

Finsbury Park Neighbourhood Plan

MINUTES [DRAFT FOR APPROVAL]

Date: Tuesday 14 March 2017, 18.30-20.00
Venue: FinSpace, 225-229 Seven Sisters Road, N4 2DA
Chair: Ricky Thakrar (RT) - local resident, Islington
Minute taker: Dorothy Newton (DN) - local resident, Islington
Invitees: All interested parties

Attendees: Ben Myring (BM) – local resident, Haringey
Geraldine Timlin - local resident, Hackney
Adam Cook (AC), observer, Islington
Cllr Asima Shaikh (AS), Islington Councillor, Finsbury Park Ward
Elena Jenkins - local resident, Islington
Tony Corbett - local resident, Islington
Susan Lowenthal (SL) - local resident, Islington
Elizabeth Lowe (EL) - local resident, Hackney
David Weatherall
Ciara Malerba - local resident, Islington
Katherine Stansfeld – PhD student RHUL
Viv Snook – Hornsey Road Traders and Business Association
Susie Barson (SuB) - local resident, Hackney
Dan Evans (DE) – local resident, Haringey
Stephen Coles – Islington resident and Vicar of St Thomas’s church
Roulin Khondoker - local resident, Islington
Talal Karim (TK) – Finsbury Park Trust

Apologies: Alasdair Clarke (AC), Kari Pilkington (KP), Liz Cooke, Sally Billot (SaB)

FORMAL BUSINESS		
1.0	Introductions, apologies, and confirmation of chair / minute taker as above	
2.0	Welcome to newcomers, and recap on progress to date	
	<p>RT welcomed everyone and recapped on progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A group has been meeting every so often since 2015 to progress the idea of a Neighbourhood Plan for Finsbury Park. We are first working to define the boundary, which must be agreed by the three local councils. An application must also be made to establish the group as a Neighbourhood Forum under the Localism Act 2011.• Three of the group – one from each borough - met with Neighbourhood Planning officers from the three boroughs to discuss the two applications (see Section 4.1).• RT had attended a Management Committee meeting of the Friends of Finsbury Park; they emphasised that they wanted the whole of the Park to be included within the Plan area (see Section 4.2).• We currently have survey responses from more than 700 people in the area. We have run seven street survey sessions, been door-knocking and also have responses from the online survey on the website. A draft boundary is emerging (see Section 5.1).	
3.0	Approval of draft minutes from previous meetings	
3.1	Open Meeting – Wednesday, 15 February 2017 - The minutes were approved as an accurate record. Action: RT to upload to website.	RT

3.2	<p>Culture and Leisure event - Monday, 16 January 2017 - The notes from the Culture and Leisure event on Monday, 16 January 2017 were not yet ready. Action: SL to finalise notes from Culture and Leisure Event.</p>	SL
KEY ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION		
4.0 Update on recent activity		
4.1	<p>Meeting with officers - Wednesday, 8 March 2017 - RT (Islington resident), BM (Haringey resident), and SuB (Hackney resident) had met with Neighbourhood Planning officers from the three local councils. RT shared some of the key points that were discussed, and explained that minutes from the meeting would be circulated in due course.</p> <p>Timing of applications - It was recommended that the submission to designate the Area boundary and the application to become a Neighbourhood Forum be submitted at the same time. AC, who had been involved in the Crouch Hill area, said that, in his experience, Islington took both applications (Forum and Area) at the same time but only consulted on the Area. He suggested that, until there is an agreed Area, a group cannot fix a Forum.</p> <p>Decision-making process - The officers had informed the group about the decision-making process. There would be an approximately 20-week decision timetable from publicising the applications, including six-week formal consultation, and 4-6 weeks lead in to Executive / Cabinet meetings.</p> <p>Key considerations – Inclusivity of all aspects of the community would be a key consideration. As both Islington and Hackney have refused applications from some areas already, we would review those to understand why and what to avoid.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Area boundary – Officers had flagged some issues to consider (see minutes from Officers Meeting for more detail):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liaison with adjacent Neighbourhood Plan groups - Officers asked whether the group is liaising with other Neighbourhood Forums - indeed, the councils recognised the duty of Forums to liaise and consult with each other. The residents confirmed that people involved with Highgate and Crouch End had attended meetings. • Liaison with businesses - Officers had pointed out that it will be vital to engage with businesses in the central area and to take account of Nag's Head town centre. • Addresses for referendum – Officers explained that maps submitted must be adequately detailed, and accompanied by building numbers and streets clarifying which are within the boundary, so that when the councils consult with the community, they know which addresses to include and exclude. <p>Liaison with council officers - The three councils will agree which of them will take the lead in terms of project management and liaison, and provide one contact. They asked that the group offer a single contact as well. The residents agreed to this, but explained that there would be a named resident from each borough who should be copied into all communication.</p> <p>Planning officers offered to review a draft application pack.</p> <p>Involving councillors – Officers encouraged the group to engage with ward councillors, and recognised the benefits of engaging with other relevant</p>	

	<p>councillors and the Mayor of Hackney – some of whom would be attending the Finsbury Park Regeneration Conference 2017.</p> <p>AC clarified that Forums are not obliged to have councillor members – some NFs have chosen not to, and have found other ways of keeping them involved. RT responded that before the constitution is finalised there will be plenty of opportunity for discussion about this topic, but having them as members does offer multiple benefits.</p>	
4.2	<p>Meeting with Friends of Finsbury Park (FoFP) – Monday, 6 March 2017 - SuB and Clive Carter who are part of this group are members of the Management Committee of FoFP.</p> <p>RT had consulted the Management Committee on whether some, all or none of Finsbury Park should be included in the Neighbourhood Area. The Committee's view was that there should be coherent planning policy in place across the whole Park – the Park is managed as a whole, so it could create issues if there were inconsistencies across the area. The Plan may also provide additional protections against the loss of open space from the Park.</p> <p>It was agreed that a communication would be sent to their members setting out the potential benefits of including the Park. RT reported that the email has been drafted and should be sent to FoFP members in the next few days.</p>	
5.0 Neighbourhood Area / Neighbourhood Forum applications		
5.1	<p>Approval of boundary – A draft boundary map had been circulated with the meeting papers, for discussion. However, RT reported that since that draft was prepared, volunteers had run a boundary survey stall in Hornsey Road outside the Sobell Centre and Cllr Claire Potter (Hackney) had been door knocking in Brownswood ward.</p> <p>RT sought views on the version circulated, taking each of the numbers listed on the map in turn. The following issues were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas 3 and 4 - EJ asked about the exclusion of Hermitage Road, where some respondents felt it was within the Finsbury Park area. RT shared the results of the boundary survey, which were mostly Manor House or Harringay. • Areas 4 and 5 - Mansion House and Woodberry Down have not been included as they already have their own detailed plans/masterplans. • Area 6 - Green Lanes presents a strong physical boundary. • Area 7 – This area warranted further work to gather more survey responses. The developer of the King's Crescent estate will be speaking at the Finsbury Park Regeneration Conference 2017. • Areas 8 and 9 - SC queried whether Mountgrove Road and Gillespie Road should be divided down the middle; RT responded that the boundary followed the ward boundary, and whilst there were some non-residential units on both sides of Mountgrove Road, this was a relatively small number and felt that the area would not be harmed by the division in the same way that Hornsey Road would, due to its prosperity. • Area 10 – SC also queried whether Arsenal tube station would be inside or outside the Area. This area warranted further work to gather more survey responses. • Area 13 - RT explained that rather than drawing the boundary down the middle of Hornsey Road, the draft boundary excluded properties on both sides of Hornsey Road, as the group don't want to divide the commercial area which had been in decline for many years could benefit from rejuvenation. He reported that Hornsey Road Traders Associated were keen to be included; however, it is residents who will be consulted on the Neighbourhood Plan at referendum. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area 14 - RT reported that the only response to the draft boundary had been from a resident of the Holly Park estate who had not wanted to be excluded, but the area could not be included as it is already part of Crouch Hill and Hornsey Rise Neighbourhood Area. <p>AS asked whether the area was too large, and should be split into two. RT explored some of the pros and cons of doing this, and confirmed that the group felt that the area was correct, given the principles established. DE asked if the council officers had given any advice on the size of the area. RT reported that they had not raised concerns, but estimated that the currently suggested Area has over 40,000 residents, which was certainly large compared to other Areas.</p> <p>It was noted that whilst the neighbourhoods of Finsbury Park and Stroud Green have a considerable overlap, the southern part of Finsbury Park does not identify with Stroud Green, and the northern part of Stroud Green does not identify with Finsbury Park. It was therefore felt appropriate and necessary to recognise both identities in the name of the Neighbourhood Plan / Forum / Area. Options discussed were “Finsbury Park and Stroud Green”, “Finsbury Park with Stroud Green” and “Finsbury Park including Stroud Green”. It was agreed that “Finsbury Park and Stroud Green” was the most elegant solution.</p> <p>EL raised a concern about the change of scope of the Neighbourhood Plan from Finsbury Park to Finsbury Park and Stroud Green. Whilst she agreed with the decision based on the evidence collected, she was concerned that the survey had been asking people whether they identified their home area as being included in “Finsbury Park”, not “Finsbury Park and Stroud Green”. RT responded that an article was being prepared to explain more about why this decision had been taken, as a result of the consultation exercise. He confirmed that the survey would not be changed, in order to ensure consistency.</p> <p>Attendees confirmed that they were happy with the process and principles being followed, subject to a small number of geographic areas of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • King’s Crescent • Isledon Village • Myddleton Avenue • Nag’s Head/Seven Sisters • Gillespie Road <p>RT proposed that these areas should be addressed, and then a revised draft boundary circulated to the 300 contacts we now have to seek their views. This would enable the next meeting to focus on the constitution. The group voted in favour of this approach.</p> <p>RT also proposed a walkaround of the boundary, particularly the southern area, but there was not enthusiastic support for this amongst the group.</p>	
5.2	Approval of constitution – To be taken at Open Meeting in April, circulated in advance of meeting	
5.3	List of Neighbourhood Forum members – In the interests of time, this agenda item was not taken at the meeting on 14 March 2017	
5.4	List of affiliated organisations – In the interests of time, this agenda item was not taken at the meeting on 14 March 2017	
5.5	Preparation of paperwork - In the interests of time, this agenda item was not taken at the meeting on 14 March 2017	

ACTIONS ARISING / CARRIED FORWARD FROM PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

6.0	Actions arising / carried forward from Open Meeting 8 December 2016 <i>(In the interests of time, this agenda item was not taken at the meeting on 15 February 2017 or 14 March 2017. The following was reported via the agenda on 14 March 2017)</i>	
6.1	Minutes of previous meeting - RT to upload final version of the minutes from Tuesday, 20 September 2016 to FPNP website.	RT completed
6.2	Minutes of previous meeting - RT to upload final version of the minutes from Wednesday, 26 October 2016 to FPNP website.	RT completed
6.3	Boundary Survey - RT to add other planning policy document boundaries to the pack of maps.	RT completed
6.4	Boundary Survey - SS to mention the Boundary Survey in the Woodberry Down Community Organisation chair's report.	SS to provide update
6.5	Boundary Survey - DN to send the survey with covering message to the three Councils of Voluntary Service (CVS) for distribution to their members once the details of the next themed meeting were finalised.	DN completed
6.6	Boundary Survey - SC to contact local faith groups.	SC completed
6.7	Boundary Survey - RT to design a poster.	RT completed
6.8	Boundary Survey - EL/SaB/DN to coordinate street surveys.	EL/SaB/DN ongoing – Final sessions Sat 11 March and Sat 18 March 2017 meeting 11am at FinSpace
6.9	Neighbourhood Area application - RT to draft email to the three councillors, seeking their help in arranging a meeting with the three planning departments.	RT completed – Meeting held Weds, 8 March 2017
6.10	Culture and Leisure event - SB to confirm date, speakers, venue, and draft invitation.	SB completed
6.11	Culture and Leisure event - SL to circulate the invitation list by email for further suggestions of who to invite, and contact details for those where they are currently unavailable.	SL completed
6.12	Public toilets – BM to circulate the Section 106 agreement for City North.	BM circulated what information was available, but this is not the agreement itself
6.13	Shopfront improvements - BC was still pulling together a pack of designs for the group to review.	BC hosting a walkaround Sat, 11 March 10am outside City and Islington College, Blackstock Road
6.14	Shopfront improvements - TK to obtain and circulate breakdown of costs.	TK to provide update
6.15	Stakeholder engagement - TK to advise attendees of the 2015 Finsbury Park Conference of the activity around the Neighbourhood Plan.	TK added NP workshop to the Conference programme
6.16	Boundary consultation – RC to speak to Frank Jacobs about progress with the emerging Crouch Hill & Hornsey Rise Neighbourhood Forum area.	RC completed – Frank offered to contact SuB via email. SuB to provide update
6.17	Action Plan and Programme - To be updated to show meetings to be set up with LAs, continuing consultation on the boundary and the intention to submit the boundary application to the LAs in March	RT completed – Now targeting submission end April 2017

7.0	Actions arising / carried forward from Open Meeting 15 February 2017 <i>(In the interests of time, this agenda item was not taken at the meeting on 14 March 2017. The following was reported via the agenda.)</i>	
7.1	Minutes of previous meeting - RT to upload final version of the minutes from 8 December 2016 to FPNP website.	Action outstanding
7.2	Minutes of previous meeting - SL to prepare notes from the Culture and Leisure event.	SL ongoing
7.3	Outreach - DN to contact Bridge Renewal Trust, which has replaced Haringey CVS.	DN to provide update
7.4	Outreach - BM to ask Cllr Raj Sahota about including an item about the neighbourhood forum in his planned Stroud Green newsletter.	BM drafting article
7.5	Outreach - DB to consider the impact of business types and locations on the boundary.	DB to provide update
7.6	Outreach - KP to consider the demographics of the area, and propose a target mix for the Citizen's Panel.	KP to provide update
7.7	Finsbury Park Regeneration Conference - DB, DE, KS, DN, RT to discuss offline.	DB, DE, KS, DN, RT to provide update
7.8	Towards a draft boundary - SaB / DN / SuB to coordinate future street survey stalls.	SaB / DN / SuB to provide update
7.9	Towards a draft boundary - RT to set up a meeting with FoFP.	RT completed – Meeting held Monday, 6 Feb 2017. Resolution in favour of including the whole of the Park in the Plan boundary
CLOSING		
8.0	Area update <i>(Current consultations, new planning applications, etc.)</i>	
8.1	TK gave a brief outline of the programme for the Finsbury Park Regeneration Conference 2017, to be held on Saturday 25 March 2017. There will be a Neighbourhood Plan workshop facilitated by RT and SuB, with an activity led by KS. Other members of the group who would be attending the Conference were encouraged to join different workshops and make sure that those groups were aware of the Plan and why it was relevant to their interests.	
8.2	There is to be an exhibition about proposals for the George Robey site, at St. Mellitus Church, Tollington Park on 21 and 22 March 2017 from 4.30pm to 7.30pm. All were encouraged to attend to find out more.	
9.0	Any Other Business	
9.1	RT encouraged anyone who has connections to local businesses to engage with them – we need their support and membership.	
10.0	Dates of future meetings and events <i>(Date and time, venue, chair and minute taker)</i>	
10.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Meeting – Thurs 20 April 2017, 18.30-20.00 – venue tbc • Open Meeting – Mon 15 May 2017, 18.30-20.00 – venue tbc 	