

MOUNT PLEASANT NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM
MEETING TO BE HELD ON MONDAY SEPT 24TH AT 6.45PM AT
THE CALTHORPE PROJECT, GRAY'S INN ROAD

AGENDA

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING (enclosed below)**
- 3. MATTERS ARISING (see below: included as Agenda items)**
- 4. TREASURER'S REPORT AND APPOINTMENT OF NEW TREASURER**

Bruce is leaving us because he has moved away from the neighbourhood. We all thank him very much for his expert work, and wish him all the best in his new location. We need to elect a new Treasurer.

5. REPORT BACK ON INITIAL MEETING WITH CAMDEN AND ISLINGTON TOWN PLANNERS

Ed Denison, Judy Dainton, Meg Howarth and Vincent Goodstadt met with the planners from Camden and Islington to discuss the draft plan. Discussion centred mainly on wording. The borough planners had a particular interest in our sections on air pollution and design priorities. **(Ed to report back).**

6. REPORT BACK ON PROGRESS RE EASTMAN DENTAL HOSPITAL PURCHASE BY UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

Chair was invited to a meeting on 7th September with Calthorpe Project to discuss their new relationship with UCL who have bought the Dental Hospital. Prior to submitting planning application (scheduled for Jan/Feb) UCL are discussing proposed works with Calthorpe Project. Project have asked the Forum to work with them on this issue. UCL, apparently with Camden's approval, intend to keep the façade of the Eastman Dental Hospital/former Royal Free Hospital, but demolish and rebuild behind this frontage. They are discussing as yet not fully formed proposals with Calthorpe Project, including some rather odd requests (such as using a metre of CP land, such as relocating football pitch etc). CP decided to ask for an Impact assessment by independent body, and discussed various projects/works they would like UCL to fund. **On behalf of the Forum Chair accepted Forum's inclusion in this work and asks this meeting's approval for this action.** Note about present situation will appear on our website.

7. FUTURE TIMETABLE

In discussion with the planners we agreed that the Forum would present a final draft to the neighbourhood at our meeting in September. (this present meeting) We will then consult the neighbourhood groups and associations, make any minor adjustments, add further illustrations, maps etc, and submit the Plan and Appendices in December 2018. At that point we will enter the official consultation period, culminating in a neighbourhood referendum

8. THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN*

This is the agreed substance of our points and our arguments. Any changes made after this date will be cosmetic – layout, pictures etc. Meg Howarth is to be greatly thanked for the work she put into editing this final draft, as are Julie Riley for her work on the website, and Ed Denison for his section on the design guide, and Vincent Goodstadt for his guiding hand with planning issues.

9. THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE APPENDICES TO THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN*

On advice from the Camden and Islington planners, we have cut this document as far as possible, tightening it up to include evidence of the work we have done and the data we have been working from.

10. REPORT FROM MPA ON LIAISON WITH TAYLOR WIMPEY RE BUILDING WORKS (Graeme Weston/Judy Dainton).

11. REPORT BACK- COMMUNITY FUNDING FOR LOCAL PROJECTS FROM TAYLOR WIMPEY (Judy Dainton)

An interim application has been put forward for Taylor Wimpey to fund some of our projects (pocket park near school, trees down Fleet River walk etc) but no response has yet been received. We need to discuss this issue

12. REPORT BACK MEETING WITH BRAG RE TRAFFIC RE-ROUTING IN BLOOMSBURY (re Tavistock and Judd St)(Ed Denison/Judy Dainton)

13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS - liaison with neighbouring Fori?

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING Monday December 10th 2018

- Plan and Appendices are still being edited. Final docs will be sent electronically before the meeting and posted on the website. Hard printed copies may be available at the meeting.

MOUNT PLEASANT NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY MAY 21 2018

AT 6.45.PM AT THE CALTHORPE PROJECT

1. **PRESENT** :- Annika Muller Jones, Elena Henson. Paul Stevens, Nick O’Riordan, Caroline Brown, Francois Smit, David Goldsmith, Edward Denison, Susan Haskins, Meg Howarth, Lucy Shinadu, Gail Sulkes, Graeme Weston, Judy Dainton. (14)
2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**: Julie Riley, Louise Gates and Graeme Weston (arriving late)
3. **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**. These were passed nem.con.
4. **MATTERS ARISING**. There were none except for work on the Plan, to be discussed at the meeting.
5. **ADDITIONAL ITEM**. Annika informed the meeting that University College London had bought the site for its mathematic department. The intention was to run research into Alzheimer’s disease. The department was in touch with the Calthorpe Project, its next-door-neighbour, and she would keep the Forum informed of developments as/when she heard of them. She was thanked.

6. THE DRAFT PLAN AND THE APPENDICES.

Chair reported that Forum had held two walk-in consultation sessions which had been advertised with local community groups and on our website. Hard copies of the documents had been made available for attendees to take home. The sessions had been well attended and comments had been recorded, discussed, and incorporated into the documents. Attendees had not opposed any of the contents, but offered helpful insights.

She threw the item into open discussion, asking everyone present to give their views about the contents of the draft Plan and Appendices. There was an hour’s free-fall discussion. Items discussed were:

In general: the contents of the Report and Appendices were approved, but the general consensus was that the tone should be bolder, snappier in style, less repetitive and more progressive/upbeat in outlook.

Housing. Meeting agreed that social housing was the prime necessity. Affordable housing in this area was not “affordable” because of the excessive price on land in Central London and the consequent high cost of property. Given both Councils’ strategy regarding providing social housing wherever possible, despite lack of funds, and their insistence requiring “affordable housing” as a planning condition, the Forum supported both Councils’ current housing policies.

Traffic and Air Pollution. This was a talking point. The long-term principle of discouraging polluting traffic in our neighbourhood was agreed by the meeting. However, there were lots of individual views about how effective electric cars would be, whether electric cars produced their own form of pollution (though less than petrol/diesel), how much electricity-production polluted the environment, etc. It was agreed electric traffic would need a more efficient infra-structure, with charging points in every street. Some people favoured resident’s parking, but most did not, and advocated a general phasing out of private emission-giving cars and motor-bikes in the neighbourhood. In general, the meeting felt that discouraging motor traffic in side streets was a worthy aim. It was agreed this should be a gradual phasing out project, and that each stage should be subject to local review, since the devil was in the detail at local level. Overall the meeting was in favour of more room for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport and a gradual diminution of motorised transport in local streets. The Forum agreed it supported the Camden council’s traffic proposals, and liked most of the Islington council’s policies.

Design Features. It was agreed that this section should give specific examples of what was good and what was undesirable. Ed agreed to write this section in September.

Local Planning Decisions. It was agreed that Councils' strategy /practice was not clear to members of the public; in advance of submission of the Plan, the Forum should attempt some clarification from the local planners about the practice of local town planning.. Everyone also agreed that our firm policy of being involved with the planning stage very early on in the proceedings was the right decision, so that local opinion could be embedded into the decision-making process from the start.

Appendices. These documents to be shortened, edited firmly, and suggestions from the public incorporated into the draft.

The worth of the Forum's work on the Plan. Some members queried what gain the locality would get from all this work, since we had no land to develop for local housing, and we would have no direct power on the Planning committees who make the decisions. The Chair and Ed Denison replied that having our priorities legally written into the local planning system would stop an outrage such as the Royal Mail development happening again, early legal input into the consultation process would influence decision-making, and the neighbourhood would have the satisfaction of seeing its priorities become actualities, to the benefit of the local inhabitants. Members should also note that once the Plan accepted, our Designated Neighbourhood Area is entitled to a small percentage of CiL payments to fund specific local projects. That, in itself, would be a tangible and quantifiable result.

The meeting agreed the work on the local Plan was definitely worthwhile.

7. REPORT FROM MPA RE LIAISON WITH TAYLOR WIMPEY OVER SITE WORKS. Local fury over site traffic near the Christopher Hatton Nursery and Primary school was expressed. It was agreed to involve the local press and the parents, and to complain vociferously to Taylor Wimpey.

8.A.O.B. There was none.

9.Date of next meeting; Monday Sept 24th at 6.45pm at the Calthorpe Project.