**Meeting of SHRA, 20th March 2012. Time: 7 p.m., 95 Highlever Road**

In attendance:

Ben Joseph, Joe T Brown, Nigel Whitbread, Ruth Hilary, Jenny Harborne, Margaret Tyler, David Marshall, Lucy Gaiger, William Cooper, Henry Peterson

Apologies:

Tania, Clare

**Items discussed**

**1 Helical Bar (HB)**

Henry: Raised issue of SHRA review of details of the scheme

Ruth: Confirmed that building heights are not made clear on literature provided so far, and that there seems limited information on “affordable housing”.

It was agreed that Maggie would attend the consultative meeting on 23rd, Joe on 24th and Lucy on 25th March. Objective of meeting is to let HB know we require honesty and transparency when it comes to information provided. In addition, email to be sent to SHRA members, highlighting this is at scoping stage, and an email to be sent to HB stressing we are unhappy with consultation so far, ie random letter drops.

**2 White City Forum (WCF)**

Henry: been in contact with WCF, and they note and appreciate typical behaviour of Imperial, Councils etc, ie they are experienced in this regard. Main concerns of WCF are affordable housing and amenities eg GP surgery, less so building heights and density. WCF will send letter raising these concerns

Ruth was keen to ensure we keep dialogue open with WCF, and William will facilitate meetings with them

In answer to question why OAPF delayed, it was suggested it was due to negotiations re Infrastructure Levy.

**3 Imperial, Correspondence and Media**

Henry: strongly worded draft letter to be sent to Imperial Trustees and Chair. Still awaiting reply from 3 letters to H&F on negotiations and design review. Response is due this week.

William: suggested use of F.O.I. requests where possible to solicit replies

Henry: commented on media coverage won so far eg Mount Grange pamphlet, Fulham Chronicle, ES mag (due in future).

Henry: re CABE, will get response and circulate

Nigel: highlighted a dry humour piece in diary column of Architect magazine, that would make for uncomfortable reading for developers / architects

Maggie: Highlighted press coverage of general Invasion of the Tall Towers – style – piece in Friday Independent

Ruth: stressed need to respond to GLA comments, and to respond to Ed Lister and Colin at GLA in particular, questioning the approval process so far.

Nigel: with regard to above, SHRA letter must raise and stress issue that the project is not being looked at and reviewed as a whole, but instead piece meal so far, which fails to properly appreciate the issues that the project as a whole will raise, ie traffic, congestion, density etc

**Supplementary point– WDT**

Ruth and Henry: explained that WDT are working with Imperial and support an underpass in particular to help “expand the catchment area” of the sports facilities, in particular to benefit from what they see as new large student population. We need to inform WDT of Imperial misrepresentations re the new population, and suggestion is to point WDT in direction of Shepherds Bush blog. Suggestion also made that we inform WCF that WDT and Imperial will draw leisure facilities away from White City. (But the point is also made, that this may be of less concern to White City residents, than new access to shiny sports facilities).

**Supplementary point – April 3rd RBKC meeting**

Henry: Response to be made at RBKC planning applications committee, which is open to public attendance. Suggest SHRA members attend. Not clear if questions can be asked, but presence will be useful.

**Supplementary point – Political involvement**

Henry: Todd Foreman to adopt the development as a campaign issue, with Andy Slaughter and poss Ken Livingstone at an event.

Ruth: We should pressure Conservatives too, at K&C, Kit Malthouse and work with the Kensington Society. Ruth to follow up via Ken Soc.

Maggie/Jenny: suggests revisiting issue of failure to provide affordable housing which was included in original IC minutes discussing the proposal in 2009

**4 Direct Action**

Jenny: advocates floating balloons (attached to string to improve safety) above the site, to demonstrate height of building. In response to concerns that balloons will be too smalll, confirms that they would be floated as a bunch. Various concerns were raised re safety of balloons drifting across Westway, and Jenny is to look into this issue further.

William: suggests taking the action to Imperial, for example raising the balloons above their site.

Ruth: suggests corresponding with Imperial’s partners, for example asking them to sign a pledge that commits to behaviour that won’t affect our community.

Ben: remains concerned that our campaign risks being seen as “posh” North Ken residents, protecting what is already a relatively privileged community, from eye sores and shadows – when we may have more success embarrassing Imperial and their partners, by highlighting their unscrupulous behaviour during the application process, as well as their “commercial greed” in an era of cut backs and ever higher student fees.

Banner will cost £145 for 8 by 1 metre, but still not clear where it can be hung. William has been trying to get flats on Wood lane on board.

Give a photo montage to Latymer school, so they can be encouraged to get on board. Joe T-B to seek permission to a photo to be taken from Latymer playing fields

**4 RTL**

Jenny: BRE planning leg determines that anyone with less than 2hr of light has the right to object materially to actual development. The “right of light” leg relates to people who have had light for > 20 years and now will have this impinged. In response they can be compensated, or request plans are changed. Two houses at the southern end of Latimer road are worst affected. Shirley is sending out various letters to relevant authorities, and so the process of objections has begun.

Ruth: suggest we tell TMO to protect their tenants. Henry to follow up earlier emails.

**5 Legal Challenge**

Henry: pro bono legal application has been made to Bar Pro Bono Unit for 3 days’ worth of advice. David also made approach to Richard Buxton solicitors. H&F and Buxton have history, whereby Buxton almost succeeded in challenging Westfield 1 on environmental grounds. His appointment would therefore concern the developers. His main argument would be on environmental grounds, especially the use of multiple EIAs as opposed to one for the entire OAPF project. Noted that Kensington Society want to use him too, and as such we are wary that he does not feel overburdened, and tact is required as we sort out lines of communication..

Henry to look into costs associated and the definition of “protected costs basis”.

It is generally recognised that delays are very useful, this will be explained to the association, and any further actions that can legally cement delays should be taken

**6 Neighbourhood plan and Forum**

Henry: localism act comes into force in April, and ability for neighbourhoods to put together a plan regarding favoured developments in neighbourhood.

Decision is taken to cross various boundaries, and initial neighbourhood area is proposed as extending from Wood Lane to the West to St Marks Road to the East, the Westway to the South (excluding WDT area) and Dalgarno Gardens to the North.

Ruth to clarify if St Quintins Residents Assoc is in our area, and if so whether they are happy to be included in Neighbourhood Forum

**AOB**

Lucy to correspond with Judith Blakeman re St Helens festival, Diamond Jubilee, The Big Lunch

Ruth: 2 more Advertising Towers planned. One on top of Monsooon CA1200634, One by S Bush Roundabout 00397/ADV2012. All to write objections

Jenny: we should consider use of solar panel legislation and new Green Deal as part of defence against tall towers blocking sunlight.