

**MINUTES OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING FORUM MEETING  
ON TUESDAY 9 APRIL 2013**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
1. Introductions	<p>Present: Roberta Blackman-Woods MP (RBW), Nick Rippin (NR), Alan Hayton (AH), Ruth Chambers (RC), Teresa Hogg (TH), Frank Newton (FN), Malcolm Smith (MS), Ian Forrester (IF), Chris Allen (CA), Jonathan Elmer (JE), Ann Evans (AE), Gordon Cessford (GC), Roger Cornwell (RC) Goshke Bialek (GB)</p>
2. Area of NPF	<p>Discussions took place around the area the future Neighbourhood Planning Forum should cover. Issue of whether this area should include some of Gilesgate and the Sands area of the City Centre was raised. RBW was torn as this is a large area for one group to cover, but if it isn't included, then this area might be missed out entirely. Should it include Merryoaks area? Should the area include down to the Stonebridge roundabout, and the boundary of Langley Moor Parish Ward? RBW also raised issue that there may be a local authority boundary change in Gilesgate.</p> <p>AH raised issue that this was too large an area, but he didn't see any choice other than to include it.</p> <p>AE suggested that the residents of Merryoaks may also feel left out if the group didn't include this area.</p> <p>JE suggested that for clarity, we could include all the areas in the City that were not parished. This was agreed.</p> <p>RBW said not Newton Hall, as there is a natural border to the north of the city.</p> <p>RC suggested that he may have a map that could be used to define the area of the NPF.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS: RBW to contact electoral commission to see what their intentions are with potential boundary changes. : RC to forward maps to NR</b></p>
3. Membership	<p>RBW stated that there are 28 people who are interested in the forum, and we need over 21 for the forum to function. This 28 does not cover Gilesgate however, and this will be flagged up with Gilesgate residents to try and get them involved.</p> <p>RBW suggested that it is the right of the forum to exclude people from membership, although this has to be done on correct grounds. Discussions need to take place about potentially including clauses in the constitution document that would outline the reasons for exclusion.</p>

	<p><b>ACTION: NR to e-mail interested parties to confirm their involvement with the forum.</b></p>
<p>4. Constitution</p>	<p>Discussions were had around the cost of developing plans. RBW stated that this was very much the next stage of the process, and it was important to get the group and running.</p> <p>Discussions were had around the forum, and JE raised the issue that the steering group and the forum sounded like 2 separate bodies in the constitution document. RBW pointed out that the attendees of this meeting were the steering group, and they would become the forum. It was agreed to write the constitution in a way that makes this clear.</p> <p>FN pointed out that there was no declaration of interest clause in the constitution, and that this should be included.</p> <p>Constitution should include something about how the group will work – statement on engagement and best practice.</p> <p>It was agreed that section 8 in the constitution needed considerable work, particularly around points 8.2 and 8.3.</p> <p>RBW asked the group if they wanted an executive committee, or whether they simply wanted to elect officers to drive the forum forward, and keep meetings open to all members. It was suggested a 5<sup>th</sup> officer be added – and Engagement Officer to liaise with residents and businesses. All present agreed that no executive committee would be the best format.</p> <p>Discussions were held around elections of officers. Deadlines for nominations would be set for people to express an interest, and voting would take place via a secret ballot. Background information would be needed on the candidates, and the deadlines would set so people cannot nominate on the night of the election.</p> <p>RBW said there was nothing in the constitution about how the forum would work. It includes a clause about working with the Local Planning Authority, but should include something about working with the local community.</p> <p>Discussions were had around the confidentiality clause, as it was felt that the forum should operate as transparently as possible. RBW clarified that this was particularly pertinent for personal information and commercial confidentiality matters.</p> <p><b>ACTION: RBW to work on constitution and forward to members of the group by 25<sup>th</sup> April.</b></p>
<p>5. Next Meeting</p>	<p>RBW suggested council officers should be invited to the next meeting, and she would write to clarify and formalise the support on offer. Council officers should be invited to the next meeting to speak about the resources on offer to the group, but they should be invited to attend after the forum has carried out its business.</p> <p>TH asked if subsequent meetings could be arranged later in the</p>

	<p>day to allow for other commitments. RBW pointed out that this would be fine, although some for the work involved in the forum would need to be carried out during the day.</p> <p><b>Meeting date was arranged for 23 May at 6pm at The Miners' Hall, Redhills.</b></p>
<p>Deadlines:</p>	<p><b>Constitution documents amended and circulated by 25 April</b>  <b>Comments on amended constitution needed by 8 May</b>  <b>Finalised constitution and requests for nominations for officer posts by 11 May</b>  <b>Closing date for nominations by 16 May</b></p> <p>Please note that, as per the above minutes, should you wish to stand for any of the positions that were discussed, as well as confirmation of your intention to stand, you will need to provide some background information on yourself. The positions were:</p> <p>Chair  Vice-Chair  Secretary  Treasurer  Engagement Officer</p>