**Central Ealing Neighbourhood Forum Management Committee**

Meeting on Thursday 15 June 2017, 7:00 pm

in Ealing, Hammersmith & West London College, W5

**Minutes**

**Present:** Tony Miller (TM) (Secretary) in the Chair, Jon Ball (JB), Ann Chapman (AC), Robert Gurd (RG), John Hummerston (JH), Ann Hunter (AH), Mary McDougall (MM), and Tony Burton (TB)

1. **Apologies for absence:** Andrew Cazalet (AJC), Gordon Chard (GC), Paul Conlan (PC), Charles Rich (RC), and Jennifer Smith (JS).
2. **Minutes**Minutes of the 27 April meeting were approved.
3. **Neighbourhood Plan**
	1. TM reported the Ealing Cabinet had approved the paper presented by the planning policy team. Despite his representations to Cabinet at its meeting, two changes had been imposed on the draft neighbourhood plan as amended after the Examiner’s report, on policy HBE4 (Green and Open Spaces) and part of its supporting text. Two options for a possible challenge to the imposed changes to the plan were considered:
		1. to support a ‘call-in’ by either of the opposition parties under which the Scrutiny Panel of the Council would re-examine the issue; and
		2. an appeal to the Secretary of State as provided by statute.

 After discussion, it was **agreed** not to support any challenge.

Cabinet had also approved a date of Thursday 12 October for the two referendums, and is to ask the Council’s Boundaries Panel to consider having only one polling place for the whole of the referendum area, to reduce the cost. TB pointed out that LBE would receive £20k in grant for this. It was **agreed** to raise this with the Council and to object to the proposal, as it would reduce participation in the vote. **ACTION: TM**

* 1. TM reported that Matt Clark (Star 69), who had prepared the submission version of the plan for printing, had quoted for revision of the document. This would form the plan on which the referendum would be held, subject to completion of revision of the maps. This had been sent to Steve Barton at LBE. As responsibility for this now lay with the Council, costs should come out of the original front-runner grant. This should be settled by discussion with him. **ACTION: TM**

1. **Referendum**
An outline for the campaign (Appendix A with the agenda) had been circulated to those members who had been invited to act as a working group (JB, AC, AH, GC, MM & PC). This included costings for projected publicity material.
TM expressed concern about the difficulty of contacting business ratepayers who would vote, as the Council was forbidden from giving out copies of the register.
MM said she had asked Andrew Rollings (Chair, Make It Ealing) for a meeting to discuss the role MiE might play in the campaign, and was waiting for a date. She would also like terms of reference for the working group. **ACTION: TM**
AH said MiE could circulate its 447 levy payers with information prepared by the Forum about the referendum, but she would not participate in the working group as it was not in her remit to campaign for the plan. RG suggested that, as the total number on the register would be small, we should seek to extract details by personal inspection of the lists. We could also use delivery by a commercial operation, which could have access to lists of local businesses.
TM drew attention to the limit of expenditure the Forum could incur as a ‘campaign body’; this had to be calculated by the Council once the voters’ registers had been compiled. TB noted that the Forum could still apply for any unused amount of grant through Locality, but this could only be used for circulating factual information about the plan, not campaigning for a ‘Yes’ vote. He recommended that the campaign itself should be relatively short, and should make use of social media and street-based Twitter groups.
It was **agreed**
	1. that members should look for details of such networks and people experienced in using them **ACTION: ALL**
	2. LBE should be asked for a timetable of actions **ACTION: TM**

1. **Future role for the Forum**TM said five members (AC, RC, MS, CR and RG) had been invited to join a working group to consider the issues raised in the paper circulated at the last meeting. All had agreed other than RC, who had not yet responded.
The consensus view was that there was enough work to be completed on the referendum before moving to the future. It was therefore **agreed** to defer the item for another meeting. **ACTION: TM**
2. **Finance**
	1. TM reported that AC had not yet prepared annual accounts for presentation to the AGM, but would circulate these by email beforehand to the committee. There had been no change in the financial position since the previous meeting. **ACTION: AJC**
	2. In the light of TB’s comment on restrictions of the use any further grant through Locality, the Forum should look for other possible sources of income, include sponsorship. **ACTION: ALL**
3. **Annual General Meeting**
	1. The proposed date of Wednesday 12 July was **agreed.** Details of the room arrangements at UWL were awaited. **ACTION: MS**
	2. As noted under item 6, annual accounts would be circulated. **ACTION: AJC**
	3. It was **agreed** to propose the constitutional amendment attached as Appendix B to the agenda. **ACTION: TM**
4. **Future meeting dates**Committee. Week beginning 17 July, 7 pm in the College, day to be agreed by circulation of a poll.
5. **Other business**None.
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