

Finsbury Park Neighbourhood Plan

MINUTES

Date: 8 December 2016, 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
 Kevin Duffy (Friends of Finsbury Park) - local resident, Haringey
 Louise Page-Jennings - local resident, Hackney
 Rev'd Stephen Coles (SC), local resident, Islington
 Mike Dark - local resident, Haringey
 Simon Slater (SS) - local resident, Hackney
 Elizabeth Lowe (EL) - local resident, Hackney
 Caroline Selman (CS) – Hackney councillor Woodberry Down Ward
 Nicola Duncan - local resident, Hackney
 Peter Dacre (PD) - local resident, Hackney
 Irma Irsara (II) - local resident, Islington
 Elizabeth Szewczyk - local resident, Haringey
 Sally Billot (SBil) - local resident, Haringey
 Gordon Hutchinson - local resident, Haringey
 Sonia Cooper - local resident, Islington

Apologies: Susie Barson (SBa), Alasdair Clarke (AC), Kari Pilkington (KP), Susan Lowenthal (SL), Talal Karim (TK), Hugh White, Jeanette Arnold, Dominic Sweetman, Ruth Clarke, Katherine Stansfeld

FORMAL BUSINESS		
1.0	Introductions were made, and apologies noted as above	
2.0	Welcome to newcomers, and recap on progress to date	
2.1	Information disseminated about the Boundary Survey had resulted in many new interested people, hence the excellent turnout this evening. RT provided a short history of the working group, a brief outline of the process of adopting a Neighbourhood Plan, and the group's progress towards a Neighbourhood Plan for Finsbury Park.	
3.0	Approval of draft minutes from previous meetings	
3.1	The minutes of the Open Meeting on Tuesday, 20 September 2016 were agreed as an accurate record. Action: RT to upload to website	RT
3.2	The minutes of the Open Meeting on Wednesday, 26 October 2016 were agreed as an accurate record. Action: RT to upload to website	RT
4.0	Reviewing the interim results of the online Boundary Survey	
4.1	RT talked through the slides that had previously been circulated. He emphasised that the survey is still open and that to agree a boundary we needed responses from those who don't see their neighbourhood as being Finsbury Park as well as those who do. The results so far have some areas showing relatively clearly that residents identify as living in Finsbury Park, whilst residents in other areas were much less	

	<p>definite – and some people identified as living in Finsbury Park rather than possible alternatives – e.g. Tollington or the Haringey Ladder.</p> <p>He mentioned that BM had started work on developing a Neighbourhood Plan for Stroud Green some time ago, the areas are seen to overlap and it may perhaps be appropriate to have a separate Stroud Green Plan, or a Plan for Finsbury Park and Stroud Green together.</p> <p>Other borders, too, are important – for instance, CS mentioned that there is an Action Plan for Manor House, and that residents from Woodberry Down with its existing Masterplan may not feel it appropriate to get involved. Action: RT to add other planning policy document boundaries to the pack of maps.</p> <p>This discussion raised the question “Why do we want/need a Plan”? The answer, from those who had already been involved, was that we need a way of forcing the three boroughs to work together. We have always been neglected and ignored by all three. A Neighbourhood Plan does not require a Lead Borough – it must be submitted to all three and requires approval from all.</p> <p>SC asked if the Boroughs would require equal representation on the Neighbourhood Forum – it was felt that, while representation from all sectors/interests was required, exact numerical balance was not likely to be required.</p> <p>Il asked when and to whom the survey was sent out. RT explained that the group is an informal gathering of residents, not yet a formal group and the survey was sent out by each of us to local contacts as well as to all relevant councillors. The next step would be to get it circulated more widely to local community groups, etc. Action: SS to mention the Boundary Survey in the Woodberry Down Community Organisation chair’s report.</p> <p>Everyone was asked to help get word about the survey out to as many local people as possible.</p> <p>Action: 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.</p>	<p>RT</p> <p>SS</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>DN</p>
5.0 Agreeing a strategy for more focused consultation in more uncertain areas		
	<p>As previously described, responses from some areas showed clearly that most respondents thought of themselves as living in Finsbury Park. In areas where the response was less clear, we needed more focused consultations. Many suggestions of avenues for reaching more people were made by the group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents’ Associations including e.g. Stroud Green RA, Charteris Co-op, Quadrant Brownswood Co-op, Manor House TRA. • Schools, including e.g. Stroud Green (and the after-school club), Islington Arts and Media • Youth groups e.g. Youth Forum at Woodberry Down, Platform, Elizabeth House • Churches and other faith groups • Traders groups • Community organisations like The Laundry • Older people’s groups/lunch clubs <p>Action: SC to contact local faith groups.</p>	<p>SC</p>

	<p>It was suggested that posters (with QR codes) could be put up in places where people gather around the area, including local libraries and that this should be done quickly. Action: RT to design a poster.</p> <p>One attendee suggested printing and posting leaflets through residents' doors; however, RT reported that he had had limited success with such an initiative in the past (two responses from 400 leaflets).</p> <p>There could be a stall outside Tesco in Stroud Green Road and outside the N4 Library, to conduct street surveys. EL, SB and DN volunteered to help with this. Action: EL/SNB/DN to coordinate street surveys.</p> <p>There is no statutory timescale for this process, but the meeting agreed that while we wanted to get it right, we didn't want to drag it out.</p> <p>It was agreed that we shouldn't do door knocking at this stage but rather get moving so we can focus on the issues. We would only door-knock in areas where doubt clearly remained after other survey methods.</p>	RT EL/SB/ DN
6.0	Arranging a meeting with the local authorities prior to submitting our Neighbourhood Area application	
6.1	Engagement with ward councillors - All relevant ward councillors have now been notified by an email including the survey, and some had responded (all positively, including Richard Watts, leader of Islington Council).	
6.2	<p>Order of applications - RT explained that two applications leading to a Plan had to be made (in each case to all three boroughs), one for approval of boundary ('Neighbourhood Area application'), and one for approval of the group ('Neighbourhood Forum application') to take forward the development of a Neighbourhood Plan. The group was asked whether there were views about doing both applications together or sequentially.</p> <p>Following discussion, it was agreed that we should develop the Neighbourhood Area application – recognising that each of the three boroughs may have their own agendas, wanting certain areas included or excluded.</p>	
6.3	<p>Format for application - RT explained that Hackney had a template for submitting applications; Haringey and Islington did not, but asked groups to discuss their application with planning officers. RT suggested that this was an early example of the challenges in dealing with three planning authorities – from a community perspective, fewer resources would be required if we could agree one format for submission across the three. It would also be symbolic of the group's aim of encouraging more cross-borough working.</p> <p>It was suggested that we should aim to have one councillor in each Borough as a point of contact. Clare Potter (Hackney) and Tim Gallagher (Haringey) had shown interest by coming to meetings and Richard Greening (Islington) was suggested for the borough.</p> <p>It was agreed that we should try to have a meeting with all three planning departments as soon as possible. Action: RT to draft email to the three councillors, seeking their help in arranging a meeting with the three planning departments.</p>	RT
6.4	<p>Format for community engagement - RT explained that that there was no specific requirement for the means of engaging with the community – such as a minimum response from a survey, or number of meetings.</p> <p>Also, that the area that some have been thinking about including within the Plan is large (c.50k residents) compared with the largest area approved so far (c.30k</p>	

	<p>residents). RT pointed out that whilst the Councils may be wary of conducting such large-scale consultation in one go, it is possible that each of the subareas would only come forward separately at some point in the future anyway.</p> <p>As shown on the slides shown earlier, there are already various planning documents relevant to parts of our area – for instance, the 2012 Finsbury Park Accord and various Supplementary Planning Guidance documents.</p>	
7.0	Agreeing the wording of slides to provide more information about FPNP at presentations and on our website	
7.1	<p>RT shared some draft introductory wording to be used in presentations and on the website, including a section explaining the need for a Neighbourhood Plan for Finsbury Park. It was agreed that the website should make it clear that the group is made up of local residents, independent of the councils. Also, that there are challenging issues in the area. Other suggestions were to highlight that the idea emerged from the Finsbury Park Trust Regeneration Conference, and explain the work programme after the boundary setting stage. It also made some suggestions for strengthening the section about what local improvements a Plan might contribute towards.</p>	
8.0	Future themed events	
8.1	<p>These events are designed to get more people interested in being involved with the issues and the group. The first, in June, was on Transport and Connectivity.</p> <p>SB and SL are leading the organising of the next event on Culture, Sport and Leisure. Key speakers will be from the Park Theatre and the former Silver Bullet. It was suggested that Furtherfield Gallery and other groups associated with the park might be useful speakers. Action: SB to confirm date, speakers, venue, and draft invitation.</p> <p>Action: 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.</p>	<p>SB</p> <p>SL</p>
9.0	Actions arising from previous meetings	
9.1	<p>Minutes of previous meeting - RT to upload final version of meeting minutes from the Open Meetings on Tuesday, 20 September and Wednesday, 26 October 2016 onto the FPNP website.</p>	RT
9.2	<p>Actions from Transport and Connectivity Event – Thursday 16th June 2016 – RT reported update email from BC on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City North landscaping – BC has passed this request on to be incorporated into discussions with the developer. Action closed. • Directional signage – BC reported that he had not received any suggestions to take forward. Action closed. • Shopfront improvements – BC was still pulling together a pack of designs for the group to review. 	BC
9.3	<p>Public toilets – RT reported on an update email from BC saying that he is trying to clarify the ownership of the existing public toilets, in liaison with Network Rail.</p> <p>Several members of the group reported that the toilets under the arches by the Wells Terrace Bus Station are still there, being accessed by bus drivers etc by key and could surely be refurbished for public use.</p> <p>It was asked whether City North had provided for public conveniences as part of their planning application. Action: BM to circulate the Section 106 agreement for City North.</p>	BM

9.4	Shopfront improvements – TK provided a brief update on progress with the scheme. Action: TK to obtain and circulate breakdown of costs.	TK
9.5	Notification to councillors - Completed by RT, AC, KP and DN.	Action closed
9.6	Stakeholder engagement - DN would send the survey with covering message to the three Councils of Voluntary Service for distribution to their members once the details of the next themed meeting were finalised by SL and SBa	DN (SL/SBa)
9.7	Stakeholder engagement - TK was not present to update on advising attendees of the 2015 Finsbury Park Conference of the activity around the Neighbourhood Plan.	TK
9.8	Boundary consultation – Consultation boundary map – This action had been superseded by the interim results of the Boundary Survey.	Action closed
9.9	Boundary consultation – Draft consultation survey - The Boundary Survey had now been launched.	Action closed
9.10	Boundary consultation – RT reported that Talal had sent the survey to the Manor House Development Trust to gather their views on the eastern boundary.	Action closed
9.11	Boundary consultation – RC was not present to update on her conversation with Frank Jacobs about progress with the emerging Crouch Hill & Hornsey Rise Neighbourhood Forum area. Action: RT to seek update from RC.	RT/RC
9.12	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
9.13	Themed event – SL and SB had made good progress in organising the event. Action: To finalise speakers for Culture, Sport and Leisure event, agree date, invite interested parties and advertise the event.	SL/SB
9.14	Presentation from Locality event - RT had incorporated key elements of the presentation into text for the FPNP website and for use in presentations. Action closed.	Action closed
9.15	Locality event in York – AC provided a brief update on the event, and circulated a hard copy of the presentation.	Action closed
9.16	Stroud Green Fair – RT sought volunteers to attend the Stroud Green Fair. The feeling in the room was that the date had passed.	Action closed
STANDING AGENDA ITEMS		
10.0	Area update	
10.1	RT reported an email from Hugh White which alerted the group to the intention of demolishing the Victorian buildings numbers 3-27 Wilberforce Road – PD said that local people were gathering further information.	
10.2	Local planning guidance (until 2033) for Hackney is currently being consulted on with a deadline of 14 December 2016.	
11.0	Communications <i>(Stakeholder liaison, community engagement, 'hard to reach' groups)</i>	

11.1	In the interests of time, this was not discussed as a separate topic, although elements were discussed under other agenda items.	
CLOSING		
13.0	Any Other Business	
	No other items were raised.	
14.0	Dates of future meetings and events <i>(Date and time, venue, chair and minute taker)</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Meeting or Themed Event (theme tbc) – Monday 16 January 2017, 18.30-20.00 – venue tbc • Open Meeting or Themed Event (theme tbc) - Wednesday 15 February 2017, 18.30-20.00 – venue tbc • Open Meeting – Tuesday 14 March 2017, 18.30-20.00 – venue tbc • Open Meeting – Thurs 20 April 2017, 18.30-20.00 – venue tbc • Open Meeting – Mon 15 May 2017, 18.30-20.00 – venue tbc 	