

File Note Ref:1871

ERUV

NOTES OF A MEETING AT THE LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET ON
WEDNESDAY MARCH 8TH 1995

PRESENT: Mr. J. Koster - London Borough of Barnet (Highways)
Mr. D. Schreiber - United Synagogue Eruv Committee
Mr. G. Murdoch - Fibbens Fox Associates Ltd

1. Mr. Murdoch explained that with the successful conclusion of the two planning appeals and the subsequent withdrawal of a High Court challenge lodged by one of the local residents, his clients are now keen to move forward in respect of the highway issues relating to the proposed Eruv. In doing this it was recognised that the situation on the ground has changed since the Eruv boundary was identified, particularly in the area of the Express Dairy site known by the Council as "site 7" and in respect of which a Planning Brief is currently being prepared. Recognising that there could be major upheavals in this area for a number of years Mr. Schreiber felt it would be sensible to reconsider the exact boundary in this location to avoid future problems and that this will almost certainly require revised locations for "Gateways". In addition to undertaking the exercise in this area, Mr. Schreiber felt it would be prudent to revisit all of the sites and check whether the approved proposals could be implemented. It was recognised that any revised locations will need to be the subject of separate discussions with officers from the Council's Planning Department. However the applicant's position is that the principle of the proposals has been established by the appeal decisions and that as any proposed new locations will be less sensitive than the Wildwood Road location (considered by all parties to be the most sensitive location in the original proposals) such that it was not anticipated that there would be any objection to the revised Gateway proposals.

2. Mr. Murdoch explained that an application in respect of all Trunk Road locations had been submitted to the Department of Transport prior to the Public Inquiry and that he was in regular contact with Mr. Deveraux concerning this. He felt that the application had not necessarily had a high priority pending the outcome of the appeals and also while the High Court challenge was in place. He had subsequently spoken to Mr. Deveraux to inform him that the challenge had been withdrawn as a result of which Mr. Deveraux had indicated that he hoped to be able to move the matter forward fairly quickly. His understanding from discussions with Mr. Deveraux was that there had been contact between the DOT and Barnet Council concerning the best way to handle the highway aspects of the proposals and Mr. Koster confirmed that this was the case.

3. Concerning the Barnet Council position, the Public Works Committee had resolved in 1992 to grant a years licence to the Eruv Committee. Mr. Schreiber suggested that, as the licence had never been completed, the matter could proceed forward with the Council granting a licence for one year in accordance with that resolution. While recognising that the matter was open to interpretation, Mr. Koster felt this would not be an appropriate approach not least because of the revised locations discussed earlier. He suggested that full details of all the proposed locations are submitted to him following which a report will be prepared for Public Works Committee. Members will be reminded of the previous decision. He confirmed that he will need a full set of location drawings including details of the Eruv boundary. He anticipated that any licence granted by the Council would remain on an annual basis. In answer to Mr. Schreiber's question he confirmed that Councillor Stan Cross is the Chairman of that Committee.

4. Mr. Schreiber suggested that it would be beneficial to discuss the proposals prior to them being submitted and Mr. Murdoch suggested that this meeting could perhaps involve both Mr. Koster and the necessary representative of the Planning Department. Mr. Koster was not sure who the current officer dealing with the matter in the Planning Department would be - it was thought possibly Mr. Townsend and Mr. Murdoch agreed to make contact with him to see if this was the case.

5. It was recognised that Barnet Council will only be able to deal with the non-trunk roads and that the Department of Transport will be responsible for trunk roads. It was agreed that Mr. Murdoch would contact Mr. Deveraux to see how matters were progressing on the current application and to explain that the site's specific locations are being reconsidered. Mr. Koster expressed a willingness to attend any meeting that was arranged with Mr. Deveraux and confirmed that Barnet will need to be guided by the DOT because they act as agents for them.

6. One specific problem Mr. Koster felt might occur in relation to the Trunk Roads was the proposal to construct one set of the poles on the parapet of a bridge crossing the M1 and it was suggested that this should be avoided if at all possible.

7. Mr. Murdoch explained that the difference between the two approved schemes related to Wildwood Road with the second proposal attempting to address the Council's concerns by utilising existing lamp columns as far as possible rather than their own poles. Mr. Koster expressed a preference for independent support and Mr. Schreiber confirmed that there is no problem regarding this. It was recognised that the proposal will be located on the footpath on this location thereby avoiding any need for contact with the City of London.

8. In response to Mr. Schreiber's question, Mr. Koster confirmed that all legal highway matters had been addressed by the Council in-house. Reference was made to a comment made by Mr. Deveraux to both Mr. Murdoch and Mr. Black of the Eruv Committee concerning a Counsel's report concerning highway matters. Mr. Koster was not aware of this but agreed to check to see whether such an opinion existed. If it did he could see no objection to providing a copy to Mr. Devereaux and thought it might be possible to provide one to the Eruv Committee aswell.

Distribution: All present plus E. Deveraux Esq
C. Townsend Esq
E. Black Esq
~~G. Morris Esq~~
L. Begner Esq
D. Drukarz Esq
A. Perrin Esq

GAM/PCF
9.03.95