

THE SECOND GENERAL MEETING OF THE ST JOHN'S WOOD NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

6.30PM WEDNESDAY 5 OCTOBER 2016 AT QUINTIN KYNASTON SCHOOL

Chair Bill Tucker (WT)
Secretary Virginia Newman (VN)

MINUTES

1.0 WELCOME

- 1.1** WT opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and thanking QK School for hosting and catering for the meeting. Alex Atherton (QK Head) confirmed that QK was delighted to engage with the community.
- 1.2** WT apologised for any confusion arising from the necessary change in date for the meeting. Every effort had been made to communicate this change.
- 1.3** WT reported that since the meeting in May 2016, the Steering Group had met twice and together prepared the Vision Statement (VS) for the area which would be discussed and hopefully ratified by members. See minute 3.
- 1.4** WT noted that a Communication Sub Group had been set up and that every effort had been made to communicate with all members of the local community including posters, distributing leaflets and using social media. There was a discussion about how to reach out to everyone and ensure the Forum is broad, diverse and representative of the population. VN reported that 2500 leaflets had been distributed through letter boxes, to concierges, at the tube station, at bus stops, outside schools, in the library, in local shops. Contact had also been made with institutions such as churches, synagogues and CityWest Homes. WT reported that the Forum now had 140 members and stressed that it was the responsibility of all members to spread the word. VN suggested that everyone present should introduce 3 friends, neighbours or colleagues to immediately quadruple numbers. David Burr noted that not everyone was interested in planning matters and that the Forum should remain welcoming and open to all. ALL
- 1.5** In order to start to bring together themes for the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) a couple of flip charts had been positioned to allow people to write up their thoughts on items for inclusion. These would be compiled and circulated. ALL
- ### 2.0 PREVIOUS MINUTES
- 2.1** WT confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting had been circulated by email and posted on the website. No comments had been received and therefore would stand as a true record.
- 2.2** WT stated that the website would be updated to include minutes of any Steering Group or Sub Group meetings. If there are any comments on minutes, these should be notified by email to chairman@sjwnf.org.uk and the comments will also be posted. WT/VN/
ALL
- 2.3** WT noted that CVs of Steering Group members had been prepared and these too would be posted on the website. WT/VN

3.0 VISION STATEMENT

- 3.1** WT presented the final version of the VS which had been refined following comments received from members on the first draft. He stressed that this VS for the Forum need not be the same as the VS within the NP which was more important and would be more detailed.
- 3.2** WT confirmed that changes to the VS included a reference to health and omission of the phrase ‘inclusive, diverse and vibrant’ which Judith Warner had considered to be more appropriate to a community like Notting Hill since SJW is more tranquil. JW voiced her reasons for removing these words. A lively discussion took place and the following comments were received from members:
- 3.2.1** Losing the references to inclusion and diversity made the VS less human-centric and more business-centric. VN noted that these characteristics were embedded within national, GLA and Westminster planning law and were not ‘special’ to SJW therefore there was no benefit in including these.
- 3.2.2** Concern at SJW being described as a ‘garden suburb’. VN noted that this is a correct definition from its historic roots.
- 3.2.3** The area benefited from a number of major national assets such as Lord’s, and therefore had many visitors.
- 3.2.4** Concern that the phrase ‘promotes responsible and sustainable development’ was too pro-development. It was noted that the VS and NP must not be anti-development, however it was suggested that the phrase could be changed to ‘supports responsible and sustainable development’.
- 3.3** WT agreed to carry out a further review of the VS with the Steering Group in the light of these comments, and would circulate the final version / post on the website. In order to avoid delaying development of the NP, WT proposed the motion that the VS would be approved by the Steering Committee on behalf of the NF once all comments have been received and the disposition shared with Forum members. NOTE
- Proposed – Susan Kaye
Seconded – John Rothenberg

4.0 PRESENTATION BY RACHEL FERRY-JONES, WCC PLANNING DEPARTMENT

- 4.1** RFJ made a clear and informative presentation on the background to NF and the process for their development in the City of Westminster. She also responded to questions from the floor.
Note: the presentation is posted on the website. It includes an email address for queries however the Steering Group and WCC would prefer all queries to be focussed through the SJWNF Chair.
- 4.2** RFJ confirmed that there must be a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Development should reflect a consensus of what the community needs but must support WCC’s targets for growth. The Council’s overarching plan, City for All, sets out their targets for a ‘City of Aspiration, Choice and Heritage’. Thus the NP could require higher rates of affordable housing that WCC’s own targets, but not lower, although the higher rates must be financially viable.
- 4.3** WCC has recently adopted the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which is a tax on development to pay for infrastructure improvements. The Forum will provide an opinion on how CILs should be used in the area.

- 4.4** RFJ set out the stages for the preparation and adoption of the NP, and highlighted the following that should be incorporated in the Plan:
- Local issues to be addressed - policies will shape or influence the location of developments.
 - Projects to be pursued
 - Other items to be addressed (eg refuse collection)
- 4.5** RFJ confirmed that WCC will assist the NF by signposting information that was available in the public domain such as demographics.
- 4.6** RFJ showed a diagram illustrating the relationship of the NP to other planning guidance (see SJWNF website).
- 4.7** RFJ noted that WCC will consult widely on the proposed NP, including local interested parties and individuals, businesses and adjacent boroughs or forums. She agreed to confirm the constitution of the 'community' who will take part in the referendum (all residents/ workers in the area or just members of the Forum?) RFJ
- 4.8** RFJ confirmed that the Examiner who would be appointed by WCC was likely to be a member of the Inspectorate and someone experienced in planning matters.
- 4.9** WCC will finally adopt the NP which will give it statutory weighting, to allow it to sit alongside national and regional planning guidance. The Inspectorate will take the NP into consideration in any appeal.
- 4.10** RFJ concluded by stating that the Government was totally committed to Neighbourhood Planning with recent and future planning legislation reinforcing this.
- 5.0 DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FOR SJW**
- 5.1** WT outlined the process in developing the NP and stressed that there was much work to be done and that the inclusive and participatory process required all members of the Forum to take part.
- 5.2** WT presented three example draft NPs for members to review and consider:
- 5.2.1** [Knightsbridge](#) - 5 pages, a few objectives with specific actions. Includes suggestions for spending CIL.
- 5.2.2** [Highgate](#) – 87 pages, 5 core areas, specific site allocations identified
- 5.2.3** [Kentish Town](#) - 15 page summary with 62 pages in support, specific policies and projects highlighted.
- 5.3** WT confirmed that the SJWNP should identify issues, qualify these and be evidence based.
- Issues - members were referred to the SJW Conservation Audit (available on the SJWNF website) prepared by WCC in 2008, which was considered to be an excellent start for the plan.
 - Data – issues should be backed up by data on demographics, usage, movement patterns etc.
 - Community – the voice of the entire community should be evident
 - Local Estates – input from John Lyon Charity and Eyre Estate was important.
- 5.4** Members present voiced a range of suggestions for areas to be addressed in the MP and were also asked to write their thoughts flip charts (see separate summary) WT

page). WT will also solicit responses from all members by email. These thoughts will start to inform/ shape the Plan.

- 5.5** WT noted that the Steering Group will be divided into sub-groups which members will be invited to join. Each sub-group will deal with a specific subject and will be required to gather information, speak to local people and pull together elements to go into the Plan.
- 5.6** WT confirmed that an application would be made for up to £15k funding as SJW should be considered to be a complicated area. The application must identify how the money will be spent.
- 5.7** It was noted that there would be many varying opinions from members and from the public however WT stressed that it would be for Members to vote and decide on policies to be adopted.
- 6.0 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**
- 6.1** In response to specific questions from Members, RFJ confirmed that to date no NPs had been approved by WCC. One draft NP had been submitted for consultation. She also confirmed that the number of Members attending the meeting was higher than average.
- 6.2** WT closed the meeting by reporting on the threatened closure of the Post Office and noted that a Public Meeting would be held 6.30 - 8.30 pm on 20 October at Our Lady's, Lodge Road, Lisson Grove. He introduced two representatives from the Communication Workers Union, Huw Davies and Gary Watt, who would distribute leaflets and answer questions after the meeting.