

Ref: 1871

ERUV

**NOTES OF A MEETING AT THE LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET
ON TUESDAY 15TH DECEMBER 1998**

PRESENT:	Mr. J. Koster	- London Borough of Barnet Highways
	Mr. E. Black	- United Eruv Synagogue Committee
	Mr. G. Morris	- United Eruv Synagogue Committee
	Mr. A. Perrin	- United Eruv Synagogue Committee
	Mr. G. Murdoch	- Fibbens Fox Associates Ltd

-
1. The meeting had been arranged to discuss progression of the licence following the decision by the Council's Public Works Committee at its meeting on 27th October 1998. Mr. Black expressed the United Eruv Synagogue Committee's appreciation for the comprehensive way in which the item had been presented to the Council's Committee by Mr. Koster and his colleague, Mr. Beattie, that evening.
 2. It had been hoped that Mr. Penhey from the Council's Legal Department would also be attending the meeting but was unable to do so and Mr. Koster apologised on his behalf.
 3. Various matters were discussed, by reference to points raised in a letter from Mr. Koster to Mr. Murdoch dated 12th November 1998 and from points set out as conditions in the officer's recommendation to Committee concerning the grant of a licence.
 4. Mr. Koster identified that it is the Council's intention to provide a single licence covering all the sites with appended details of all the individual sites, including schedules and plans. This would relate to the Borough Road sites and from a conversation with Shelagh Best at the Highways Agency he believed that they were adopting a similar approach.
 5. In terms of scale drawings, the Council have received a number of comments concerning the positioning of individual poles. It is obviously a sensitive issue. Drawings to date have been provided at scale 1:1250 (Location Plan) and at a scale of roughly 1:100. Mr. Koster identified that precise scaled drawings must be provided but that it would not be necessary for these to be dimensioned. He felt that a scale 1:100 would be appropriate and confirmed that the Council can use their CAD system to generate these drawings from OS plans. There would obviously be a cost which would need to be borne by the United Synagogue Eruv Committee and he undertook to provide some details of this to Mr. Murdoch. It is recognised that if necessary Alan Perrin could add additional features and in response to Mr. Perrin's question, Mr. Koster confirmed that these drawings would be suitable for contractors to work from.
 6. Four further specific issues have been raised in Mr. Koster's letter and these were discussed in turn.

7. Location 27. Mr. Perrin identified that it would be necessary to instruct a practising engineer to design heavy foundation. This will need to be submitted to the Council and they will consult the Highways Agency. Mr. Koster suggested that it would be necessary to design a base and also a protective kerb detail, the latter may be resulting in the need for a Section 278 Agreement and the possibility that the Council may wish to undertake the work at this location themselves, at the Committee's cost. There was some discussion concerning the heights of poles here. The current proposal involves medium poles but Mr. Koster identified that this is an abnormal load route as a result of which it would be necessary to provide tall poles here. It was recognised that it may be possible for the Planning Department to deal with this matter as a minor departure from the approved plan. Mr. Murdoch agreed to take this point up with Mr. Townsend. If not then a further approach would be for the Council to notify the Committee whenever there is an abnormal load programmed to use the road so that the wire can be removed to accommodate it.
8. Details of the standard foundations. Mr. Koster confirmed that the Council are now using David Webster Ltd of Hoddesdon and G.M. Briton of Harlow as their contractors. They will have a standard foundation design which is likely to be considered favourably and it was agreed that Mr. Perrin could contact them.
9. New Roads and Street Act 1991 – This is a matter which will be covered by contractors with Notices served by them.
10. Barnet Borough Site Impaired Group – This is a consultation issue and is one which officers of the Council will undertake. Mr. Koster felt it is possibly a matter of providing them with more information and he also felt that it may be useful to provide the Committee with details of talking pages so that they could pass details of the new signs on to them.
11. There were also a number of conditions identified in the officer's Committee report's recommendation and the opportunity was taken to discuss these.
12. Detailed Design Calculations, Specifications, Colour Etc – Design calculations are likely to be discovered in discussions with the Council's contractors. Details of height and diameter of poles have been provided and Mr. Perrin confirmed that it is still intention to use steel poles. Mr. Koster felt the Council's laws would support use of the dull green paintwork used on a number of the Council's items of street furniture already.
13. The necessary approvals and consents - these are being obtained.
14. Traffic Director for London – Mr. Koster will deal direct on this point. It is a general catchall point. Mr. Koster identified that the Director is responsible for designated road and he felt that the High Road, East Finchley was an example of this.

Ref: 1871

ERUV

15. Approvals from City of London, D.E.T.R and Public Utilities – Members of the Committee took the view that there was no further consent required from the City of London. The D.E.T.R question is being dealt with by discussions with the Highways Agency. The submitted scheme avoids the public utilities and it was felt that it may be useful for Mr. Koster if the Committee provide a confirmatory letter concerning this point.
16. Licence Format – Mr. Koster confirmed that a draft is being prepared by the Borough's Solicitor and that it should be available for the Committee soon. In response to Mr. Morris's question he saw no reason why this should not be early in January. Concerning the constitution of the body to whom the licensing is to be issued Mr. Morris explained that the United Synagogue Eruv Committee will be formed as a company limited by guarantee, incorporated and registered as a charity. The purpose of this approach would be to maintain continuity and to avoid any problems arising if the Council had to deal with individuals. Mr. Koster welcomed this approach in principle.
17. Bonding – Details of this will be in the licence. The Committee will need to indemnify the Council against any third party claim. As they will need to have the bonding in place they will need to know the amount as soon as possible in order to take the matter up.
18. Expenses etc – This will not be in the licence. It will be spelt out separately. Mr. Koster needs to set up some form of arrangements with the Committee to cover matters such as supervision, involvement of Council's arboriculturalist (whom it will be helpful to have on site when foundations are dug near trees) etc. This will be separate from the licence fee.
19. Mr. Koster saw no reason why the Committee should not go out to tender and did not feel that a target date of construction in March was unrealistic. He was pleased that the Committee were able to confirm that this construction process will be undertaken in a comprehensive manner and suggested that this approach is likely to take some two weeks.
20. It was recognised that there are details of planning conditions which need to be satisfied. Mr. Murdoch suggested that these should be sent direct to Mr. Townsend and felt that where necessary Mr. Koster and Mr. Townsend should liaise. An example for the need for this liaison was likely to be the colouring of the poles.

**Distribution: All present plus J. Penhay Esq
C. Townsend Esq**

**GAM/PCF
15.12.98**