour further erodes the democratic process by making residents feel excluded and by making them feel that there is no point in getting involved as the Council has already made up its mind and is not really listening.</p>	
--	---	--

		<p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>For all the above reasons (and more), we object to this consultation and to the proposed charges.</p> <p>We further call on our Council to start this consultation again. To this effect, we have already offered to work with Officers and Councillors alike to ensure that this consultation (and hopefully others in the future) will be prepared, planned and carried out not only according to the letter of the law but also (very importantly) according to the spirit and intent of the law and in a manner that fully supports and promotes the democratic process and proactively encourages more engagement and input from our residents.</p> <p>All the best,</p> <p><b>Chair - Mill Hill Residents Association</b></p>	
26.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> Parking in Mill Hill Park</p> <p>Can you please point me in the direction of the full documentation relating to the proposed parking charges that you plan to introduce at Mill Hill Park</p> <p>Don't consider an advert in the local rag enough notification for these drastic changes being proposed</p> <p><b>Subject:</b> Re: Parking in Mill Hill Park</p> <p>Many thanks for this, but these are just notices, do you have any documentation relating to the proposed introduction of parking charges</p> <p><b>Subject:</b> Re: Parking in Mill Hill Park</p> <p>Thank you for your email dated 10th December.</p> <p>In response to my request to you dated 2nd December for further information, you have stated in your email that there is no further information. However, I just discovered over the weekend that on the 9th December (a day before you sent me your email) you sent further information to Mr XXXXXXXX of the Mill Hill Residents' Association. I have cc'd him into this email.</p>	Objects

		<p>As you may know, I have a Facebook group of almost 7,000 members in Mill Hill and many of my members have contacted me for further information and clarification on this consultation. That is the reason I contacted you for further information.</p> <p>As you know, you kept me waiting 8 days (that is over a third of the consultation period) to tell me that there was no further information. However, it took me a further few days to discover that your statement is not the complete truth and that further information does indeed exist.</p> <p>As a result of keeping me waiting so long and misinforming me, you have prevented me from informing my almost 7000 members about this consultation and prevented me from giving them sufficient information to learn about the details of this consultation and be able to participate and formulate a view.</p> <p>I have been made aware by Mr XXXXXXXX and one of his MHRA members, who is a lawyer specialising in this field, of a relevant ruling by the High Court in the case of Partingdale Lane vs LBB where LBB lost on a matter of a consultation that was ruled by the court as "flawed" and therefore illegal.</p> <p>One of the main points from that ruling that applies directly to this consultation is that "those consulted must be provided with information which is accurate and sufficient to enable them to make a meaningful response"</p> <p>By miss informing me and "hiding" this further information from me and not enabling me and my Facebook membership to have the full facts and to make a meaningful response, I feel that this consultation is flawed and not valid. It simply does not serve the democratic process as intended.</p> <p>In addition, there are a number of other relevant points raised by the court that make this consultation very flawed and I think you need to go back and do some better fact finding and start this consultation again.</p> <p>Regards,</p>	
27.	Mill Hill Park	<p><b>Subject:</b> Mill Hill Park Parking</p> <p>I am incredibly alarmed that the planned consultation for the proposed parking charges in Mill Hill Park has proceeded despite the residents being without an MP during Purda .</p>	Objects

Please can you confirm from Harrow Legal that this is indeed a legally safe consultation given that even if you had consulted our MP he cannot possibly know and have spoken on behalf of the residents relaying thier views.

I note that some lease holders within the park have been given dedicated parking in principle. Please can you urgently reply under what policy , covenant , contract and rational has this been included in the plans?

There is the former Civil Defence building in Daws Lane that has limited use ancillary to the park that must be considered and as I have failed to find any background documents which exclude Etz Chaim and 80 Daws Lane from the same advantages.

Please consider this correspondance as a request for further information so that I may make and informed and considered response.

I look forward to hearing from you as a matter or urgency.

**Subject:** Re: Mill Hill Park Parking

Thank you for your email, in 2011 I submitted a Freedom of Information request to the LBB with regards to the covenant of Mill Hill Park , the result is a copy of the attached document and accompanying map, As you can clearly see , contrary to your email "***As you noted below the proposal includes to provision for free parking for lease holders these include the Bowls Club, Café and Nursery as these three operators are based within the park. The neighbouring School and Hub are not part of the park and so are not included within this provision.***" both the school and The Hub are , in fact , in the park unless you can provide further documents to the contrary dated post 2011 and details of the submissions to the Upper tribunal ( lands division) to have either the covenant destroyed or a variation to remove Etz Chaim and the Hub.

At a Planning meeting in 2012 Natalia Levine from Landmark Chambers was asked to consider the covenant, none of which was tested for a ruling within the Royal Courts of Justice or via the Secretary of State for communities. following extensive research I have unequalled counter evidence of that given by Ms Levine that now requires you to review all matters relating to the park as the covenant is mentioned in many detailed documents and seems to runs with the land.

		<p>Following the 1963 London Government Act which came in to force in 1965 reserved all matters of Parks Open Spaces, and Green Belt for 5 years, in 1971 all those pieces of land were handed over to The London Borough of Barnet on a statutory instrument paper 230 " with hereditaments for and against the Local Authority intact". This, we are led to believe, means that the LBB have to adhere to the covenant. Further research has shown that in matters of land swap at Copthall playing fields between the LBB and the Jewish Secondary Schools Movement a public enquiry took place and indeed a memorandum was added to the conveyance, this single act and steps that Barnet took indicate that they are indeed aware of the need to adhere to the deeds of transfer.</p> <p>Barnet Archive holds extensive minutes that agree with my research and indeed the London Metropolitan Archive has the corresponding documents, copies of Minutes and resolues in the parks and open spaces as the complexities of creating the GLA and its lands. even the creation of the Lido in the 30's mention the fact that the covenant runs with the land.</p> <p>In 1981 it was decided that the only proposal acceptable for the former swimming pool was a Garden Centre as it was considered a hobby ancillary to the park, all of this information is in the public domain. The former Civil Defence building was erected under special measures and was intended to be demolished. It was allowed to be retailed by the LA on the condition that it could only be used for matters ancillary to the park and as a community centre.</p> <p>In December 2016 ARG committee meeting I noted that Barnet Museum was removed from the ARG assets strategy as it was noted that the restricted covenant meant that it could only be used as a Museum.</p> <p>Please can you, as a matter of urgency relay this information to Harrow legal and see advice as to how to proceed as clearly the status of the ark and its lessees within is a matter of confusion. I am happy to share any information i have or indeed to signpost you to the whereabouts of the original documents.</p> <p>I understand that the purpose of the charging is not a matter of allowing a regular turnover of parking spaces but is indeed considered to be a revenue stream potential. I am not clear whether the vendors' successors would be entitled to compensation in this case as they would be at Copthall . Large swathes of that land was indeed owned by the same family.</p>	
28.	Mill Hill Park	<b>Subject:</b> Mill Hill Residents' Association	Objects

	<p>Dear Elliott,</p> <p>I wish you and your family a very happy Chanukah and all good wishes for a healthy and peacefully exciting 2020.</p> <p>Just after midnight on Sunday 22nd December I received this notification from a friend who was notified by the Mill Hill Residents Association informing us for the first time that LBB are intending to charge for parking in the Daws Lane car park in Mill Hill Park</p> <p>The notice advises us that we have barely 2 days, until Christmas Eve, 24th December 2019 to raise any objections.</p> <p>For all I know you may have been at the meeting proposing these changes but for anyone connected with the Etz Chaim primary school this proposal is a major inconvenience, an outrageous interference, and having regard to the secrecy of this announcement, a vicious and malicious proposal.</p> <p>I ask in all seriousness is this proposal legal? The mysterious way that this proposal has appeared is very worrying. My Granddaughter is a pupil at Etz Chaim school. It would impossible for the parents and the school itself not to have been aware of the proposals unless the LBB and the Councillors tried very hard to hide the proposal from residents, the adjoining school and other interested parties.</p> <p>Instead, the underhanded and deliberately secretive way that LBB appear to have have slipped this proposal under the table determined not to allow local residents and other interested parties the opportunity to appeal is very disturbing.</p> <p>I appeal to you to use your influence to put an immediate stop on this proposal until interested parties have the opportunity to appeal against this proposal.</p> <p>I am also copying Matthew Offord MP in the hope that he might be able persuade the Council to act in a more honest and appropriate way.</p> <p>I question the legality of the way Barnet Council and its counsellors have slipped this proposal in. This proposal gives us virtually no time to make representation or appeal against this ruling.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Even more disturbing is your likely response to tell me that the offices of the Council are not open until after Christmas meaning that no objections can be raised.</p> <p>This cannot be right. We are entitled to expect more transparent behaviour from our Local; Authority and the Counsellors.</p> <p>I would ask you to please let me know what on earth is going on and how can such a proposal be so dishonestly considered without giving the opportunity for interested parties to raise objections.</p> <p>I am sorry that I have no option other than to Email you. The last thing I would want to do is disturb you but the way this has been explained we only have until 24th December - just 2 days - to raise any concerns.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p><b>Subject:</b> Re: Mill Hill Residents' Association</p> <p>23<sup>rd</sup> December</p> <p>Dear Mr Gunyon and Mr Simberg</p> <p>Firstly may I thank you both for replying so speedily to my concerns to impose charges for parking in the Daws Lane Car Park. I am responding to you both with equal urgency because I realise that we only have until tomorrow to voice our objections to the proposed charges for Daws Lane Car Park.</p> <p>My first objection is that I do not believe that the residents of Barnet and those using the recreational park adjoining the Daws Lane Car Park have been supplied with sufficient detailed information to understand why Barnet Council are suddenly proposing to impose charges on motorists using the Daws Lane Car Park.</p> <p>Matthew Gunyon has confirmed to me that Barnet Council have actually done all that they are legally entitled to do by publishing the statutory notices as required by law.</p> <p>I am not qualified to understand if that is correct but I would suggest that the Council have deliberately failed in their duties to transparently notify residents and users of the park of their intention to suddenly impose charges on those using the Car Park.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>I suggest the Council have failed in their obligations to explain their reasons for imposing these charges. I do understand that we residents of Barnet are absolute entitled a fair period of consultation after all the facts are clearly explained. I suggest that the Council have failed in their obligations to explain and justify their motives</p> <p>If the intention is to stop Commuters from using this Car Park then why not have a couple of hours during the day when parking is not permitted. The Council surely does not need to impose a blanket ban on all free car parking.</p> <p>I heard about these proposals less than 24 hours ago which gave me less than 2 days to write to the Council with my objection. For you to only give us until 24<sup>th</sup> December – Christmas Eve – to object, which I suggest is monstrously unfair.</p> <p>You claim to have openly served notice and complied with the statutory rulings. You may have done so but you have deliberately failed in your efforts to ensure that those using the Car Park would see and understand details of the intended charges.</p> <p>I am under the impression that the Councillors are in office to stand up for the interests of those living in the Barnet area. Regardless of where we stand politically the interests of Barnet Residents and those member of the public using the facilities of the Park.</p> <p>Instead, the interest of all those people have been deliberately ignored. These people include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Residents of Barnet visiting the park.</li><li>Children using the playground</li><li>Adults taking children for a walk.</li><li>Children and adults playing football and cricket</li><li>Everyone walking safely around the park</li><li>Everyone using the Café</li><li>Those using the Tennis Courts</li><li>Those using the Bowling Green</li><li>Parents safely dropping off children at the adjoining School</li><li>Parents safely collecting children from the adjoining School</li></ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>With very little alternatives to legalised parking around this Car Park how can Parents be expected to safely drop off and collect children from their school.</p> <p>When Planning permission was given for Etz Chayim school I believe the retention of the adjoining free car park was assured. I suggest the Council's plans are quite unfair and need to be reconsidered. Children need to be encouraged to use the park. Maybe for walking or for recreational purposes – using the excellent playground, visiting the Park Café is all part of a safe and important Community Lifestyle.</p> <p>You claim you advised the public on 28<sup>th</sup> November. I have spoken to a number of Parents at the adjoining school and no one that I contacted knew about the Council's intentions. They are in a worse position than me. I was introduced to the proposed charges yesterday, giving me just 2 days to voice my concerns. Certain parents are hearing this for the first time the day before Christmas Eve which is the final day you are allowing the public to voice their concerns.</p> <p>I suggest the Council are failing in their duties to clearly set out their intentions and that they should withdraw their proposals until they explain their motives for imposing charges</p> <p>Matthew Gunjoy suggests that he was following a statutory consultation process which included a notice in the newspaper and detailed notices were put up at the locations (see attached image from Daws Lane). The public notices displayed at the locations provide the details of the proposals.</p> <p>I object most strongly to you suggesting that you, the Council, have provided a 21-day statutory consultation which ran from the 28 Nov – 18 Dec however it was agreed to extend the time line to the 24 Dec to allow for further responses to be received. This was done so secretively that no one I have come across has been aware of the Council's plans</p> <p>I say again that I have only just heard about these proposals. It is possible that I am misunderstanding exactly when and how charges are being imposed but that only confirms my concerns that the Council have not provided sufficient or adequate information.</p> <p>I admit that I no longer buy a local newspaper which used to be delivered to our door when we lived in Edgware. Perhaps details were explained in clearer terms.</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>Like many others, the park and the use of the Car Park is very important to me and that is why I am writing to implore the Council to reconsider the proposed charges for parking in the Daws Lane car park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>	
29.	Old Courthouse Recreation Ground	<p>I refer to the notice dated 8th August and apologies for not emailing earlier but I'm been away. The timing of the notice comes at a time when people are away or looking after children in the school holidays!</p> <p>The half hour proposed is simply not long enough and could adversely affect the cafe which operates in the gardens and be a restraint of trade.</p> <p>I think there shouldn't be a charge for parking in a recreation ground as it may affect the ability of some people to enjoy the park.</p> <p>Moxon St offers an hour free and believe the courthouse should as well if indeed a charge is actually appropriate in a civic asset like a park.</p>	Objects
30.		<p>With reference to the NOTICE dated 8th August relating to parking fees in the Old Courthouse Recreation Ground, we have no objection in principle to charging but half an hour free does not make sense. We would argue <b>one hour</b> is required for several reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is not simply a municipal car park but is a parking area integral to a recreation ground.</li> <li>• The Old Courthouse Recreation Ground - as its name would indicate - provides facilities, in particular, a childrens' playground, a cafe, tennis courts and the Bowls Club as well as gardens and seating for the enjoyment of the local people.</li> <li>• Council Tax payers already pay for the upkeep and maintenance of the park and these facilities</li> <li>• Moxon Street car park, which is closer to the High Street, offers one hour free. Equivalence would seem fair.</li> </ul> <p>The benefits are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All four park gates can be opened and closed simultaneously in the early morning and at dusk and avoid the inconsistency of opening these gates at variable times. This inconsistency frequently results in chaos with several cars entering Manor Close, which is a single track lane, while others are trying to depart having found the park locked. This is inconvenient for those of us who live here and we are often open to dialogue with irritated and disappointed drivers.</li> </ul>	Neutral

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fees may deter those who park all day or for lengthy periods while shopping,</li> <li>• and, presumably the Council intends to derive some income.</li> </ul> <p>The arguments in favour of a One Hour free period are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A family bringing small children to play probably take nigh on 10 minutes to get out the car and on to the swings and likewise to depart.</li> <li>• Similarly, it may take 10 minutes or so to get to The Old Courthouse Cafe** and get served. 20 minutes is insufficient to enjoy a coffee and one of the delicious sandwiches or cakes or offer.</li> <li>• On a summer's day families take a picnic, sitting at the table or on the grass - one assumes to get away from the confines of a flat or housing with no garden</li> <li>• Half an hour is insufficient time to pop a prescription into the doctors' surgeries or to pick one up from the pharmacies.</li> </ul> <p>The notice indicates that organisations will receive parking vouchers, by which one assumes the Bowls Club will benefit. Who else will qualify?</p> <p>**If our understanding is correct that Barnet Council has leased the Old Courthouse Cafe, for which the lessee is paying rent with the not unreasonable intention of making a profit, then the Cafe should be given special consideration when reaching a conclusion.</p>	
31.	Scratchwood Open Space	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed parking charges at Scratchwood Open Space. Scratchwood Open Space is the nearest wooded area for me to take my dog on walks.</p> <p>I can understand that you want to put off people who might dump their cars there but I think that it should remain free as a resource for local people to take their dogs for exercise or to have a picnic.</p> <p>Therefore as an alternative, I would like to suggest that the car park is free for the first 2 hours and then you charge in bands of 2 - 4 hours and then over 4 hours.</p>	Objects