

## SUMMARY OF THE CONSULTATION AND COMMENTARY REGARDING SUGGESTIONS/ COMMENTS MADE.

There were 123 responses. Five were from statutory bodies providing factual information only. The remaining 118 provided an opinion with a duplicate response from Harrow School representatives.

Of the 117 opinions a total of 107 (**91.5%**) were supportive of both the concept of a Neighbourhood Forum (Forum) and the proposed Neighbourhood Area. Five of those requested a minor change to the proposed Neighbourhood Area (asking if a few more houses could be included). Two were generally supported though with reservation.

Only six of 117 responses rejected the proposed Neighbourhood Area, which is **95% support**. This indicates that the coherence and inherent logic of the Area as proposed is sound and resonates with the vast majority of the community. This strength of support is not surprising as the proposed Neighbourhood Area correlates closely with the Area of Special Character outlined in every Local Plan since 1986 (Borough Local Plan 1986, the Unitary Development Plans of 1994 and 2004, and the current Core Strategy 2012 section 6.4) as well as the Local Authority's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the 8 Harrow on the Hill Conservation Areas from 2008.

The definition set out in the Local Plan is “ ***having regard to the architectural and historic character of the area and the open land which provides setting and views of the hilltop settlement, inclusions of all of the Hill's conservation areas and significant open spaces around the Hill***”.

The Core Strategy of February 2012 states that the characteristics of Harrow Hill which make it a special area in terms of its historical and environmental significance to the Borough, remain valid and equally important today. The legal requirement for concordance between Local and Neighbourhood Plans can only be better served by as close a concordance in Area as possible.

These results show there is overwhelming support in the community for both the formation of a Neighbourhood Forum to exercise the rights conferred by the legislation; and for the Neighbourhood Area as proposed.

<p><b>Individual comments 1-4</b> Supportive of the Plan but would like the northern side of Roxborough Avenue included.</p>	<p>These residences were not included because they are outside the Area of Special Character and Conservation Area. General support noted. When assessing the Conservation Area a boundary change could be discussed with the Roxborough Residents Association and the Council to see if this request can be accommodated.</p>
<p><b>Individual Comment 5</b> Supportive of the Plans but would like slight extension down South Hill Avenue to Brooke Avenue.</p>	<p>As above, not included because currently not in the Area of Special Character or Conservation Area. General support noted. When assessing the Conservation Area a boundary change could be discussed with the Council.</p>
<p><b>Statutory Responses 1-5</b> National Grid</p>	<p>No assets in the Area, noted</p>
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Opportunity for environmental improvement is indeed welcome for the Area and agreed</p>
<p>Highways England</p>	<p>No impact noted</p>
<p>Historic England</p>	<p>We agree the 2012 Act enables neighbourhoods to be more proactive in the management. We agree that the integrity of Conservation Area boundaries is important and 7 of them are fully included and the one exception discussed with Harrow Planners is to exclude a very small area of one Conservation Area which lies within the Intensification Area where policies need GLA involvement. Offer of help welcomed.</p>

TFL	Comments noted and they understand the Area of Special Character is separate from the Intensification Area. Access to and from the Harrow town centre trains and bus station is key to the inclusion of the Grove and Church Fields open spaces used by the public.
<p><b>3 Individual Responses objecting to inclusion of their names and to the application process</b></p> <p>Daniel Beckley, Harrow School</p> <p>Had I been informed that an application was being made in that form, I would have consulted the School and taken advice. I would certainly not have agreed to my name being on the list of Forum members impliedly in support of the application in its current form.</p> <p>..there has never been any formal discussion or agreement of who would be chairman, who might be officers...</p> <p>There is no way in which I or the School can support the constitution as drafted, nor can I or the School agree to the area proposed to be included in the application.</p> <p>I ask that my name be forthwith taken off the list of current and potential future Forum members. I also ask that this s made clear by you to all those who are being consulted on the current application.</p>	<p>Mr Beckley’s name and reference to Harrow School have been removed by way of the addendum provided to the Planning Committee.</p> <p>The process was not perfect, it being new to both us as applicants and to Harrow Council. Indeed it was a surprise that Harrow Planners unilaterally published all names without warning despite the document stating that this would not happen and explaining that Forum Membership was constantly evolving with increasing numbers and wider scope of representation. Not everyone had seen the application in its final form (with additions about the research undertaken and communication reach requested by the Council).</p> <p>Mr Beckley had confirmed in writing that he was happy with the Area. That Area had not changed for one and a half years and was published on the website, at all roadshows continuing to reach new groups, and all updates. Mr Beckley was invited to but did not attend an update meeting on 22/11/16.</p> <p>Mr Beckley had also confirmed in writing his willingness to be on the Forum. He was sent a copy of the proposed constitution for comment and he did not submit any comments.</p> <p>No officers for the Forum, including a Chairman, have been appointed. They cannot be appointed until a Forum exists. The current applications are submitted to the council by a ‘steering’ or working party purely for the purpose of bringing a Forum into existence. However a name is required by the legislation. Other applications have used a designate title for the purpose and this precedent was merely adopted by way of expedient for the process, given the agreement to be nominated and sufficient support to second such nomination.</p> <p>Once the Forum is formed membership is open to all individuals who either live or work in the area. Any member will be able to put him/herself forward for any position he/she wishes.</p> <p>Harrow School individuals as residents and/or employees have been invited to membership of the Neighbourhood Forum from a very early stage. Harrow School as a organisation is invited as as a non-voting associate, continues to be invited and is very welcome. However not only common sense but the terms of the legislation dictate that participation cannot be forced on any individual or entity. What is clear is that Harrow School has been informed and membership has been offered. Further, any Neighbourhood Plan ultimately drafted will be consistent with the Local Plan and existing SPDs, including the SPD for Harrow School. The School’s corporate membership of other community</p>

	<p>bodies such as the Harrow Hill Trust (HHT) and Harrow Hill Forum (HHF) create alternative, albeit less direct, channels for information feedback on relevant issues overlapping with those that would be addressed in any Neighbourhood Plan. It is for Harrow School to decide whether, in the context of a functioning Neighbourhood Forum supported by the rest of the community, that existing level of community engagement is adequate for its purposes.</p>
<p>Michael Gibson , Bursar, John Lyon School (JLS)</p> <p>I also was not aware that the documentation previously circulated by you by email was being taken forward into a formal application. Had I known this, I would have taken advice and consulted School Governors prior to my name being submitted to the Council on the application as it is currently laid out.</p> <p>.. I have not been afforded the opportunity to comment on the proposed area defined by the plan...</p> <p>... I regret to say that the School cannot support it in its present form. I therefore request that my name be removed from the list of current members in the application. I would also ask that you make it clear to the Council, and other members listed in the application, that (that) the School are not in support of the HHNF in its current form and constitution drafting.</p>	<p>As requested Mr Gibson' s name has been removed from the Forum by the addendum submitted to the Local Authority Planning Committee. Other comments about procedure are as for Mr Beckley above.</p> <p>Mr Gibson had confirmed in writing that he was happy both with the Area and to be on the Forum. The Area has not changed in one and a half years. Mr Gibson made no comments on the constitution provided to him and was invited to but did not attend the update meeting on 22/11/16.</p> <p>As required by the legislation, the opportunity for Forum membership has been offered to any eligible individual living or working in the community and continues to be open to John Lyon School employees to be taken up at any time.</p> <p>For practical purposes there will inevitably be many people in the Area wishing to provide input and receive feedback from the Forum without taking up Forum membership. Although the Forum allows voting by individuals only, once constituted it would inform JLS and other interested organisations on a continuing basis and take any comments into consideration. As education, in the widest sense, is the second largest industry on the Hill, the steering group has ensured that that industry is currently represented by individuals on the Forum and St Anselm's School as an associate member.</p> <p>Although the objection is stated to be to the Forum in its "current form and constitution drafting", no specifics are provided about what is objectionable. The question is therefore whether this is indeed a specific objection or a general objection to the existence of any Neighbourhood Forum in the Area in which JLS is located. If so, these are in reality objections to the legislation itself and, as such, a matter properly to be explored with the local MP. The legislation has been passed, it has created legal rights for collaborative community participation in local development. Those who disapprove of those rights can choose not to participate in the process but do not have the power to deprive others in the community of the legitimate exercise of rights towards the proper ends contemplated by the legislation. In the event of a boycott the legislation does not give a power of veto to any community entity that is a manifest subversion of the legislative purpose.</p>
<p>Mr Ted Allett, Resident</p>	

<p>In September, you submitted applications to designate a Harrow Hill Neighbourhood Area and Forum with yourself as Chairman-Designate, without having convened a meeting of the proposed Forum or having notified volunteer members of the said Forum, of either your intention to do so or that you had done so.</p> <p>I do not wish to be a member of a Forum run on such lines, so please accept this letter as my resignation from any resulting Neighbourhood Forum.</p>	<p>The objection expressed is not with respect to either the concept of a Neighbourhood Forum or the proposed Neighbourhood Area but to the perceived process.</p> <p>As noted above, no officers for the Forum, including a Chairman, have been appointed and cannot be appointed until a Forum exists. The current applications are submitted to the council by a 'steering' or working party purely for the purpose of bringing a Forum into existence. However a name is required by the legislation. Other applications have used a designate title for the purpose and this precedent was merely adopted by way of expedient for the process, given the agreement to be nominated and sufficient support to second such nomination.</p> <p>As requested Mr Allett's name has been removed by the addendum submitted to the Planning Committee. The addendum also lists the names of 5 new members who joined before Mr Allett's resignation.</p> <p>Mr Allett has been offered Forum membership and that offer, as for all in the Neighbourhood Area, remains open. Regardless of Forum membership there will be continuing information by way of general communication, the Forum website <a href="http://www.harrowhillneighbourhoodplan.org">www.harrowhillneighbourhoodplan.org</a> and other community entities such as HHT. And any and all comments will be considered. Forum members will run and record focus groups with those residing or working in the Neighbourhood Area.</p>
<p><b>7 responses (5 individuals and 2 community groups) objecting/provisionally objecting to the Neighbourhood Forum</b></p> <p>1 Individual</p> <p>This sounds divisive to me. Creates a sense of Harrow Hill being separate from the rest of Harrow. After their failed plan to make areas into car parks instead of amenities for all I feel there is an attempt to be exclusive.</p> <p>2 Individual</p> <p>I do not believe that this self-appointed group represents the views or interests of the local community. Furthermore there is a huge democratic deficit in that there is no way that this self-elected group can stand for election or re-election.</p> <p>3 Individual</p> <p>I am opposed to the application for a Harrow Hill Neighbourhood Area and Forum. I do not agree with the purpose of the Forum which I believe to have been proposed by people with their own agenda. There are already means for consultation on planning matters.</p> <p>4 Individual</p>	<p>In response to comments by Individuals 1, 2, 3 and 4:</p> <p>Objections expressing apprehensions of power-grasping by Forum members and/or distrust of existing Local Authority processes reflect a misunderstanding of the consultative, collaborative and democratic process of Neighbourhood Forum functioning and its built-in protections.</p> <p>The importance of a Neighbourhood Forum is solely in relation to the formulation and prosecution of a Neighbourhood Plan. The main task of Forum members is to be organisers and proactive communicators, obtaining and collating community feedback. Comprehensive views are yet to be gathered from the community and a huge opportunity is available to do this.</p> <p>The proposal for a Neighbourhood Plan is subject to independent Inspector review and, if passed, then to the most democratic of processes – a referendum in the Neighbourhood Area. The prosecution of the Plan's objectives is only by the most collaborative and democratic of processes in that they must be consistent with the Local Plan and specific development proposals must again be supported by local referenda.</p> <p>Currently Harrow Planning decisions can be made by as few as 3 persons (where the Chair exercises a casting vote), and the opportunity for community input is limited and reactive. The Localism Act 2011 was enacted specifically to enable local people to engage more formally and proactively in community matters of interest or concern to them. The vision articulated in</p>

<p>This team certainly do not speak for me and I very much reject the idea of this group being allowed to proceed. If the community has that little faith in the Council on making decent planning decisions they should at the very least give residents the same playing field on if they want to be part of neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>Local Plans and SPDs are often what the community wants to achieve – the disconnect is between what is articulated and what is actually happening. Practice can fall far short of policy including for reasons of Local Authority financial constraints. It is to enable the local community to actively collaborate with councils in the fuller achievement of shared policy goals that the legislation exists.</p> <p>The Hill's Area of Special Character has been consistently agreed by every single Local Plan since 1986. Documentation for the Conservation Area has not been addressed since 2008. There is an opportunity for individuals living or working in the area to have a say on the implementation of the new London Plan for the Area where they spend time either living or working.</p>
<p>5 Harrow Hill Forum (HHF)</p> <p>This Forum supports the concept of a Neighbourhood Forum being established (broadly covering the Area of Special Character) .....</p> <p>This Forum offered that were a Neighbourhood Forum to be set up, it would be prepared to 'migrate' into it i.e. its members would all agree to become members of the new Forum ..... Sadly this was not taken up.</p> <p>Volunteers were consulted on a draft Constitution in Autumn 2016, but the five volunteers attending the recent meeting of This Forum were unaware of any other consultation on or notification of the application.</p> <p>The Chair of This Forum had volunteered in a personal capacity but is listed in the application as representing This Forum. (Several other members of this Forum had similarly volunteered in a personal capacity but were listed as representing organisations).</p> <p>The Chair of the Harrow Hill Trust confirmed that the Trust had not asked or been asked to be represented on the Neighbourhood Forum, but Debora Catherall is listed as representing the Trust.</p>	<p>The support for the proposed Neighbourhood Area and for a Forum by HHF is noted.</p> <p>The "migration" offer is an indication of the strength of support for the concept of a Forum, however it cannot be adopted for several reasons. Some HHF members do not qualify for Forum membership as they do not work or live in the Area or represent the Area as Ward Councillors. Two HHF members who do qualify and are very keen supporters of both Area and Forum applications have chosen to be represented by others from their streets and indicated they are happy to provide their views to the Forum without being formal members of the committee.</p> <p>No doubt notification processes can always be improved. However the draft constitution was circulated together with an invitation to the update meeting on 22/11/16. The HHF Chair refused three offers of a follow up presentation and two-way discussion at the recent meeting of the HHF on 23/11/17. Several HHF members are active members of the newly proposed Forum and others are keen supporters, hence the initial comment of support from the Forum.</p> <p>The Chair is Mr Allett who has made an individual complaint not about the Area or a Forum but about procedure (see above). He was given a list with the HHF listed alongside his name and asked to clarify any mistakes.</p> <p>Forum Members signed off recently to the presentation of their name and full documentation including the addendum.</p> <p>Mr Allett is mistaken about the HHT. Indeed the instigator of the entire process was a member of the HHT's planning committee. In a communication to HHF Members on 2/5/2016 Mr Allett wrote that the initiative "is being promoted by the Harrow Hill Trust". Volunteers from HHT assisted with a joint leaflet drop and provided information and sign-up sheets at their very well attended May Day events in both 2016 and 2017. A resolution from the Executive of the HHT, the largest resident organisation on the Hill, confirming support has been sent to the Council.</p>

<p>In the absence of any known consultation or meeting, the Chairman Designate (Paul Catherall) is presumably self-appointed.</p> <p>We also noted that it seems that none of the three churches represented on This Forum had been invited to be members of the proposed Forum.</p> <p>A second major concern with the application is that it is not supported by Harrow School.</p> <p>In conclusion, whilst supporting the concept of a new Neighbourhood Area/Forum/Plan for the Hill, the present application appears to be premature. The successful emergence of a Neighbourhood Plan requires wider active representation, more meaningful consultation and more local 'buy-in' to develop the level of consensus required.</p>	<p>There can be no appointments until the Forum comes into existence. Currently there is a steering or working party and a volunteer (Mr Catherall) who chaired the last meeting of Forum Members who is willing to stand with sufficient support to be nominated subject to others also being nominated. A name and contact details were required to be published by statute for the application. Please refer above where this point has been fully addressed.</p> <p>Our analysis showed no synagogues, mosques and no temples in the Area. An email message request was sent to 58 people who attended a working session which included Mr Allett specifically requesting people reach out to Forum members and representatives of religious organisations. Mr Catherall called one directly. As for all eligible in the community the invitation to membership remains open.</p> <p>The School has been offered and declined the opportunity of Forum associate membership. This does not prevent feedback and comment which will always be considered from any community entity or individual, in addition to public documents such as the Harrow School SPD and Local Plan as guidance. The School is an organisation, not an individual, and so is not eligible to full Forum membership but can be a non-voting associate. However it has indicated the potential difficulty of feedback by direct discussion given existing authorisation levels (possible Governors involvement). By contrast the Headmaster of St Dominic's Sixth Form College is a Forum member. A further approach to the new Headmaster for Harrow School will be made in a few months to see if he would like to join.</p> <p>The support is noted. The roadshows and consultation show a very strong local buy in. It is so clearly an appropriate Area as it has been endorsed by every single Local Plan since 1986 including it been endorsed by the current Core Strategy for the Borough. The buy in is so strong that the Neighbourhood Area has not changed in one and a half years. The Forum is becoming more and more representative and is compliant with statute. The emergence of a Neighbourhood Plan cannot start until the designation is made. Plans involve tapping into many resident organisations including the largest resident organisation on the Hill (the HHT), and having a good spread within the Area which includes businesses. It will be checked by an Inspector for legal compliance. It is not defined as a business area and hence there will be a single referendum involving the entire neighbourhood.</p>
<p><b>6 Individual</b></p> <p>I write to you to inform you that I am very much in favour of the Harrow Hill Neighbourhood Area and Neighbourhood Forum.</p> <p>Further to my last email I now revoke my previously given approval to the above Forum. I now object to the above on the basis that:-</p>	<p>Support for the Neighbourhood Area and Forum is noted.</p>

<p>The Forum Committee will not be known to the general public.</p> <p>The Forum has the potential to be dissolved in five years, with all funds, assets and powers passing to one or more affiliate members of which the identity will remain unknown.</p> <p>There is also no concrete provision for the opportunity to comment by email on any of the proposals that are discussed in future years, as there is presently. The application states that all necessary funds will be raised by the applicant, potentially changes the planning process, for Hill residents, from tax-payer funded to privately funded.</p>	<p>This is a misunderstanding. Until the Forum is in existence there is only a steering group of interested persons calling themselves Forum Members trying to bring that about. The objective was not to publish personal details of those Forum Members at this preliminary stage although in fact their names and post codes have been published.</p> <p>It is true that a Forum once created will not exist in perpetuity. The governing law allows for it to cease in the event it no longer fulfils certain conditions and also determines what happens on any winding up. The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 are themselves subject to review every 5 years.</p> <p>E-mail communications can be sent to <a href="mailto:info@HarrowHillNeighbourhoodPlan.org">info@HarrowHillNeighbourhoodPlan.org</a> and <a href="mailto:Chairman@HarrowHillNeighbourhoodPlan.org">Chairman@HarrowHillNeighbourhoodPlan.org</a>. Developments for which approved planning permission is required will continue to be handled by the Local Authority's present planning application system.</p> <p>Funding is mainly from central Government, from volunteer services and services from Harrow Council which becomes entitled to central Government funding. It is the voluntary element which supplements/adds to existing Harrow Council resources. Updating of individual Conservation Area documents and SPDs and an assessment of the new London Plan are all required and some of this burden can be assumed by the new Forum.</p>
<p><b>7 Hatch End Association</b></p> <p>A Neighbourhood Forum gives legitimacy to local opinion and, provided it remains consistent with the Harrow Council UDP could help in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribute to the UDP with specific requirements for the area</li> <li>• Bring forward with local support small scale developments within the neighbourhood scheme for housing development or reuse of land.</li> <li>• Represent and protect areas that are special to the local community such as parkland, green belt, rights of way and conservation areas.</li> <li>• Encourage local participation within planning proposals within the area.</li> <li>• An active Forum with continuing local support within the community would be an excellent vehicle for achieving these objectives.</li> </ul> <p>However, we do also have some potential concerns on governance requirements for a Neighbourhood Forum.</p> <p>We note that the Forum is comprised of 21 elected persons to represent the community. The Executive Committee is 5 to 14 people, so the minimum quorum would be 3. This could lead to a minority taking control of local policy to the detriment of the broader</p>	<p>We agree with the benefits stated.</p> <p>There are built in safeguards. Firstly the Plan must be consistent with the NPPF, the London Plan and the Local Plan. The scheme is one of active collaboration between the Local Authority and the community. Secondly, the Plan must be approved by an independent Inspector. Thirdly, the Plan must receive more</p>

<p>community. We feel there should be governance protections against this to ensure unrepresentative voices do not claim to speak for the community as a whole.</p> <p>... ..funding should come primarily from the community rather than other sources such as local business sponsorship.</p> <p>Any neighbourhood forum needs to be for the long term....</p> <p>If these concerns can be addressed, and with the active support (and possible of veto) of the Harrow Council to work with the neighbourhood Forum community as part of the UDP and local planning process, we would support the formation of the Harrow on the Hill neighbourhood Forum.</p>	<p>than 50% of votes in a referendum of the local community within the Neighbourhood Area within which it would operate.</p> <p>Funding is primarily from central Government both directly by grant and indirectly via Harrow Council which becomes entitled to funding and provides the Forum with support. The main benefits to Harrow Council arise from volunteer efforts supplementing what is now provided.</p> <p>The Plan can have a 15-year vision.</p> <p>We believe that the concerns are fully addressed by the legal framework governing the operation of the Forum. This provides for open and flexibly evolving Forum membership in response to community issues as they arise, community consultation, proactive collaboration with the Local Authority, and built in democratic safeguards, most notably by community referenda at all important steps of the process.</p>
<p><b>8 Individual</b></p> <p>Supports the Neighbourhood Area and states that the proposal has been welcomed by people.</p> <p>Questions raised:</p> <p>I think there has been insufficient Public Consultation on the whole. I attended the meeting at St Dominic’s held in May 2016. People were invited to give their views on the proposal and these were written on charts. I cannot trace that these comments have been distributed to those who attended the meeting – I cannot find such advice. Nor that there have been any more public meetings held in the period.</p> <p>Only one School Governor represented on the Forum (as an associate member)</p>	<p>Support for the Area is noted as is the support by the people they know.</p> <p>The meeting at St Dominic’s Sixth Form College was for three purposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) to determine if there was support for a Neighbourhood Plan and for the Area;</li> <li>2) to assess if there would be enough volunteers for the likely workload; and</li> <li>3) to identify key issues in the community and consider if they were they best addressed by a Neighbourhood Plan as opposed to available alternatives.</li> </ol> <p>The meeting confirmed the first two points. The charts clarified that the majority of issues raised related to local Development Management Policies so that the Neighbourhood Plan option was the most appropriate process to pursue to address them. Thereafter a “road show” approach was adopted to disseminate the message into the community, using the existing infrastructure such as the HHT, various residents’ associations and business groups.</p> <p>St Dominic’s Sixth Form College is the largest school in the area by pupil numbers and the Headmaster is a Forum member. Another individual members include a deputy school head by profession; an individual with a special interest in provision for children in the Area (not affiliated to any particular school); and also an owner of a training company. Further support is provided by another School official and teachers in the Area but without being members of the Forum in an official capacity.</p> <p>There is therefore considerable input for education even at this preliminary stage. It is a reasonable assumption that once the</p>



	<p>Forum, and later the Plan, is a fact, community interest and engagement will grow, specifically with respect to local issues of concern for which there has to date been no effective or formally recognised avenue for directed action. A recent example is the application to the council for a CPZ on the Hill. The burden of pursuing initiatives on such issues has hitherto largely fallen to individuals to shoulder as best they could.</p> <p>The opportunity for membership is not time limited, it is welcomed and continuing, remaining open to any interested individual or entity in the community at any time.</p>
<p><b>1 response from Harrow School requesting revisions to or removal from the proposed Area and objecting to the validity of the two applications overall.</b></p> <p>Harrow School objects to both A and B above: namely to the designation of the proposed area as the Neighbourhood Area and to the designation of the Neighbourhood Forum under the Act and Regulations.</p> <p>The School at no time gave its consent to the application, the draft constitution or to the proposed Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>Government Guidance DCLG ‘Neighbourhood Planning’ – states that a Neighbourhood Plan should support the strategic development needs set out in the Local Plan and plan positively to support local development (as outlined in para 16 NPPF) – see para 004 Ref ID 41-004-20170728. A Neighbourhood Plan cannot be a device to detract from, counter or undermine the policies found in the Local Plan or in an SPD.</p> <p>1. Regulation 5 (1)(c) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires that an application for a Neighbourhood Area must include a statement from the applicant explaining why the proposed area is considered appropriate to be designated as a neighbourhood area. The statement accompanying the application is wholly inadequate for</p>	<p>Objections noted with corrections and missing information provided below.</p> <p>An employee for Harrow School signed to indicate support for the Area and to membership of the Forum (see above). The Area has not changed. No comments were submitted in response to a request for comments on the draft constitution as circulated.</p> <p>Harrow School’s revised position is noted. However, this residential Neighbourhood plan is for individuals resident in or working in the Area or elected as Ward Councillors for the Area. Harrow School as an organisation cannot be a voting Forum member.</p> <p>These comments are not germane to the applications in so far as a Neighbourhood Plan is yet to be developed and cannot be developed until after a Neighbourhood Forum is in existence. In any event here are legal safeguards to ensure that the Plan is in accordance with the NPPF, the London Plan and Local Plan, including review by an independent Inspector before the Plan is accepted. The whole tenor of the legislation is of proactive collaborative community participation with Local Authorities in community development, not one of detraction or undermining.</p> <p>What is within contemplation is precisely a Plan to support local development, consistent with and respecting those policy documents and existing SPDs drawn up on a similar basis, i.e. not detracting from or counter the NPPF, London Plan and Local Plan. A new London Plan provides an opportunity to update documentation to ensure adherence and provides assistance to the Council in doing it.</p> <p>The statement explaining the proposed Neighbourhood Area was validated by the Council with no adverse comment. The Area is virtually co-incident with all the Harrow on the Hill conservation areas and has been designated in every single Local Plan since 1986, including the current one. That it is geographically, historically and functionally coherent is evidenced by support by 95% of the community in consultation.</p>

<p>the reasons set out below.</p> <p>2. A substantial proportion of the area sought to be designated as the Neighbourhood Area (about 40%) is exclusively owned and occupied by Harrow School. The School is a strong objector to the Neighbourhood Area boundary as set out in the application. As the Council is aware, there is already prescribed local planning guidance applying to the School Estate as set out in the recently adopted (July 2015) Harrow School Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The SPD should, in accordance with government policy in NPPF, be given significant weight as supplementary guidance to the Local Plan, the statutory Development Plan for its area.</p> <p>3. ... Designation of the proposed Neighbourhood Area, which would overlap the majority of the SPD area. Would undermine the purpose of the SPD. This clearly should be avoided in the interests of the proper planning of the Council's area. The only way to avoid the proposed Neighbourhood Plan being in potential conflict with the SPD would be to exclude the Harrow School SPD area from the Neighbourhood Area.</p>	<p>It is uncontroversial to the point of just plain obvious as the sensible Area in planning and neighbourhood terms.</p> <p>Freehold title percentages are not relevant to the Area as set out in the legislation. The land area exclusively occupied by School buildings used for academic purposes is small with most being residential or for joint leisure use with Hill residents (including exclusively leased assets such as Church Fields, Yew Walk, and the pitch and putt course). Residential buildings owned by the School are occupied by staff who are an integral part of the year round community and the form of accommodation/tenure is not relevant as, equal with other community residents and workers, they are legally entitled to vote in any referenda. Only 53% of residents are owner-occupiers in the Harrow on the Hill Ward. Freehold ownership is not a criterion specified in the legislation and it would also be undemocratic to use this.</p> <p>These apprehensions of conflict are unwarranted. As previously stated (see above), a Neighbourhood Plan must be drawn up in accordance with the NPPF, the London Plan (not mentioned in the comments) and the Local plan. The aim of the legislation is constructive community collaboration with the Local Authority, not conflict, and there are legislative safeguards to secure this. A Local Planning Authority considers a draft Neighbourhood Plan (or Order) against the statutory requirements set out in <a href="#">paragraph 6 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)</a>. Paragraph: 053 Reference ID: 41-053-20140306 It is only after the independent examiner's review report is received that the Local Authority concludes a formal view of the Plan. If the Plan is accepted it is then subject to community endorsement by referendum – in which all Harrow School personnel are entitled to vote by virtue of living and/or working in the Area.</p> <p>The comments are uninformed and do not take into account the purpose and many potential benefits of the Localism Act 2011. The safeguards ensure that the Council's planning remains coherent but with the added benefit of becoming more representative for the Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>Further, exclusion of the Harrow School Estate makes no sense for a Neighbourhood Area for historic, geographic, transport, parking, health and leisure, biodiversity and conservation reasons. The School would be the first to assert its longstanding significance to the Hill community in all these respects and has in fact done so in its own SPD. A Neighbourhood Area for the Hill that excludes Harrow School estate would be nonsense. Our very detailed analysis of all estate buildings clearly shows them to be predominantly residential and leisure. Those individuals living and working on the estate are eligible for Forum membership irrespective of the tenure. To demand of School personnel that they do likewise is undemocratic and a denial of their legal rights under the Localism Act 2011. But legislation has been passed, it has created a right for meaningful positive collaborative community participation in local development To</p>
--	--

4. Section 61F(7)(a)(ii) of the 1990 Act requires that when determining whether to designate a Neighbourhood Forum the Local Planning Authority has regard to the desirability of designating a body whose membership is drawn from different places in the Neighbourhood Area concerned and from different sections of the community in that Area. This is clearly not the case here and the postcodes of the members listed do not reflect a proper geographical spread of the proposed neighbourhood area (see map attached). Whilst there is a concentration of members to the West of the High Street there is very limited representation of residents, businesses and other organisations elsewhere, particularly at the southern and northern ends of the proposed area. The eastern part of the area is largely in the ownership of Harrow School who is unwilling to join the Forum. Further, as the criteria in section 61F(7)(a)(ii) cannot reasonably be met if the School estate is included, it should be excluded from the Neighbourhood Area.

5, The proposed Forum is comprised of membership which is not representative of the community at large and the application fails to demonstrate an understanding of the demographic profile of the area. The area does not include membership from characteristic groups. In short, the application for the designation of the Neighbourhood Area fails to draw membership of the Forum from different sections of the community within that area. It should be significantly reduced at least to exclude the School's estate and other areas not represented.

try to prevent the meaningful exercise of those rights by endorsing modification of the Area by withdrawal of the School estate is to seek to deprive both the School's own personnel as well as the wider community, indeed to subvert the manifest intention of the legislation. It is also contrary to the Local Plan and many policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The postcode distribution of current members presented is not up to date; it only includes 19 Forum Members out of 25. An up to date one shows excellent coverage throughout the area. There are no postcodes for fields, which is consistent with other designated areas. Highgate has 44% green space.  
<http://www.highgateneighbourhoodforum.org.uk/evidence/the-forum-in-numbers/>

The different sections of the community requirement  
 Basic legal requirements of forming a neighbourhood forum are

- [Established for] the express purpose of promoting or improving the **social, economic and environmental wellbeing of an area** that consists of or includes the neighbourhood area concerned
- A **purpose** that reflects (in general terms) the character of the area in general terms
- Membership **open** to people living and working in the area, and elected members for the area (reasonable steps must be taken to secure at least one of each)
- A minimum of 21 members from above groups
- Membership drawn from different places in the area and different sections of the community.

By sections it means male female, ethnicity, age and so on. A prospective Neighbourhood Forum is not required to have a member from each membership category in order to be designated. It must have an open membership policy, but it cannot force people to be a part of something they may not wish to be a part of. The local planning authority must consider whether the prospective neighbourhood forum **has secured or taken reasonable steps to attempt to secure** membership from each category and from different places and sections of the community in that area <https://mycommunity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Establishing-a-neighbourhood-forum.pdf>

It is clear that the Forum has excellent coverage which continues to evolve, that it has taken reasonable steps to attempt to secure membership from each category – and has succeeded in doing so. The census shows education as the second largest industry in the ward (there are 10 schools). Even at this preliminary stage there is significant representation from individuals associated with that industry in compliance with the legislative requirements: [section 61F\(5\) and section 61F\(7\) of](#)

[the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Act as applied to Neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.](#)

We have studied the demographics of the Area and communication has been Area wide with supporters requested to follow up. As noted in many other Forum applications the process is on-going. Such steps were discussed with the Council as part of the process. It is a reasonable assumption that more of the community will actively engage with the Forum over time, with a progressively fuller and better understanding of the benefits of doing so.

The School's comments are focussed on freehold estate ownership. As noted above this is not however a qualifying or operative criterion in the relevant legislation and hence not a legitimate basis for objection.

Dialogue is always welcome. There is no logic in planning terms for the remaining neighbourhood i.e. the modified Area proposed by the School. It is an incoherent nonsense. As noted above the proposed Neighbourhood Area has been endorsed in every Local Plan since 1986 and is accepted in Harrow School's own SPD. The School's proposed modification would at the very least break up 6 of the 8 Conservation Areas, the Area of Special Character, split the two Grade 1 assets, make no sense for transport or tourism, and split the biodiversity and leisure access for the public. It would deny residents their say over where they dwell, have their recreation and commute. The School as an organisation is not entitled to be voting member. However School personnel as individuals living and/or working in the Area are eligible, attended meetings and had access to all relevant information throughout. This formal consultation process in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 has provided the opportunity for notice of their changed position and that has been duly noted. The debate from road shows and indeed this consultation shows tremendous community support for the proposed Neighbourhood Area.

Representatives from the Roxborough Residents Association, the Campaign for Better Harrow Environment and the Harrow Architect forum all had an input to the process of deciding the boundary of the proposed Neighbourhood Area. This resulted in the a slight expansion to the North Western corner to include the Roxborough Park & Grove Conservation Area which is outside the Intensification Area. The strong logic in the Area has resulted in much greater consensus than for many other designated Neighbourhood Areas.

The number of households is below 4,000, the number quoted includes the whole Ward.

The legislative requirement for membership for the purpose of an assessment of an application for Forum designation – which is what is in issue here - is a minimum of 21 individuals, Organisations are not eligible to vote in their own right but a

6. The public engagement carried out by the applicant in respect of defining the extent and location of the Neighbourhood Area boundaries, including the appropriateness is wholly inadequate. Despite attending two meetings and receiving correspondence from the applicant the School was not informed by the applicant of the making of the application. Had it been properly consulted, it would have objected to the inclusion of the estate and the area of the Harrow School SPD in the proposed Neighbourhood Area and would have wished to have engaged in further dialogue concerning the appropriate boundaries of the Neighbourhood Area.

7. The School is not aware of any evidence that residents or businesses beyond but adjacent to the proposed boundaries were consulted on the proposed Neighbourhood Area boundary proposals and specifically as to whether they considered themselves to be part of a district neighbourhood area and/or wished to be inside (or outside) the proposed area.

8. In an area of approximately 4,600 households the Forum seems to have fewer than 25 members, as indicated by application papers. There is no evidence that the residents, businesses, organisations and employees in the proposed Neighbourhood Area have been properly consulted. It cannot therefore be concluded on evidence that the proposed area is appropriate based on democratic support. The legislation requires this as a prerequisite.

<p>B 1.The Neighbourhood Forum is not representative of the residents and businesses located within the Harrow Hill area. It has not been properly constituted and the applicant has not carried out adequate or proper consultation. In the circumstances any designation of the Neighbourhood Forum under the Act and Regulations as is proposed in the application would be wrong in law. Public engagement has been limited to one leaflet mail out, one public meeting in 2016, a stall at May Day 2016 and 2017 on the Hill, and undocumented meetings with some local organisations who are not affiliated with the Forum. Residents, businesses and organisations located in the area must be properly consulted before the application can have any validity. As the Council cannot be satisfied of this, there is no power for it to approve the application.</p> <p>B2.The applicant, Mr Paul Catherall, is self-appointed as chairman and has not been properly elected as chairman of the Neighbourhood Forum in this application nor has he any elected power to act on behalf of the Neighbourhood Forum in making such application. The application is for this reason invalid too</p> <p>B3.There is no evidence that all the persons stated to be members of the Neighbourhood Forum have agreed to be named members or to their names being included in the list of supporters of the application. In fact, the contrary is true as the list comprises objectors to the application, including Mr Daniel Beckley, who is stated to be a supporting member of the Forum on behalf of Harrow School. Neither he nor Harrow School has agreed to support the application nor agreed to his name being placed on such a list. This is also understood to be the case with others including</p>	<p>school can apply to join at any time as an associate member</p> <p>Contact was made with all households and the Council has carried out full consultation in accordance with regulatory requirements. Membership is and will remain open as set out in the constitution. As is usually the case in community organisations, the strength of support does not equate to all supporters signing up as members who are in a position to provide time. For example, some 58 individuals provided email contact details of whom only 19 however were in a position to dedicate their time to be on the Forum. Furthermore some members of the Forum communicate via organisations including various residents' associations and HHT. The support of HHT, whose membership covers around 10% of residents and 30 businesses in the proposed Area, provides input from members via the executive and other various committees. To equate the listed membership with community representation is not therefore correct.</p> <p>The Forum is representative of individuals in the Area and has been properly constituted under the regulations. There has been considerably more public engagement than those mentioned including via HHT (a second full leaflet drop and attendance at their 2016 AGM), attendance at the AGM of the Mount Park Residents' Association, via representatives of management blocks who used their own e-mail databases and the HHF. Attendees at the consultation run by Harrow School for a recent development were provided with details and various businesses have been informed individually. In addition information was published in the HHT newsletter distributed to several hundred households, on the HHT website and via an email list of approximately 300 on Change.org. The process was overseen by the Planning Policy team before documents were accepted and consultation has been enhanced further since that review. In addition statutory consultation has now taken place and confirmed the very strong level of support in the community.</p> <p>This point has been addressed above and to repeat: No officers for the Forum, including a Chairman, have been appointed. They cannot be appointed until a Forum exists. The current applications are submitted to the council by a 'steering' or working party purely for the purpose of bringing a Forum into existence in the absence of a Parish Council for the area. However a name is required by the legislation. Other applications have used a designate title for the purpose and this precedent was merely adopted by way of expedient for the process, given the agreement to be nominated and sufficient support to second such nomination.</p> <p>The addendum submitted to the Planning Committee removes the three people mentioned and adds five new members joining prior to Mr Allett's resignation on 30/11/17. The current membership of 25 meets the minimum requirement specified for an application in section61F(5)(c) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. All 25 individuals have confirmed their membership and their satisfaction with their details. As the Forum comes into existence and its profile develops there is</p>
---	---

<p>Michael Gibson from John Lyon School and Ted Allett of the Harrow Hill Forum. The School objects to the application on this ground, too, and without a minimum of 21 named members of the Forum, the application is invalid and not in accordance with section 61F(5)(c) of the 1990 Act. There is in such circumstances no power for the Council to approve the application.</p> <p>B4.The constitution of the proposed Neighbourhood Forum is totally unacceptable. It is drafted in such a way that very few persons on an executive committee, a minimum of five persons with a quorum of three, would be able to exercise significant if not total control over the Forum’s planning and other decisions concerning the Neighbourhood Area. In the draft constitution the chairman is accorded the casting vote at any executive committee or Forum general meeting which would give the chairman and a very small number of persons acting with him control over all activities and decisions the Forum may make. This is unacceptable and can lead to undemocratic decision making.</p> <p>B5.The executive committee is stated to be able to co-opt unelected members of their choice onto the committee, including persons with no local knowledge or understanding of the area, who would have the same voting rights as any elected members and could also be elected as an officer by the committee. As there would be no need for them to stand for election, they cannot be required by the membership to stand down. This is unacceptable and unconstitutional.</p> <p>B6.The executive committee would be able to determine policies in relation to expenses, including awarding themselves expenses. If a small unrepresentative body as is proposed, this would be unacceptable.</p> <p>B7.The Forum membership would be unrepresentative. Membership is to be given to residents and businesses operating in the Neighbourhood Area, whatever the size of the business or the area each ‘representative’ holds within the Neighbourhood Area. Therefore only one vote at general meetings would be given to Harrow School – evidently the largest employer and land-owner in the area - the same voting rights being given to each business of whatever size and number of employees. This is clearly not in accordance with the spirit or the intent of the Localism Act 2011 which gave rise to Neighbourhood Plans and Forums. This is unacceptable.</p>	<p>every likelihood that community awareness and interest, already strong, will continue to increase.</p> <p>The constitution is based on a standard template. The number of individuals currently on the Forum is 25. Their role is to oversee the collation of material. As explained above there are many safeguards in the legislation as one would expect for such an initiative in enhancing and increasing the status of community engagement in local matters. An Independent examiner is appointed to review a submitted Neighbourhood Plan to ensure harmony with the NPPF. London Plan and Local Plan. His/her report is followed by Council review and, if the Plan passes those two stages, it is submitted to the whole community for approval by referendum. It is difficult to contemplate a more democratic process even if, as is usual and indeed inevitable in any community organisation, the work to make it happen will necessarily be assumed by those willing few who have the time.</p> <p>There are no tests of knowledge for Forum members and membership is open under the constitution as required by the legislation. Co-option is a standard process used in the process during the period between elections. Again there are safeguards, including that to continue the Forum must maintain its status through the 5 year period of designation. For practical purposes the Forum is a secretariat the purpose of which is the Neighbourhood Plan with the legislative safeguards outlined above.</p> <p>Funding is transparent. The steering party has a Chartered Accountant and FCA approved individual within the team. A small unrepresentative body is not proposed.</p> <p>This comment is at odds with the Localism Act 2011 and clearly does not understand the constitution. In many Neighbourhood Areas there are substantial landowners and users such as the Local Authority, London Transport, major rail station operators, electricity and utility providers, sports stadia, other large employers. The legislation provides that the Neighbourhood Forum is not for those organisations per se but for the individuals who work in and/or live in or near them in the Area.. It does not provide a “weighting” for different community players it is up to the individuals to engage and vote, not the organisation</p> <p>It is a clear fact that the designation of the proposed Neighbourhood Area is residential. Most of the Harrow School’s estate is either leisure use, with access by the public, leased</p>
---	---

<p>B8. One result of adoption of the draft constitution would be the undermining of the Harrow School SPD and decisions which are made by the elected members of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with such adopted guidance. This should be resisted by the Council</p> <p>B9. The proposed Forum states that its current members, through involvement with other local community groups, will have “significant reach to a very large number of residents”. There is no evidence of this and in an area of approximately 4,600 households in the proposed Neighbourhood Area (this figure is obtained by interrogation of GIS data) the Forum has it seems fewer than 25 members, as indicated by the application papers, which cannot lawfully be concluded to be representative of even a small part of the area</p>	<p>assets such as Church Fields and the pitch and putt, or residential use. Where that residential use is by individuals over 18 years of age then there is an entitlement to Forum membership and, regardless of Forum membership, to vote in referenda in the same way as for local elections. What is clearly undemocratic to deny those residents the exercise of the rights granted them by the legislation.</p> <p>Given that Census information shows 53% owner-occupiers in the Area, ownership is clearly an unfair criterion to use and, no doubt for this reason, not one within the legislation. Census information for employment shows that the main employer for residents is wholesale and retail at 13.7%, then education 12.6% closely followed by Healthcare and social care 12.0% and 11.1% professional, scientific and technical. There are 10 schools in the area, the largest by pupil numbers and with most transport use is St Dominic’s Sixth Form College. Representation of the education industry is currently provided by eligible individuals. The legislation about representation is to protect minorities as is set out in the Forum template at <a href="https://mycommunity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Establishing-a-neighbourhood-forum.pdf">https://mycommunity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Establishing-a-neighbourhood-forum.pdf</a></p> <p>This objection is a repetition and has been addressed above. The draft constitution does not in any way undermine the Harrow School SPD. It presents an excellent opportunity to update it (at lower cost to the Council) for the new London Plan and to address matters not in the SPD but important to residents and businesses, such as transport. The Harrow School SPD had to be produced in accordance with the NPPF, the London Plan and the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan must, to be approved, be carried out on the same basis. The proposed Neighbourhood Area is virtually co-incident with the 8 Conservation Areas in the SPD of 2008. <b>Residents</b> would like that document updated and a Neighbourhood Plan would enable local voluntary effort and knowledge to be applied in assisting the Council to do this. That is why there is a <b>presumption in the legislation that Councils will help communities establish a Neighbourhood Area and Forum if this is what they wish to do.</b></p> <p>The significant reach has already been demonstrated and has included comprehensive leaflet drops, emails to resident blocks (one lived in by a Forum member and one in a professional capacity for many blocks), emails to 300 addresses via Change.org, the email data base, newsletter to hundreds of households, the website <a href="http://www.harrowhillneighbourhoodplan.org">www.harrowhillneighbourhoodplan.org</a>, committees and AGM of the HH, dissemination via Forum members who are also members of various Residents’ Associations (Roxborough, Mount Park Road, Byron Hill, West Street), Harrow Architects forum, the Campaign for a Better Harrow Environment and more. The Forum itself now has over 60 email contact addresses and its own website.</p>
--	---