

HAM AND PETERSHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM COMMITTEE
DRAFT Notes of meeting at Ham Children's Centre:
Tuesday 21st July 2015 at 7.30pm

1. Present:

Brian Willman (Chair)
Justine Glynn (Vice Chair)
Penny Frost
Andree Frieze
Helen McNally
David Williams
Lisa Fairmaner
Stan Shaw
Danielle Coleman
Petra Braun
Anne Powell

Apologies:

Jean Loveland (Treasurer)
Geoff Bond
Sarah Tippet
Paul Dowsett

In attendance:

Andy Rogers (Acting secretary)

2. Minutes of the last meetings

These were agreed together with the minutes of the EGM.

3. Matters arising

The appointment of Siriol Davies as Project Co-ordinator was unanimously agreed. Her role will be to liaise between the Committee and the Drafting Team, arrange meetings, -take minutes, organise email correspondence, and provide general support to the Committee and the Forum. She is to be paid £15 per hour, but without a fixed number of hours at this stage.

4. Committee membership

A list of current Committee members was circulated with the Agenda: BW noted that this should be updated by the removal of Kim Hacker as a committee member, although she wished to be kept informed and will provide information relating to the Library as and when appropriate.

5. Post-EGM thoughts

BW had circulated his comments on the EGM and the current position of the Forum with the Agenda. This was discussed: 1. with regard to whether the proposed date for a Referendum in May 2016 is realistic - if not this should be recorded now so that the community is not misled; 2. to agree a process for developing draft policies; and 3. how best to communicate to and consult with the local community.

1. LF said that the timescale depends on the ability of the Committee to agree a text (see comments below), the reaction of the Council, and the appointment of an Examiner. If (as is likely) the Plan is ambitious the timescale could be longer: she thought it was certainly possible to have an agreed Plan in place by May 2016, but maybe not to have completed all the steps necessary for the Referendum to be held. AF requested clarification of the statutory time periods [currently subject to Government re-

view], but LF suggested that the most critical actions after final drafting are the completion of community consultations and appointment of an Examiner.

DW initially proposed that May 2016 (election of the London Mayor) should be kept as a target, but after further discussion - DC said there is still a lot of work to do especially with regard to public engagement, which must be done properly - conceded that aiming to have the Plan in place by that date instead was the most sensible course and BW agreed. It was noted that if the Referendum is attached to other events [although not essential] there will be dates for the European Union vote or local elections/by-election.

2. LF said that a clear direction and agreement process from the Committee is essential. Each policy will be presented, questioned and discussed before being amended. Drafting is being done by synthesising the last two years of public comments, etc. DW emphasised that it is fundamental to ensure that policies are owned by the local community, so proper consultation/feedback is critical: he proposed a sounding-board or workshop for each topic and specific consultations related to smaller discrete areas that can be tailored to local ideas. AF suggested a timetable of monthly meetings open to the public and LF agreed to set up a framework together with Siriol for these, to be held from September to December.

3. BW was concerned about engaging the youth and suggested that a focus group or specialist survey should be used to remedy this, with contacts to local schools and young mothers (possibly via Alexandra Colclough and HMcN) plus the new sixth form leader at Grey Court. LF agreed that there is a problem consulting the full range of social groups. PF suggested break-out meetings for greater variety.

BW noted that Andrew Beedham put emphasis on contacts with local community groups and his list of leaders should be revisited. DC said that all meetings must be put on the website and AF agreed to do a press release and set up a Facebook page, with emails to all local associations including a request that their members should be informed of Forum meetings.

PF confirmed that the next Ham & Petersham Community Magazine is due in August and will include the presentation boards used at the EGM. These can also be exhibited in the Library and/or the vacant shop opposite Grey Court (with at least a notice advising where the boards can be seen). DC suggested additional notices for publicity and LF emphasised that all such initiatives must be properly recorded to demonstrate community involvement.

6. Drafting Team

LF noted that as the Drafting Team had not met since the EGM, there was no progress to report.

7. Update on Ham Close

JG reported on the previous evening's well-attended meeting in Grey Court School when the Richmond Housing Partnership, their Architects and the Council had presented a summary of what was now a single option (apart

from "do nothing"). This had been produced at short notice following funding changes for social housing announced in the Budget and was different from the draft that been discussed at length at a meeting in the Council offices attended by PF the previous Wednesday.

DW said that it was grossly irresponsible to publish the draft options that had been presented without prior notice or consultation and said that they had apparently been prepared in a rush over three days, resulting in a badly thought out proposal that is likely to be reconsidered. SS agreed that the way it was presented was wrong. BW noted that there was no suggestion of how the infrastructure (doctors, schools, transport, etc) for such a large number of extra residents would be provided. PF agreed that as presented the proposal did not seem to be viable and was produced too quickly.

PB was particularly critical of the lack of the Council's communication to local traders, who prior to the Grey Court presentation had neither been given any indication that the shops might be demolished nor been asked for an opinion on this. LF was concerned that, although the Plan could have an influence on the redevelopment of Ham Close (depending on the timing), it is a complex issue and it may not be possible to get a single-voice answer.

JG pointed out that planning permission might not be required because the site could be classified as brownfield. SS said that possible influence on Ham Close is an opportunity to keep the community involved. PF noted that the Plan may be critical to how Ham Close is developed but was concerned to keep the Plan separate from Ham Close issues and ramifications, but LF suggested the Forum should "twin-track" policy and development especially since the emerging Plan will have influence as a material consideration in any future applications or proposals. It was agreed that the lead architect (Andy Heath) should urgently be asked to meet with the Forum Committee.

JG is on the Ham Close Community Forum with PF and DW. Chris Ruse has offered to report on the technical issues and JG asked for everyone to send their comments on the redevelopment proposals prior to the next HCCF meeting scheduled for 12th August.

8. Treasurer's report

JL's written report was tabled. Currently there is £479.73 in the bank account, with no large outstanding payments due. The previous Government funding that expired at the end of 2014 has been returned: there is a new 'My Community' fund available of £8,000 and this will be investigated. The payments promised by RuT should also be chased up.

9. Any other business

BW requested return of outstanding Declaration of Interest forms asap.

AF tabled a publication proposing London as a National Park City and requested support for this.

10. Next meeting

The next scheduled Committee meeting will be on 18th August, 7.30pm, probably at the Children's Centre.

The meeting closed at 9.05.

ANDY ROGERS H&PF_minutes_29_7_15