**Loughborough Junction Neighbourhood Planning Forum**

**Minutes of Meeting**

**Wednesday 16 September 2015 at Woolley House**

**Attendees – see sign in sheet**

1. Appointment of chair - Kristin Bayliss.

2. Appointment of minute taker – Julia Whitehead.

3. Apologies for absence – Jan Hague.

4. Note of the meeting of Thursday 20 August 2015 accepted.

5. Matters arising – none.

6. Loughborough Junction masterplan and communications strategy.

Tom Rumble (TR) from the Regeneration team at Lambeth said they have completed stage 3 of the consultation process. Final options need to be considered taking a 2 tier approach looking at planning guidance, how to interpret policy and aspirational changes.

The budget for a communications strategy is limited. Tom asked for ideas on how to communicate.

Attendees offered the following

Suggestions

* Need to find a budget as without it Lambeth can’t communicate and/or develop a strategy for doing so;
* Use facebook and twitter accounts – get digitally active;
* Use Primesite billboards;
* Use noticeboards;
* Use leaflets and find a service that can deal with split postcodes;
* Consult door to door; and
* A form that can be sent back, so people don’t need to go to meetings.

and observations

* 89 languages spoken on the estate;
* Kate concerned about being asked for a photo and completing a questionnaire with an address on it at the consultation meeting. **TR surprised and said he would look into this**;
* Difficult to get into different blocks of flats;
* Without a full consultation it becomes a worthless piece of paper that people say they don’t want;
* Cllr Heywood noted Lambeth now have fewer resources to consult and the statutory minimum requirement for consultation is low; and
* Questionable whether Lambeth do want to consult with people from Loughborough Junction.

7. The future of the Loughborough Farm – Lambeth bid to GLA regeneration fund.

Tom Dobson (TD) gave an outline of the opportunity to bid to the GLA regeneration fund:

* Bid deadline – 2 October. The funding bid will go in from Lambeth. TD only found out about the funding opportunity two weeks ago;
* Funding available of up to £1 million from April 2016;
* The site is council land which is a Key Industrial Business Area (KIBA);
* Focus of bid/development needs to be employment based. Proposal would create 100 jobs on site. Unemployment high in the area. There will be space for training and employment and possibly an outdoor gym as well as space for the Farm;
* There would be studios and workspaces;
* Food and drink not allowed on site;
* If successful it could secure the long-term future of the farm;
* The bid would also secure funding for one of the 7 bridges;
* Concerned about management of the space. TD wants to get other groups involved like Loughborough EMB and LETRA. TD and TR will meet with Peter Shorinwa (PS), the chair of the Loughborough EMB to discuss the opportunity. Meanwhile Space and LJAG will be involved in the bid. Need people to get involved to make it a success;
* TD working on a voluntary basis for three days a week in the build up to the bid being submitted;
* TD circulated draft plans.

Concerns expressed by attendees:

* Nobody from the estate goes to the Farm

Response - Anthea Masey (AM) who attends the farm at most sessions advised this is not true and people from the estate do go to Loughborough Farm. It’s a space for everyone. There is no reason for people from the estate not to come.

* Land is Loughborough Estate land. AM taking an asset from the Loughborough Estate;

Response - TR advised it is Lambeth land. It’s for everyone to use – open to the public.  **TR needs to provide evidence of ownership of land.**

* Land is not good for growing on. It’s poisonous and that’s why the food is grown in bags. Suggested Loughborough Farm find somewhere else. EMB don’t want a farm, they want a gym. Land needs to be integrated back into Loughborough Estate. Depriving Loughborough Estate of other avenues for the land.

Response - Noted everyone can make an application to the fund and free to do so. A gym could be part of the bid.

* Super hub for the rich – motivation behind the project is to increase property prices of LJAG people who live south of Coldharbour Lane. Like another Pop Brixton.

Response - Not a motivation of the project. Not all trustees live south of Coldharbour Lane. Some have been effected by road closures. Motivation behind the bid is community driven. There is no guarantee this bid will succeed but if it does it will bring money into the area. Pop Brixton has alienated people. Don’t want this bid to be another Pop Brixton.

Cllr Heywood said there is a history of distrust. The proposal looks positive and could solve some local unemployment issues. Need to get more people from the estate using the farm. If PS from EMB not on board this would be a huge concern for her. Two weeks till the deadline to bid is not long. Needs to be some clarity over who owns it.

* No time for thorough consultation.

TD reaching out to as many people as possible in the short time available. Acknowledged consultation compromised by time restrictions. The project will be span two years and will require rigorous monitoring to ensure it achieves desired outcomes.

8. The road closures.

George Wright (GW) from Lambeth named the roads that have been closed. Level of non-compliance is very high. Additional carriageway markings will be made. CCTV camera will be installed. Warning notice will be sent initially (first 3.5 weeks), followed by a penalty notice. No exemptions will be made for residents. Only 2.5 weeks into the trial – early days. Trial will last 6 months from 29 August. Getting the message through is a real challenge. GW said the road closures could create a centre for Loughborough Junction without 13,000 car travelling through it. GW said 68% of 634 people surveyed wanted the road closure. GW said he has come to listen to people’s concerns.

Concerns expressed by attendees:

* Lack of consultation. Didn’t know road closures were happening;
* No consideration made for people who live on the estate. The closures directly affect their lives and how they travel to and from work and run errands;
* Longer routs are longer causing more pollution;
* Dangerous – saw someone get knocked over. LJAG and Lambeth responsible if there is a fatality. No previous accidents on the estate;

Chair reminded people to conduct themselves appropriately. GW said motorists have a duty of care. If there was a fatality GW would need all the details and to consult police as to whether road closures should stop. GW said there have been accidents on the estate and he has details of them.  **GW said he would share the data on the accidents on the estate.**

* No diversion signs. People don’t know where to go. Causing confusion;
* People don’t want the scheme – more people signed the petition against than for it; not listening to people makes them feel like they don’t count;
* Signage too high, too small or too late;
* Calais Street causing issues – full of parked cars, narrow to turn round and causing problems elsewhere;

Clare Neely thought it was quieter and some major benefit had been derived in the Calais Street area.

* Scheme supported by LJAG but they don’t live on the estate. Does not affect them. If the road closure was on the other side of Coldharbour Lane Lambeth would take more care;
* Need more updates from GW on what is happening with the scheme;

GW said he is taking feedback and will make changes if necessary to make the road closures work. However it is an experiment and measures are temporary.

Cllr Heywood said the road closure scheme is not well designed. Traffic is stuck at the top of Loughborough Road. If people are not compliant something is fundamentally wrong. Road closures were presented to her as something that had been decided. A real pity it’s not working as the ambition was to have a safer environment. Cllr Heywood then had to leave the meeting.

* Road closures not part of the masterplan consultation process. It is not discussed at meetings;
* Turning people against cycle use;
* Road closure scheme has not been implemented effectively;
* Need some flashing signs to warn people;
* Only a small number of people will be issued with a ticket compared with the number of people travelling through;
* **GW said a permanent camera will be installed.** At the moment there is only a temporary vehicle.
* Accessibility of emergency vehicles compromised;

GW said emergency services have been told about the road closures and if they need to access road they will need to pull out the road blocks.

* Barrington Road may be a better pedestrianised area;
* Should close Herne Hill Road, Hinton Road and/or Milkwood Road.

GW said these options may be considered as a next stage.

* Make another superhub where the wealthy meet;
* Cllr Jennifer Braithwaite and Stockwell Partnership who are monitoring the scheme should be at the next meeting.

**GW will invite them to the next meeting.**

* How do we feedback our concerns;

**JW to add George’s email address to the LJAG website.**

* Lambeth document detailing consultation process which will be followed clearly states 10,000 letters will be sent to the local area by the Stockwell Partnership. However, Stockwell Partnership when consulted said they won’t do anything until the end of the experimental period.

**GW to check this out. GW said Stockwell Partnership will consult through the experimental period not just at the end.** If people still feel strongly at the end of the 6 months experiment it will be stopped.

9. Any other business and appointment of chair for next meeting.

The next meeting has been scheduled for Thursday 15 October 2015 and Wednesday 18 November, the later to be held with the LJ Business Association to further discuss the future of the LJ railway arches