

File Note Ref: 1871

ERUV

**NOTES OF A MEETING AT THE LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET
ON MONDAY 26TH APRIL 1999**

PRESENT:	Mr. J. Koster	-	LB Barnet Highways
	Mr. J. Penhey	-	LB Barnet Solicitors
	Mr. G. Morris	-	United Synagogue Eruv Committee
	Mr. A. Perrin	-	United Synagogue Eruv Committee
	Mr. B. Levy	-	Fladgate Fielder
	Mr. G. Murdoch	-	Fibbens Fox Associates Ltd

1. The meeting had been arranged at the request of Council officers to progress discussions on the draft Licence and a number of topics were discussed.
2. The Bond. Mr. Penhey identified that the Council's concerns arise from on-going liabilities under the Licence in order to ensure that the Council did not incur expenditure were the Eruv to be discontinued and poles needed to be removed or in the event of poles causing a danger to the public and the Council need to act in respect of it. Mr. Penhey was unable to quantify a figure. Mr. Morris suggested that the maximum sum necessary will be that required to remove everything and reinstate the pavements. He stressed that the Council will only need to do this if two, unlikely, events occur, namely if the maintenance contract which the Committee are entering into with David Webster is not being adhered to and if the Eruv Committee are then not making alternative arrangements. The Committee have been quoted £15,000 for the installation of the poles (which includes their purchase). It was agreed that Mr. Perrin would obtain a quotation for the poles' removal which was expected to be considerably less, particularly taking into account potential scrap value. Mr. Koster felt this was a fair approach and Mr. Penhey agreed to discuss it with the Council's insurance manager.
3. Tension. This is a word which has a legal meaning as a result of which it was agreed that it would be sensible to substitute for it the word "tautness" which should "be approved to the London Borough of Barnet's specification".
4. Plans. Mr. Koster confirmed that work has commenced on the plans although he was not sure whether the burglary of the Council's offices over the weekend would have a delaying factor. Each plan would comprise an A4 drawing comprising a detailed and location plan, to scale but with no dimensions. It was agreed that Mr. Perrin and Mr. Murdoch would be provided with copies of the plans prior to their finalisation.
5. Numbering system. It was agreed that it would be sensible to start with a new numbering system since the historic system had evolved due to a variety of changing circumstances. In any event each individual pole will need to be numbered whereas in the past it has been locations that are numbered. It was agreed it would be sensible to number trunk road gateways in sequence and that wires can be defined by identification of the two poles which they link.
6. Annoyance. This would be amended to read "undue annoyance in the opinion of the Council" or, words to that effect.

File Note Ref: 1871

ERUV

7. Defects report. It was agreed that the Council would be provided with details of the contractor's reports in terms of remedying defects. This would comprise a weekly report on the assumption that work has been done. Websters will be employed to inspect all the gateways each week (and there will also be a further check by representatives of the Eruv Committee) and it was agreed that it would not be necessary to ask Websters to send the Council copies of reports if no defects needed remedying.
8. Council's costs. Mr. Penhey confirmed these would be based on time charges but he did not know the figure. He agreed to let Mr. Levy know this.
9. Company formation. Mr. Morris confirmed that the proposed company has now been formed in the name United Synagogue Eruv Committee with company registration Number 3749885. They are in the course of registering it as a registered charity but he requested that the Council do not make this fact public knowledge.
10. Bridge over M1. This involves the special kerbing details and the base plate. The Council need to seek authority to enter into a Section 278 Agreement which it may be possible to do under delegated powers. In order to do so they will need written confirmation of the details of the company and Mr. Levy agreed to provide these. In terms of the base plate it would be necessary for the Council and the Highways authority to liaise and provide details for Mr. Perrin.
11. Colour. This is a matter for the Council to determine as Planning Authority. It was agreed that Mr. Koster would discuss this with the planning department and revert to the applicants.
12. Identification on poles. It was agreed that this could be provided in stamp metal and need just be the pole number.
13. Confirmation of pole heights. Mr. Koster confirmed that he would circulate his understanding of the pole heights in each location for confirmation by Mr. Perrin and Mr. Murdoch.
14. Timing. Mr. Morris stressed that he wished to try to identify a timescale and that he hoped to do this on the bases of commencement of installation of the poles on or about June 1st. While not seeing this as an impossible target, Mr. Penhey stressed that the Council will need the company details, will need to seek authority, will need to clear base plate details and will also need to progress various notices in connection with this.
15. Highways Agency. It was also recognised that clearance and agreeing confirmation of a Licence will be needed with the Highways Agency concerning poles on trunk roads. Both Mr. Levy and Mr. Koster agreed to contact Shelagh Best at the Highways Agency concerning this.

**Distribution: All present plus Edward Black Esq
Clive Townsend Esq**

**GAM/PCF
27.04.99**