

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 3 February 2009
at Fellowship House at 8.00pm

Present: David B Lewis in the Chair

Simon Abbott, Douglas Blausten, Tony Brand, John Boulter, Carol Boulter, Dave Brown, Alan Brudney, Janet Elliott, Colin Gregory. Rosemary Goldstein (Secretary to the Council), Eva Jacobs, Rosalind Josephs, David Lewis, David Littaur, Steve Morris, Max Petersen, Judith Samson, Richard Kemp, Leonie Stephen, Gary Shaw, Richard Wakefield, Richard Wiseman,

Visitors: Andrew Botterill, Joyce Littaur, Derek Epstein, David Bogush, Helen Garner

1	<p><u>Apologies for Absence</u> Terry Brooks, Nicole Gerber, Selwyn Nakan. Alan Walker</p>	
2	<p><u>Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting -6 January</u></p>	
3	<p><u>Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the Agenda</u></p> <p><u>Henrietta Barnett School</u> Derek Epstein reported that Michael Balla-Goddard would be meeting with Hopkins Architects later in the week.</p> <p><u>Discussion and consideration of a Motion regarding the loss of £27 million in Icelandic Banks by LB Barnet in contrast to its withdrawal of funding for street trees on the Suburb</u> Colin Gregory and Gary Shaw had drafted a letter for the Chairman which he will deal with.</p> <p><u>Sale of the Tea House</u> The Chairman said that there may be a commercial tea house on the premises if the Trust does not agree to a change of use. Tony McGuire may be interested and, if so, might approach the new owner about running this.</p>	DBL
4	<p><u>Question Time</u></p> <p><u>Recycling Bins</u> David Bogush asked why the new recycling bins are blue and not green and whether the RA is pressing LB Barnet for proper covers. The netting supplied is not practical. The Vice Chairman pointed out that there are some red covers available and Rosalind Josephs will follow this matter up.</p> <p><u>Henrietta Barnett School Extension</u> Andrew Botterill said that he had raised aspects of this proposed extension with the Trust. It informed him that residents have had</p>	RJ

	<p>their say and that Consam had passed the plans. He had seen a letter from the Chairman of the RA to the School recording the unanimous decision taken by the RA Council deploring various aspects of the plans.</p> <p>The Chairman said that Consam had seen the plans on two occasions. The main objections to these are the window treatment and he did not recollect details of these being included when he saw the plans. Consam was divided over this proposal. An ad hoc group had been formed to lobby the school. Andrew Botterill said that the consultation with local residents in August showed the windows blank and he did not consider that this was a basis for consultation.</p> <p>Simon Abbott suggested writing to the School asking them to carry out a consultation on the window and bricks. Carol Boulter thought that the consultation process is wrapped in confusion and the RA should do more. It could be a 'blot on the landscape of the Suburb' if this scheme goes ahead without proper consultation.</p> <p>The Chairman said that there has been publicity but there has not been a big response from residents. Not many Suburb residents live near the School. He would be happy for the RA to support a public meeting if someone wishes to organise it. He said that permission to allow the design of the building is the responsibility of the Trust and Barnet not the RA.</p> <p>Derek Epstein suggested that the RA organises a presentation of the plans by Hopkins. Any public meeting would need their participation.</p>	
5	<p><u>Subsidence Working Group</u></p> <p>The Chairman thought that it would be useful to have a Working Group to help residents faced with the problem of subsidence. Judith Samson said that she would like to prepare a questionnaire and incorporate the results into a booklet. Colin Gregory said that he would like some communication with the Trees committee about this before any policy is adopted. He thought that it would be helpful if there were clearer objectives. Eva Jacobs said that a Working Group usually has parameters and she wondered whether there should be a time scale laid down. Perhaps the objects of the working group should be more specific and there should be a distinction between a working group and a sub committee. Simon Abbott said that when a working group is set up it is usually reviewed at the end of the year.</p> <p>The Chairman proposed a Motion which was seconded by Simon Abbott.</p>	

	<p>'That RA Council shall set up a Working Group to be known as the Subsidence Working Group to investigate and report back to RA Council on the problem of subsidence on the Suburb and to appoint Judith Samson as its founding Chairman'</p> <p>This was passed Nem Con Richard Wiseman offered to help on the working group</p>	
6	<p><u>Co-option of Cesar Duran to Council</u> As he was not present at the meeting Cesar Duran could not be co-opted.</p>	
7	<p><u>Nominations of Officers for 2009</u></p> <p>Chairman - Janet Elliott Vice-Chairman - David Lewis Secretary - Gary Shaw Treasurer- John Boulter</p> <p>The Chairman explained that there has been discussion about possible liability of Officers and Council members as the RA is an unincorporated organisation and it will eventually be necessary to convert to a company with limited liability. Gary Shaw had requested a definitive statement on the liability before agreeing to take office.</p> <p>A Meeting will take place with Selwyn Nakan, Gary Shaw, Peter Beesley, Colin Gregory and John Boulter to progress this.</p> <p>Leonie Stephen and Alan Walker have said that they wish to retire from Council</p> <p>Richard Wakefield said that as there are vacancies on Council we should look at the standing committee to see whether anyone would like to come on to Council. The Chairman said that new Council members could also be co-opted during the year</p> <p><u>Nomination of Council members for election retiring by rotation</u> The following retire by rotation and seek re-election:</p> <p>'Nicole Gerber, Colin Gregory , Richard Kemp, David Littaur, Tony Mcgguire, Judith Samson , Richard Wiseman'</p> <p>The following members of Council have retired or resigned during the year and do not seek re-election: Derek Chandler, Francois Crompton Roberts, Derek Epstein, Leonie Stephen, Rev Alan Walker.</p> <p>The Chairman proposed and Eva Jacobs seconded a Motion to nominate the officers and Council Members.</p>	

8	<p><u>Honorary Life Members</u> The Chairman proposed and Colin Gregory seconded a motion to nominate Leonie Stephen as an Honorary Life Member This was passed unanimously.</p>	
9	<p><u>Approval of Grants</u></p> <p><u>Club House and Museum Committee Working Group</u> Derek Epstein told Council that since Fellowship had turned down the proposal to develop Fellowship House, the working group had been considering alternative venues on the Suburb and particularly the Free Church Hall which had accommodation available now that the Institute is withdrawing. The Oakwood Room, behind the Hall, has been examined as a possible location for the Museum/ Visitors Centre/ Archives. It was suggested that the Hall and the two good small rooms behind the Free Church be used as the focus of a community centre and that an umbrella "Suburb Society" or "Club on the Suburb" brand be established to operate within a community campus comprising that accommodation together with the Free Church itself (for concerts and larger meetings), the HBS school hall, the small hall and rehearsal rooms to be included in the new adjoining school extension, St Jude's and the square itself if that improvement project materialises.</p> <p>Derek reported that he has met with Jo Velleman who thought that the school would be willing to operate its community spaces and community activities (including HB Literary Society and HB Choral Society) under the "Club" brand; and with Joy Solomon (the new principal of the Institute) who considered that the Institute may be willing to contribute activities to the "club".</p> <p>The Group, with the help of the Events Committee, would like to test the response from residents by running some events under an umbrella organisation. David Littaur suggested that possible candidates were a 60s Disco, barn dance, antique road show, picnic, outdoor cinema and a barbeque. Events committee had been asked to help organise these. There would be an admission charge and it was hoped that the individual events would be self financing and if there is a surplus the profits could be given to charity. A grant of £1,500 was requested and if necessary a further sum may be requested. David Littaur said that it is a test to see what residents want. The EC had discussed this and recommended this to Council.</p> <p>Eva Jacobs said that it seemed that a large sum of money will be needed for refurbishment. The Chairman thought that there may need to be an appeal in the future. Derek Epstein agreed and told Council that Ian Tutton had warned that the building</p>	

	<p>adaptation works needed to accommodate the museum (and access to it) could cost as much as £250,000. .</p> <p>Douglas Blausten asked whether it was proposed to give the £1,500 back to the RA. Derek Epstein said he thought that the £1,500 would be kept as a float. The Chairman said that there should be a formula for any money collected at one of these events.</p> <p>Derek Epstein would like to involve a charity as there would be an organisation which the RA could tap into and would provide some additional voluntary help.</p> <p>Eva Jacobs said this proposal would prove whether the residents wish to support an event to raise money for a particular Charity, which Carol Boulter agreed.</p> <p>Colin Gregory thought that this would encourage resident to get together and he supported the proposals.</p> <p>It was proposed that the Events Committee be granted a float of £1,500 to cover a number of events. Any events in association with a local charity would be on the basis that any surplus (from ticket sales or other revenue over costs) be given to that charity. It was proposed by David Littaur and seconded by Dave Brown</p> <p>This was passed Nem Con</p> <p><u>Grant to the Horticultural Society following recommendations of the Executive Committee</u></p> <p>The Chairman explained that the EC had recommended a grant of £1,330 which was one half of the amount requested, based on exclusivity. The Horticultural Society said that it had already asked other organisations to participate.</p> <p>Leonie Stephen pointed out that the RA Trees committee had opposed the design of the bed. Colin Gregory said that he would like to discuss the grant but the Chairman told the Council that there is another proposal from the Horticultural Society where the RA will be invited to contribute and therefore this discussion will be deferred to a future meeting. David Littaur will send the copy of the application for the grant to Council members.</p>	DLt
10	<p><u>Discussion of the question of a banded Management Charge for the HGS Trust.</u></p> <p>A lengthy paper had been circulated to Council</p> <p>Simon Abbott welcomed it and pointed out that</p> <p>i) Although RA Council was not elected on a platform that it would promote a graduated charge it was elected to act on behalf of residents. The RA can lobby either way.</p>	

ii) There would be no problem with the RA funding a neutral poll (conducted by ERS) and, at the same time, lobbying for a particular outcome.

ii) The Trustees of the HGS Trust have an obligation to maintain and preserve the amenities of the Suburb and they should also look at the social implications. The Suburb was set up with a strong social component and not as a housing estate. This must be taken into account

iii) The RA should also look at the ideals of Dame Henrietta Barnett and take action to introduce a graduated charge.

Colin Gregory said that we should get the views of the EC and then have a full discussion. The Chairman pointed out that the EC is changing after the AGM and therefore this matter should be deferred until May.

Douglas Blausten said that the Trust had already wasted £20,000 on legal fees. If we agree to spend £3,500 we must have the certainty of getting a proper result. He did not consider that this is the function of the RA. The Trust must be run as a business. The Chairman thought that the graduated charge as proposed is a waste of time because the proposed graduation makes very little difference to almost everyone. He also said that it is for the Trust to canvass residents' views.

Derek Epstein said that the LVT will take the decision on this. Steve Morris asked why anyone should spend £3,500 to get Electoral Reform Services to prepare a simple form to get a general opinion when the RA could include a questionnaire in its next mailing to RA members at virtually no cost.

Richard Wakefield said that the Trust must remain neutral on this.

David Bogush said this suggestion appeared to come from the Trust which is keen to have a graduated charge but there would be no apparent financial benefit to the Trust in the monies received. When you devise a survey the replies depend on the wording of the questions asked and you will not get a definitive vote.

He wondered what the chances of success with the LVT are. They have already stated that the Scheme is reasonable and leave to appeal was rejected. Derek Epstein confirmed that this is correct but is an irrelevance since the LVT had not addressed the issue as to whether a flat charge or a graduated charge was more equitable and therefore more appropriate.

Simon Abbott pointed out that the Scheme of Management is governed by charitable objects and the Trust must act within these objects and there is no legal obligation for them to be

	<p>neutral. David Bogush disagreed with this and considered that their actions are governed by the law.</p> <p>The Chairman said that he would like to bring back this back to Council in May.</p> <p>In reply to a question from David Littaur asking who had written the paper he was told that it was Janet Elliott and Derek Epstein with input from Angus Walker as to the history, current legal position and the Trust's position.</p>	
12	<p><u>Other Matters arising out of the Executive Committee minutes</u></p> <p><u>New Year's Eve</u> Richard Wakefield wanted the donation to the St Jude's Church increased from £100 to £200. Reminded by the Chairman that he should declare his interest (Standing Order 13) as a member of the Parochial Church Council, he said he did not agree that he should declare this interest as everyone was a member of some other Suburb organisation. The EC had discussed his suggestion at its last meeting and agreed that there was no need for Council to vary its previous decision and if a higher amount was thought appropriate next year, then that can be considered at the time.</p>	
11	<p><u>Any Other Urgent Business</u></p> <p><u>Hampstead Heath Proposal</u> Colin Gregory told Council about the Stop the Road Campaign which suggested that the City of London is planning to tarmac part of the heath by the Lido. He explained the proposal for the Parliament Hill triangle which is to make it more rural and to improve the facilities, to move the café and to separate the vehicles and the pedestrians. It was considered that the safest way is to have a separate road at the back of William Ellis school; Some residents are very unhappy and have therefore started to campaign against it.</p> <p>The RA supported the Heritage Lottery bid which is important for the management of the Heath. If there is a division this could prejudice the grant. Colin Gregory thought that it would be helpful to write to the Heritage Lottery Fund to say that the Hampstead Heath Consultative Committee has approved this and it is to improve safety. The RA has representation on the Consultative Committee and residents are frequent users of the Heath. The Heath and Hampstead Society as well as the Highgate Society support this.</p> <p>Eva Jacobs said that various representatives of the community had attended a meeting where the support was overwhelming and she was surprised at this late reaction.</p>	

	A Motion was proposed by the Chairman and seconded by Leonie Stephen that a letter of support should be written to the Heritage Lottery Fund to support these proposals to the Parliament Hill triangle. This was passed unanimously.	
12	<u>To confirm the date of the next meeting on Tuesday 3 March 2009 at 8.00pm at Fellowship House</u> This was confirmed.	