



Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 2 July 2013
at Fellowship House at 8.00pm

Present: Janet Elliott, in the Chair, Douglas Blausten, Tony Brand, Terry Brooks, Jeremy Clynes, Tony Ghilchik, Colin Gregory, Brian Ingram, Rosalind Josephs, David Lewis, Max Petersen, David Littaur, John Sells, Jonathan Seres, Gary Shaw and Rosemary Goldstein (Secretary to the Council).

Visitors: Joyce Littaur

1. Apologies for absence and welcome to visiting residents

Apologies were received from Alan Brudney, Stephanie Hurst, and Richard Wakefield and Richard Wiseman.

2. Co-option of new Council Member

Janet Elliott proposed and Tony Ghilchik seconded a Motion "That Ann Spencer be co-opted to the Council". This was passed Nem Con. Ann Spencer joined the Meeting and was welcomed to the Council.

3. Questions from Members notified in advance

There were none.

4. Questions from Visiting Residents

There were none.

5. AGM 21 March 2013

The short version of the Minutes was approved for distribution and the AGM in March 2014.

6. Council & EC Minutes

6a. Approval of Minutes of 7 May 2013 Council Meeting

These were approved with a minor spelling alteration.

6b. To receive the unconfirmed Minutes of the Executive Committee of 12 June and confirmed EC Minutes of 23 May 2013

The Minutes of both EC meetings were received. There were no matters arising.

7. Financial Report & Membership up-date

7.1 The Balance Sheet and Income and Expenditure Account for the period ending May 2013 had been circulated in advance to Council members by the Treasurer. JC stated that the accounts are within budget and the June statements will show further items of expenditure re the 23 June Fun Day.

7.2 Noted that there were 1600 RA paid up members as at the end of June. Since the May meeting the Directory had been published and is currently being circulated to all members and to Suburb residents. As in previous years, more members can be expected to sign up in response to the covering letter.

8. Harris Report – progress on outstanding issues.

This was postponed to the next Meeting although JS pointed out that progress had already been made on all urgent issues, the outstanding item being to consolidate the update of committees' terms of reference.

9. Committee Reports and Issues:

9.1 Consam:

43 Brookland Rise

JSells (JSL) reported that pressure is being placed on LB Barnet to take action. It seems that there may have been inaccuracies in the original planning application, and the Trust has been asked to confirm (or not) relevant items.

Site behind Glentree offices at 69a Hoop Lane

Objections have been submitted by Consam to this proposed development.

8 Creswick Walk

This controversial planning application has been withdrawn.

Tree on Bishops Avenue

JSL said that there seemed to be no grounds on which Consam would think it appropriate to object to the felling of this tree.

Memorial Seat in Farm Walk and Gates at Hampstead Way

These are being looked into by LBB and RJ confirmed that she is in touch with them on both issues.

Car Rental

Consam are looking into the possibility of an internet car rental scheme for the use of HGS residents and are talking to a firm. He asked whether this was within the remit of Consam and agreed to talk to the Chair of R&T.

HGS Trust

Consam are talking to the Trust about ways in which they communicate with residents and a draft letter is being prepared which will be approved by the Chairman before it is submitted. JE suggested that it would be helpful if the draft were available before 16 July so that EC members could also consider before it was issued.

BI suggested that he would like the RA to resurrect walks around the twitten/allotment site. It was noted that there may be sound reasons including security why such walks were discontinued. As a next step, and without commitment

to any decision to resurrect the walks, JSL agreed to discuss this with the Chair of Allotments Committee.

JSL

9.2 Events:

Reports on Michael Rowley Event

Unfortunately there had been a low attendance and it was thought, by Events Committee, that the speaker and the talk were not directly relevant to the Suburb. Perhaps next year this event should take a different format with a different title for the event, and this would be considered further by the committee.

Fun Day Picnic

This was a great success and appreciation was expressed for all the hard work carried out by the organisers. It was hoped that this event could be repeated but nevertheless the programme for the current year should be reviewed. DLt said that there would be a number of non-recurring items of expenditure if the enlarged event is held again next year, and there were ideas for increasing revenue income – the question in principle being for discussion in the autumn, and noting that the overall events budget had to include consideration of whether to hold fireworks at the end of 2013. He was delighted with the village atmosphere and community feel of the Fun Day. During the afternoon, several hundred people were on the Square without it feeling crowded.

JSr asked what response there had been from the 24 organisation that had tables. JC said that the Horticultural Society had sold £100 of tickets and plants. In contrast the RA table had been quiet with only one new member who had signed up, but the displayed material, and the banners, ensured RA branding, and some Gallery booklets were sold. It was understood that the Heath & Hampstead Society's table also had little interest displayed by visitors.

The Ham and High had reported the Fund Day but had included a disappointing photograph taken before most people had arrived.

BI would like to encourage the HB School café to open more frequently and he will follow this through. **BI**

JSr mentioned that while some had thought volunteers would be stretched between the various events, the Fun Day volunteers were mainly direct contacts of the organising sub-committee.

The Fun Day had coincided with an event in Lyttelton Playing Fields and the East Finchley Festival but there are events being held every weekend during the summer months and it is impossible to avoid them all.

Consultation on Fireworks

DLt said that the Events committee have not come to any decision on whether to recommend New Year's Eve fireworks this year but welcomed the idea of fireworks under certain circumstances. The Committee therefore invited Council members to express views.

After a poor response to a questionnaire in ENews asking residents for their views, EC, with the agreement of the Chairman of Events, decided to use the same RA email list, comprising about 1500 members, to send a message linked to a survey questionnaire. 135 replies had been received by 18 June and the Events Committee studied the result when it met that evening. This produced a 10% response of which 76 (56%) thought that the estimated cost of fireworks of £4,500 was a good use of RA funds and 59 (44%) thought not. Of these 25 persons were willing either to steward and/or to join an organising committee.

The Events Committee considered they needed the following update to the April cost information before they could express an opinion on whether to recommend a fireworks display and party on 31 December 2013.

*Whether the regular fireworks supplier could also be the event manager, to reduce the April draft cost;

* The cost of their management services, and

* The current cost of the fireworks themselves: (the 2011 figure was £2,400 inclusive of VAT).

The Events Committee had raised these questions with the supplier. The committee felt that they should only go ahead with these further enquires, and with responses to the potential volunteers over the summer months, if the Council decided to accept the proposal set out in the motion below.

“The Council agrees that they are likely to decide at the 3 September meeting to proceed with the firework display on New Year’s Eve 2013, if

- The net cost would be £4,500 or less; and
- Events Committee were by that meeting in a position, using the survey and subsequently acquired information, to name a willing sub-committee with energetic leadership and volunteers.”

There followed an exchange on whether a decision on this year’s fireworks was linked with a potential decision about the Summer Picnic in 2014, and whether the RA would be better served if it had a strategy that could make such decisions easier. Specifically on fireworks there were differing opinions on whether it was appropriate for the RA to run an event on New Year’s Eve when many residents used that occasion for annual events with family and friends.

DB considered strongly that there should first be a strategic discussion on use and prioritisation of RA funds. Others disagreed. Some thought that at a strategy discussion, a percentage of the annual budget might be determined for the two main events, but that this should not delay the present motion.

At the end of the discussion a motion was proposed by Janet Elliott and seconded by Terry Brooks

“That in principle the RA would like to hold a New Year’ Eve Fireworks Event subject to detailed costing being provided and the net cost not exceeding £4,500 and that the Events Committee can name a sub-committee with energetic leadership and volunteers, by 3 September.”

This was passed with 11 votes in favour, 3 votes against and 3 abstentions.

9.3 Gallery

In RWA’s absence JE said that a new exhibition had been mounted at the Gallery and she thanked Annie Walker and other volunteers for all the work involved.

9.4 Publications

The next edition of Suburb News will be published on 10 August. Lorna Page and others are assisting Richard Wakefield with this.

The Suburb Directory had been delayed this year to enable new advertisers and additions to the discount scheme to be included. Advertising revenue had raised £2,550, whilst the direct costs amounted to £2,069. The remaining revenue could be seen as having covered the £456 costs for Membership Cards, though that was covered by a different budget.

CPG was thanked for his work in finding 19 new organisations who wished to be included in the Discount Scheme.

BI asked whether the cost of the distribution could be discussed. JSr responded that the mailhouse packed several different letters, and delivered to the RA 52 boxes in sequential Ward order, the cost being the same as last year; and within budget. There would be an opportunity to discuss BI's point when the 2014 budget was considered.

The new Membership Leaflet is included in the New Residents Pack sent out by the Trust. BI's suggestion that it would be helpful in future editions to include a contact telephone number, was noted.

9.5 Roads & Traffic

GS had circulated a paper prior to the meeting. He had within the past few days received notification that LB Barnet wished to proceed with the extended CPZ proposal about which consultation had been held early in 2013. From the figures available from Barnet, GS thought that the majority of residents in a section of Meadway and Hampstead Way supported the extension of the Scheme, but that overall a majority of those consulted had not been in favour.

GS said that if Roads and Traffic had been able to take a more robust position, the extension of the CPZs in and around HGS may have been prevented. GS agreed to a request from members that he study the published figures in more details to see whether they gave further insight into in which roads residents had or had not been opposed or supportive. **GS**

Since the previous Council meeting, the RA had identified a person with extensive experience of advising authorities responsible for traffic management in cities in the UK and North America. A meeting with the advisor had been convened which the Chairman and Vice Chairman attended together with the Chairman of the former Strategy Working Party and the Chairman of Roads and Traffic.

Details of the issues and proposals discussed were set out in the papers circulated to the Council. The most notable conclusion of the meeting had been that a body such as the RA needed to be prepared to be reactive at an early stage to any proposals likely to affect London or Barnet which would have potential impact on HGS and that no strategy findings would be likely to alter Barnet's parking policy which is linked to the Mayor of London's transport strategy and to the CPZ concept.

The adviser considered various common objectives but thought that there would be no consensus and in any event LB Barnet would do what was simple to achieve and more affordable. She, therefore, suggested that the RA concentrate on issues such as hours applicable, removal of street clutter where they may be able to influence any decisions made.

In discussion CG said that perhaps the adviser was being defeatist and we should still look at the bigger issues.

The R&T Committee was asked to consider the issues raised in this discussion and in the report to Council with a view to seeing whether further issues should be put to the Council for their attention. **GS**

9.6 Trees & Open Spaces

Prior to this meeting papers had been circulated regarding the Central Square and Northway playground.

Central Square

Trees and Open Spaces have been talking to the Trust, LB Barnet and Richard Townley Chairman of North Square RA about the future of the flower beds. There is widespread support for the improvement to their present state and a request has been received for part funding of a designer for a new planting scheme. Richard Townley had agreed to administer the scheme and supervise any long term maintenance which may be necessary. Trees & Open Spaces also back the proposal to part-fund the designer. The preliminary advice was that replanting could be more in line with the original Lutyens scheme but involving a more easily sustainable planting scheme. An estimate for the design cost of £600 has been submitted. The RA has been asked to make a contribution of up to 50% £300. It was confirmed that English Heritage has also been in consultation with the group.

The EC recommends that this money be allocated on the assumption that the Trust would back the proposal and make a similar contribution and that there would be no commitment that the RA should meet the costs of long term maintenance. LB Barnet would be responsible for the planting but they may not agree to proceed with the plan.

A motion was proposed by Tony Ghilchik and seconded by John Sells:
“That the sum of up to £300 is allocated to draw up detailed plans for Central Square planting on the understanding that a similar contribution is made by HGS Trust and that there would be no long term maintenance requirement.”

This was passed Nem Con

Northway Playground

JSr had received a request from the parents group asking for information about obtaining charitable status, based on the library's experience. The Group have now asked for an in-principle letter of indication regarding the £20,000 funding which the RA had previously resolved to allocate, subject to conditions.

This playground would cater for younger children than the facilities in Lyttelton Playing Fields. The total cost originally estimated at £80,000 is now £113,000 but the equipment list can be reduced if funding does not reach the full amount. 40% of the cost is replacing the base with a resilient floor plus surrounding grass. There will be a slightly enlarged site and it is understood that Barnet have agreed to allocate £10,000 to the project. The Funding Doctors to be used by the parents group are making an assessment of the project.

The parents group understood that RA funding was subject to the balance of funding being obtained (for a viable scheme, even if less than the £113,000), to Barnet committing to maintenance, to local consultation, and to completion by say 30 June 2014 (or such other long-stop date, if any, as the RA may agree).

A Motion was proposed by Tony Ghilchik and seconded by Brian Ingram
“That the Council noted the paper regarding Northway Playground and approved the issue by the RA to the parents group of an in-principle letter for funding of £20,000 subject to the conditions as discussed.”

This was passed unanimously.

Northway Rose Garden

A short discussion took place regarding the rose garden which was inconclusive and this will be continued at a future meeting.

10. Any Other Urgent Business

Trust Elections

JE reminded Council that there will be an election for two places on the Trust Council at their AGM in September and she encouraged Council members to keep their membership up to date and to vote.

Footnote: Information on future meetings:

1. RA Council meetings

Meetings will be held on 3 September, 5 November, 2013 and 7 January and 4 March 2014. All the above are Tuesdays and all meetings will be at 8pm at Fellowship House.

2. Open meetings

Reserved dates Tuesdays: 1 October, 3 December 2013 & 4 February 2014, all at Fellowship House