

Minutes

Harehills Forum meeting

Infinity Centre, 14th November 2022

Present

Adam Aslam
Scott Bell
Tanis Belsham-Wray
Karen Harris
Joanne Harrison
Susan Johnson
Terry Jones
Anna Lysakowska
Ian Mackay
Chijioke Ojukwu
Marie Park
Suvi Saraf
Imran Shah
Natalie Tharralaos

Apologies

Vicky MacKay
Terry Wragg

Comment	Action
KH said the community has been let down in the past.	
AL queried the constitution content generally and noted it would be helpful to have a deadline for it to be finalised. IM confirmed to aim for 25 th November.	
IM noted there are two types of people – those who are connected to the community and those who are disconnected. The engagement strategy needs to consider both types, and targets should be set. He gave an example of evidencing findings – if health is raised as an issue, evidence is needed to back up what people think and feel.	
IS suggested doing a 'brutal audit' of the community to get them engaged, and that the group needs to stick to the engagement timeline (as yet to be agreed).	
MP queried who will be carrying out the engagement, and noted that there are likely to be gaps in reach. JH said this will be done by the forum members, supported by the NP team. The group agreed that full coverage is difficult.	
SB suggested the phrase <i>Engagement Involvement Plan</i> to stress the co-production aspect.	
NT asked if the council has legal responsibility to consult the forum on planning matters during the next year. Post-meeting note: The council will consult on the designation of the forum and its boundary, but there is no facility in the planning system for the forum's findings etc to be incorporated into decision-making until a neighbourhood plan has been 'made.' Once a neighbourhood plan is 'made' which involves further public consultation and agreement via referendum, the plan will become a statutory document and the council must consider it when making planning decisions.	
IM recommended that the group agrees the important things as it won't be possible to consult on everything.	
CO said the council has the power and queried how it is accountable to the people.	
AL suggested the group needs to think long term (5 years plus) to make sure the decisions we make now will have relevance.	

<p>TJ queried whether the constitution is fixed once the application is submitted. JH explained that it is not – it can evolve.</p>	
<p>AL and MP agreed that the Mabgate constitution is a good example, and suggested the Harehills constitution is based on it. NT requested that the roles and removed from the appendix. IM agreed and KH offered to lead on this.</p>	KH
<p>NT and AL interpreted the community engagement role as being JH’s paid position and expressed concern at the apparent control. JH explained that the role was added by a forum member and that none of the positions have been elected. She will not be filling that role (if the group agrees to elect a member in that role). At present, the responsibilities of each role have not been agreed.</p>	
<p>JH explained how the current designation application date has been worked out. Based on achieving designation as soon as possible, she worked back 6 weeks from the end of the year, which is the statutory consultation period. This is next week, hence trying prepare the application for submission then. In reality, since the 6 weeks will run over the Christmas period, it is likely to be extended for another 2 weeks.</p>	
<p>Katie Greaves has started to produce an outline for the vision statement. KH agreed to work on this and distribute to the group for their further input and comment.</p>	KH
<p>IS queried whether it is possible to talk to other Neighbourhood Forum groups. IM advised it will be difficult in the timescale we’re working to.</p>	
<p>CO noted that there are lots of languages spoken in Harehills and the consultation opportunity needs to be available to those who don’t have English as a first language. He said the local authority needs to be accountable and asked for written confirmation that it will promise to listen to and implement the Forum’s findings and requests for support / change etc. JH explained that once a neighbourhood plan has been ‘made’ and adopted into policy, it must be considered by the local authority planning department when determining applications / making decisions – this is the group’s power.</p>	
<p>IM suggested the group consider ‘What does success look like?’ This will be discussed in 2023 when the proper engagement starts.</p>	
<p>KH gave an overview of the themes she has identified in her initial engagement work with local groups.</p>	
<p>Several members of the group were unhappy with the boundary proposed by the smaller group who had worked on it. Specifically, there was concern that some parts of Harehills had been incorporated into the Chapelton and Mabgate neighbourhood</p>	JH

<p>plan boundaries. AA and CO queried whether this could be challenged. JH thought not but agreed to find out.</p>	
<p>MP asked in the small area including Gipton allotments could be included as her home is currently outside the proposed boundary. JH said this should be possible, subject to agreement with the wider group.</p>	JH
<p>AL requested that Wykebeck School is included and AA asked that a large area to the east of the proposed boundary, stretching to Oakwood Lane / Amberton Approach / Amberton Road / Lawrence Road is included. He said that many of the residents in these areas use the facilities in Harehills (including those in the Harehills part of the Chapelton neighbourhood plan area). JH agreed to consult on these requests but reiterated that living outside of the neighbourhood area does not mean people cannot contribute to it. She asked attendees to co-ordinate a preferred boundary and send to her.</p>	All