



Fox Lane and District Residents' Association London N13 & N14

Minutes Fox Lane Residents Association meeting on 4th May, 2021, commenced 6.33pm

Host: Phillip Sheffield (PS)

Minutes: Christian Ignatiou (CI)

Attendees: Liz Partridge (LP), Ron Tabor (RTG), John Macrory (JM), Peter Warford (PW), Sabrina O'Reilly (SO'R), Richard Thompson (RT) & Paul Dick (PD)

Start time: 6.33pm End Time 9.16pm

Format: Zoom Meeting

1. Apologies: The meeting was attended by all committee members: no apologies required and commenced at 6.33PM

2. Welcome from Chair PS:

"It's been an interesting journey. I've discovered a lot about the whole area with the fact that there are three conservation areas"

"The four wards are actually a really large area"

"There's a lot of things to deal with and a lot of issues".

"I will be humble and learn from my fellow committee members".

"I think there's enthusiasm for some other people possibly to come on-board"

Introduction covered:

- Belief in continuing with the best interests of the resident's association going forward.
- Encouraging a lack of rancour.
- Addressing a couple of quick things that people want to get off their chest

Thanked everyone for attending and moved directly on to the Treasurer's report.

3. Treasurer's report JM:

Stated a written version was shared earlier but reiterated in the meeting that the association was solvent with funds in excess of ~£4800, no anticipated bills or liabilities looming at present.

RT asked for a comparison to last year given the increase. JM responded by stating we have had no real spending vs last year – barring a charitable donation to the Northland hospitals. Balance at point JM took over treasurer duties was estimated to be ~£3000 (Increase reflects continued payment of FLDR membership fees with no material expenditure)

JM Closed and handed back to Chair for next agenda item

4. Secretary comments and minutes from the AGM

CI provided an outline of the amendment requests, as a result of having presented the committee draft minutes for their review.

- Ensuring Minute Takers details were included
- Provide narrative around proposed motions

- Update reference to speakers (split RT into RT Richard Thompson vs RTG Ron Tabor)

PD asked that all motions be listed, even if they weren't shown, particular the ones that were shown but not voted on.

Committee discussed appropriate level of inclusion given some motions were shown (inadvertently) despite being excluded.

CI asked for committee to provide list of motions that needed to be included and committed to resubmitting a new draft of the AGM minutes for further review and debate.

PS thanked CI and asked if there were any other outstanding AGM related issues.

5. Outstanding issues from AGM

PD stated he had one request of PD as he was not clear why PD "disappeared" during the AGM and subsequent voting process; the assumption was there was a technical issue (PD gave no response). PS requested PD complied with motion 1 to state his position on the LTN. PD stated "I am in favour of the LTN due to the safety of my children"

PD went on to state "I passed Sabrina this morning, which was nice. She acknowledged me this time." SO'R expressed confusion over PD statement and stated "I wouldn't ever pass anybody and not say hi" A short exchange occurred brought to conclusion by PS

PD expanded on his statement around his position on LTNs by stating he was really happy with the impact on his road something he appreciates whenever he gets into car as driving in Enfield is "a pain in the arse". Whilst he has friends who live on Bourne Hill and are against the LTN he completely understands their argument but believes this is a small step forward and needs to happen across the whole of London. PD suggested we need to change our thinking about how we get around and he made reference to how he cycles everywhere. Stated he appreciated not everyone is for the LTN and it effects people in different ways and he is not immune to that argument but stated he was only involved with the Committee because (in the opinion of PD) Paul Mandel was allowed to use email system to send out an anti-quieter neighbourhood's email to members. PD closed by saying "I wouldn't be here otherwise"

PS thanked PD for his clear explanation.

LP asked PD if he could remain neutral on this issue? PD replied of course but queried what "neutral" actually meant and a short debate on the subject followed.

PD explained a situation he encountered during his participation in LCC filming within the Fox Lane Ward and meeting Charles Keer.

PD described meeting an individual during the LCC filming event who he believed to be Charles Keer (despite the individual offering a different name when asked) and explained how he identified himself to Mr Keer and then challenged his statement that all of the FLDR committee were against the LTN stating "that wasn't necessarily the case" PD drew our attention to the fact he was with his children and the situation was making people within the LCC party nervous. He went on to describe the behaviour of RTG who he describes as filming the LCC party (which he suggested where subsequently shared on social media). PD went as far as categorising RTG's behaviour as intimidating, even making reference to and drawing parallels to "The Church of Scientology" during a BBC interview. PD stated he couldn't understand this type of behaviour from someone that was vice chair of the FLDR and neutral.

PS Thanked PD for raising the issue and asked RTG to respond to PD's representation.

RTG described walking down Fox Lane and being intrigued when he saw a film crew so stopped to briefly watch proceedings. He described having a conversation with a young LCC representative for which was grateful having been excluded by Adrian Day from the better streets network and debated views on their plan to expand across London. He was on route to film some of the traffic building up on the boundary roads and stated that he did take some footage of the event but vigorously denied his actions were malicious in intent and neither trolling nor intimidating in nature. RTG maintained such unfounded allegations were libellous. RTG offered to share the content he had with PD as proof and was adamant that he had not shared any video on social media.

A short interaction occurred between PD & RTG around the use of children to further political ambitions and the appropriateness to comment on other people's child-care values.

PS drew this to conclusion. He recognised that both parties felt strongly on this issue but reflected that there simply wasn't the strength of evidence for the committee to make any definitive ruling. PS reminded everyone that we need to respect each other but stated he did believe RTG innocently came across the scene.

RT made the observation that we had strayed into discussing motion 2 – code of conduct and reminded us that we should be mindful of our behaviour and not bring the committee into disrepute. He also drew the committee's attention to pay careful attention to how this is drawn up and to be mindful of not deferring power to the lead officer.

PS suggested that in order for the committee to move forward could RTG say a few closing words.

RTG reiterated his position defending his actions but nevertheless offered an apology, if PD had been offended by anything that he had done, in the hope of reconciliation

The peace offering was fruitless, as PD retained his position that RTG should consider his position as Vice Chair.

PS closed the topic.

6. Code of Conduct

PS suggested we need to work on developing a code of conduct and not "spring" a new code on the committee. The committee agreed we should establish a code of conduct. CI suggested that we don't need to agree the content but rather the principle at this point. The proposal was carried unanimously.

7. Roles in FLDRA that need to have a lead from a committee member

1. Membership: (CI and SO'R already volunteered) CI gave feedback about audit of data and will provide the committee a full report ASAP. Also stated that the previous membership sec had provide all hardcopy data and he was reviewing this. SO'R confirmed receipt of data and that they had established it made more sense for one person to take ownership. CI to take ownership which potentially frees SO'R for other activities.

Action: We need to update the postal address to CI

2. Planning: PS read communications from John Phillips (previous planning office) explaining how he did planning – SO'R volunteered to take on the role.

John Phillips expressed frustration at a lack of engagement by the previous committee, in particular around the 24hr gambling establishment being planned on Green Lanes. SO'R offered to reach out and engage with the previous planning officer.

3. Trees and Pavements - liaison with Enfield Council: PS explained he was meeting Andrew Robinson to discuss and asked if anyone felt strongly on the issue. RTG volunteered to take on the role.

4. Website: PS, SO'R & CI to take over maintenance of web site. PD offered assistance around training specifically sharing video he had recorded when he underwent training. CI expressed a keen interest to take this role on as he saw this as an opportunity to expand personal capability. CI question PD if we were ok to use videos given, they were from a paid for training session PD stated opinion was that this wasn't an issue stating the trainer said "it was ok to share". Committee agreed the Website was not a nice landing page and it wasn't very dynamic. View was that we needed to update the site and include more social media feeds. PS not able to change the look and we agreed we need to investigate options.

5. Mail chimp: PS, SO'R & CI to take over maintenance.

6. Schools: PS asked RT if he would like to remain in place. RT stated he was planning to resign from the committee tomorrow morning. He felt he had done his time and he was confident the current team were capable and he hope would remain committed to many things.

RT stated that there isn't anything to do about schools and that there wasn't any action required for the next 6 months but someone did need to pick this up and certainly understand the data. RT debated with committee the issue around historical use of private schooling, school catchment areas and the decreasing number of children in primary schools and in particular the falling number of children in London, making it perhaps more constructive to focus on secondary schools. RT suggested that ultimately, we need parents to bring their children to Broomfield, get involved and make it better and more popular. There was a lot of activity around the planned incinerator and the previous committee were very involved.

RT mentioned he had already shared much of the content around his work on the environmental issues and discussed how he was involved with the local council and green/environmental projects.

PS thanked RT for his expertise and the detailed information he provided. PS expressed regret that at times hard words had been exchanged but he understood his desire to move on and said his wealth of expert knowledge was hugely appreciated.

7. Possible officer in charge of relationship with local businesses: JM was interested in getting involved as he likes to support local businesses. PW suggest this was in the constitution so we need to do this. PS confirmed support of local businesses. RT informed the committee that the previous Chair talked to most of the food outlets making lists and contact details to encourage people to use them.

RT suggested we need to engage with the Palmers green action group in reference to the Southgate office village tower block. There is a role working with those organisations or at least being the contact person for that and keeping an eye on developments. LP mentioned

that the previous Chair was keen to get involved with organisations outside of the FLdra and volunteered to engage with these groups.

The committee discussed the impact of recent events on local business, their own shopping habits and the challenges some businesses were facing. JM & LP volunteered to take on the role of managing the relationship with local businesses.

PD didn't want any LTN related comments on the website, committee said they were not going to focus on the LTN but if views are expressed, we wouldn't filter but not solicit views.

A short debate followed as to where we felt local businesses were on the issue, a number of specific retailers were mentioned. PS closed the topic which had an amicable and humorous conclusion.

8. Lead with local care homes / the vulnerable in our area: SO'R volunteered to look into care homes PD mentioned the home in Groveland's having lots of issues with one of the residents, specifically indecent exposure in front of his children – PS mentioned drug dealing – PD reference a friend who is a policeman who highlighted issues with Broomfield Café - lots of unregistered cars and drug dealing. PD mentioned this was something the previous committee wasn't interested in pursuing. SO'R palmer's green station similar problem. SO'R and PD going to discuss issues outside of committee meeting.

9. Anything else: JM volunteer for events Christmas/Summer will speak to previous Chair. LP also going to help. PS mentioned we have lots of interesting people we could share with the association. Mentions the Grant family who are "amazing" musicians and how we can utilise social media to share and communicate with the membership.

8. Growing the membership

1. PS suggested free under 30 membership? – should it be one sub one vote PW suggested matching it up Duke of Edinburgh award to draw in a younger representation. PD asked if we can do this according to the constitution and we discussed when we could change the constitution and we would need an EGM. We established the committee can call for an EGM.

2. Use of technology to reach out. – PS suggested we should use SM to build our membership PD asked if we should review our boundaries – CI offered to provide anonymised distribution data. PD asked if people actually know we exist. JM says people are bit more engaged now. RT says it's a red herring we know our area. Attendance at meetings has gone up according to RT over the last few years there have been no empty chairs. PS mentions we are not very good at engaging with people further up north towards Southgate. The committee discussed the potential for changing the boundaries of the FLdra. PS "lets agree we just need to do better"

3. Engaging with the elderly and disabled – Not specifically debated by the committee

9. Report from Richard Thompson on primary schools and access to secondary education: - update already provided.

10. Newsletters: PD newsletter went out monthly RT - hard copy went out as some people need it. E news letter went to everyone as it isn't a communication with members so it goes to everyone. CI will pull together analysis of non-email membership. CI suggests this is an opportunity to reach out to membership to see if they still want a hard copy or if an online version would be a preference.

PD asked the mechanics of doing this, CI suggested the numbers were small enough to do this on a one by one basis.

PS will look to get a newsletter together CI to help with style, PS target 6 weeks. PD suggested addressing a broader area as the walk PS took was only a small bit of the FLDR.

11. Constitution: LP stated she was looking at drafting a new constitution and is looking at both the current and the proposed new constitution as a reference. RT queried why is LP doing this we don't have the right to arbitrarily make our own constitution and didn't think the new one was too controversial. RT stated we need to follow the motion to review. LP stated this was also her understanding and stated the plan was to review and come together with our notes.

12. Creating an Action List: PD suggested this is new territory CI asked if we could put deadlines against these actions. Many humorous comments made around misunderstanding the workings of the FLDR committee. Current Committee recognised and thanked the hard work of a number of the previous committee Richard, Lia & Julia.

13. Environmental issues: PS opened the topic by stating:

"We all want the world to be better. We want our environment to be better we want less pollution. We want a better world and it's how we can help in that journey, how we as an association can encourage this. It's just how we can help the society"

RT shared the 2030 Enfield target to be carbon neutral 2030. CI & RT agreed this was an excellent target and would mean Enfield were ahead of the country in regards to being carbon neutral. RT defined this as a "stretch target". PS shared that he chooses to cycle as much as he can and stated he wanted to be part of a solution that gets rid of the hard feeling in regards to environmental issues. *"We all want the same thing we're just not clear how to get there and it's causing a lot of heartache and bad feeling"*

PD asked could we help residents with school streets outside of the FLDR area? A debate followed one of the issues discussed was the introduction of cameras. RTG raised concerns around visibility and early warning of cameras.

RTG asked if we could look at the burning of wood to make charcoal for BBQ and gas central heating and wood burners. SO'R said legal position is only coal not wood PD said neighbour burns garden waste but you can't do anything about it. CI mentioned if it becomes a nuisance then it can be treated as antisocial behaviour.

PS suggested we could make a communication highlighting the effect on neighbours this may have.

PD suggested we could encourage the use of environmentally friendly fuel sources. CI asked if there was an opportunity for any group discounts to be negotiated.

PW suggested we should share the information with the membership and would be happy to join in. PW suggested we should put together a "sub-group" to look at this issue: PW & PD volunteered to take on this topic

14. Public Transport: Not discussed in any detail – Committee unclear how they could impact this

15. Quieter Neighbourhoods and LTNs: PS opened the topic with *"At the AGM we publicly stated that we will be maintaining a neutral position as an association. But I do believe that doesn't mean*

that if individuals have concerns they're completely within their rights to raise those concerns, but it does not represent the actual view of the FLDR. That is a clear position that we took at the AGM and we have to abide by that. I invite anyone to say anything on that, on this subject right now."

PS States like many people he was unaware of the LTN plans until they came into effect.

JM we will have a challenge when the experiment ends.

RT suggested many people "a very large majority" are enjoying the LTN and went on to explain how he saw the process unfolding in terms of the trial period and the consultation process.

The possibility of polling the membership on their opinion was raised RT stated consulting members on the views would be very difficult. PD not comfortable says "you want an affirmation of the numbers that came with you on the AGM" and thinks it's a waste of money – doesn't think the council would listen. PD expressed the opinion to the Chair that "I don't think your appointment will have neutrality. I'm sure there'll be an EGM that will come up soon, and the neutrality will be another motion to say that we will get rid of neutrality." PD suggested that certain members of the committee were more affected by the LTN than others pointing out CI & SO'R. CI responded by reiterating that whilst anti LTN he is neutral about how the committee stand on this issue and neutral in regards to a poll. CI highlights the need to remain "nice" in our interactions. PD responded by suggestion the previous planning officer had made representations to the committee on CI & SO'Rs behalf around how much the LTN had negatively impacted them. Both CI & SO'R challenged this statement and SO'R questioned its validity and source.

We debated how to remain neutral. CI mentioned we can't be of use or act as stakeholder if we don't know the views of the membership. PS suggested it wasn't worth reaching out to 3500 houses. RT said that Ian Barnes was not interested in numbers but what people say. CI asked RT if the council questionnaire was in his opinion well-constructed. RT referred to previous questionnaires and reflected they were to his mind "beautifully done", but did highlight that there was a lot of "free text" to be collated which would be a challenge for the council.

PD requests people remain calm and refrain from any sort of vandalism and points to people keeping a level head and not attacking posts, bollards or putting fish wire across the road to knock people off their bikes. JM "I don't know who would be doing that?" PS responds by stating PD is the only person he's heard mention that and that he absolutely has no idea what PD is talking about, "literally no idea". CI states 100% none of that should happen on any topic in any direction. PD made reference to builder in Winchmore Hill who was prosecuted for fly-tipping; "there's definitely things happening!" JM made the comment you can't stop people behaving as they will but certainly very much like the vandalism that happened in Manchester city on Sunday I have no time for those that vandalise. It's nothing to do with the club. PS Stated he understands that PD wants to have this minuted

PS wanted to proceed with a way to extract the feelings of the membership re the LTN

CI reflected that we can't spin or filter data otherwise we lose impartiality.

PD asked if we are voting on a poll

PS suggests we need to find a way to reach out to membership to get opinions on their feelings.

PD suggest only anti LTN people want a survey.

JM suggested we should reach out to all households not just members

PD asked why not do a survey on all issues

PS wants to give a snapshot to the council

RT thinks One Community is not giving facts

PD & RT suggests one millionaire/billionaire campaigner is giving thousands to the One Community group. PD presses RTG asserting he is on the One Community Committee. RTG states he has no knowledge of any donations and says he is not on the One Community Committee. PS "It's important PD and RT you know, you really do have to believe that we're not in the pockets of some billionaires. We're members of the local resident's association and we want the best for the association and that is just the truth"

PW suggested it should be more structured not to vote on something non-specific.

PS suggested a vote on a process of information gathering on quieter neighbourhoods and the LTN. The exact form to be agreed.

RT said we can't ask the members because that would make us no longer neutral

PD says the same

JM says it only binds the committee

RTG asks "what is the problem? Do you want the LTN as it is? Do you not want the LTN at all? Remove? Keep? What's so difficult about that?"

SO'R "So the question I asked was can we ask the members a direct question and merely pass that information on. That's not us putting our spin on anything that is just passing the information that we've collated"

PD wants to remain neutral and suggest this wouldn't make us neutral

Animated discussion followed a vote was taken to develop a way to gather member's view.

PD asked for the motion on neutrality to be shared

RT & PS agreed it's not about numbers (according to the council) just about what people say. Mentioned the previous poll where 74% people voted against the proposal but was still implemented.

Point of how we communicate in general was briefly discussed by the Committee.

PS "I think what you're finding is there's a huge diversity of opinion and I think that's just the truth. Some people are very radical absolutely passionately anti. And then there are other people who are sane and sensible in the middle who vaguely against it/for and there are people who are passionate supporters and their entire life is devoted to better streets and those types of things. People have very varying opinions and I think it's wrong to categorise all of us in the same way."

JM asked PD to what extent he had engaged with his opponents on the topic of LTNs. PD reiterated that he had friends who lived on Bourne Hill and had listened to their discussions and knows their arguments. Stating they are worried about pollution and their children. JM asks why PD is not persuaded by those arguments. PS "because of the way that my life has changed and made my children's life change. We do not get any rat-runners. I do not get any boy racers doing 60 miles an hour down my road" PD adds that he preferred the first scheme as it would have been quieter and

safer. A debate follows regarding the placement of the buss gate and the volume of traffic that would have passed down Fox Lane on the original proposal between CI & PD.

JM asked CI to minute that the conversation continued (in a robust fashion) about LTNs and why committee members feel the way they do. Needed to be closed for the sake of completing the meeting.

PS closes by saying whilst it's not decided it's a fair reflection of the meeting that the majority would like to look at conducting some sort of information/opinion gathering

16. Local businesses: JM & LP volunteered earlier in the meeting to look at this topic

17. Crime and Police: RT said there were regular updates from police and important for committee to be in the loop. RT says he will send something in the next few days. His opinion is that it's about calming people's fears, because people get very overexcited about crime. This is in fact an extremely, extremely safe place to live. And it is worth repeating that. If you have a catalytic converter, you may not think that!

18. Planning: SO'R volunteered earlier in the meeting to look at this topic

19. Possible name change of FLDR: Decided to move over this issue

20. Use of surveys to engage with membership: Merkur Slots

PD was against a poll and suggested we act immediate rather than issuing a poll to the membership and send a communication to membership because time is of the essence and we should vote – we agreed to move forward 100% in favour of raising an objection. PS keen on the idea of surveys and including the membership in the decision-making process. Will look for alternative opportunity to test simple polls to engage membership.

21. Social events: Committee discussed options around liaising with Burford Hall, Southgate Methodist Church & Christ Church as alternative venues. PD raised the issue about insurance – need to investigate the issue around multiple locations. JM to investigate further. Agreed the next social event will need to be after restrictions are raised.

22. Date of next meeting: TBD

23. AOB: Nothing further discussed meeting closed at 9:16PM