

Consultee	Comments	Council's Response
Natural England	Natural England does not wish to make comment on the suitability of the proposed plan area or the proposed neighbourhood planning body.	Noted
Environment Agency	We have no comments to make at this stage, however, depending on the environmental risks or opportunities within this area, we may comment at the later stages of the neighbourhood plan. We will focus our detailed engagement on those areas where the environmental risks are greatest.	Noted
Councillor Golnar Bokaei Mill Hill ward	<p>I am not only a councillor in Mill Hill ward but also was a member of the above Forum.</p> <p>I object to the application currently submitted on the grounds that there is still a lot of outstanding issues with this organisation and no one that the Forum felt they had to answer to. I am concerned that during the last five years of forum's existence and certainly since I joined a couple of years ago the following concerns were raised with no proper replies due to the autocratic way decisions were made. My concerns as it stands are:</p> <p>1- timely account submission.</p> <p>2- non compliance with policies and Procedures in Place in particular lack of safeguarding measures.</p> <p>3- failure to follow decision making procedures.</p> <p>I am not satisfied that once the new application is approved the forum will operate differently. As the council is providing financial package to the forum before the application is approved measures should be put in place to permit the council to perhaps have a more hands approach with regard to how the forum functions. I am available to discuss this further however is it stands I object to the application.</p>	<p>The Council expect Forums to be managed in a way that promotes good governance and transparency enabling the local community to be engaged and able to contribute to the production of a Neighbourhood Plan. This includes clarifications about finance.</p> <p>The Council does not provide financial support for the Forum. Support for Neighbourhood Plan production is available via MHCLG.</p> <p>The remit of the Forum is to produce a Neighbourhood Plan. As an unincorporated body there are limits on its handling of grant funding.</p>
Local Resident 1	<p>I have read the proposal for designation of "Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum" on the Engage Barnet website, and I would like to register my concerns about the proposal, in its current format. I am supportive of the creation of a neighbourhood forum for the NW7 and served as a committee member on the previous forum and was until February 2020, when I was summarily ejected from the committee by the new chair, a Mr Stuart Kershaw, a person I do not recall ever meeting. The explanation Mr Kershaw gave was that he had engaged the former chair John Gillett as a consultant to the committee and Mr Kershaw felt that I could not be involved in the organisation if Mr Gillett was to participate, as I had previously criticised Mr Gillett's tenure as chair. It is clear to me that there are many issues with the newly formulated organisation under Mr Kershaw's tenure.</p> <p>1) Security of data. Mr Kershaw, who was acting as chair, forwarded an exchange of emails, marked private and confidential, to a third party without my authorisation. The content of these was a private exchange, Mr Kershaw had confirmed that he was treating this as private. It was leaked deliberately to damage my credibility. Private discussions concerning committee business should never be released to third parties in this manner or for these purposes. This demonstrates a complete lack of understanding of principles of data protection. I have reported this breach to the ICO.</p> <p>2) The committee is not sufficiently representative. It appears that six of the members are married couples. During my tenure on the committee, I sought to seek representation on the committee from as many of the organisations in Mill Hill with wide memberships as possible, such as The</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Data held by the Forum should follow the data protection principles set out in the Data Protection Act 2018 2) The Forum Committee has not sufficiently demonstrated that it has reached out to residents and other bodies that are active in Mill Hill. It is disappointing that in one of the largest Neighbourhood Areas in London some households have two representatives on the Forum Committee. 3) We expect Forums to be managed in a way that promotes good governance and transparency. This includes clarifications about finance. The remit of the Forum is to produce a Neighbourhood Plan. As an unincorporated body there are limits on its handling of grant funding.

<p>Residents Association, The Mill Hill Services Club, the Mill Hill Synagogue, the Sacred Heart Church, The Good Neighbour scheme. I also suggested that these organisations be invited to a public meeting when the relaunch of the forum was proposed. There have been no open meetings and no attempt to widen the base of the committee beyond the previous committee and the circle of friends of the current and former chair. As far as I am concerned, this means that the issues and problems that plagued the previous committee have not been resolved.</p> <p>3) I have grave concerns about how the finances of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood forum are managed. Despite asking on numerous occasions, I have never seen accounts for the forum. As a committee member for five years, I regard it a matter of due diligence to review these. I believe that my continued requests for accounts is another reason why I was asked to leave the committee. My specific concern was brought about following a Freedom of Information request (ref 6059088). In the response, it stated that £3,500 of a large grant obtained from Barnet Council was to be paid to an organisation called "Comida Festival" to help stage a Summer festival. I have reason to believe that this money was not paid to this organisation, as I provided the staging for the said festival and did not receive a payment of this amount. Whilst I have no reason to believe that the money was misused, in the absence of proper accounts and documentation, I feel that I have not been able to discharge my duty as a committee member and undertake proper due diligence. This lack of transparency in the business of the neighbourhood forum has been a constant issue throughout my tenure as a committee member.</p> <p>4) I have sincere and grave doubts about the constitution, especially in light of the formation of the committee. There are several major structural weaknesses.</p> <p>4.1 Quorum - The constitution states "3.3 A Committee (or Steering Group) comprising at least 21 members will be elected at each AGM to carry out the day-to-day work of the Forum. A quorum for the Committee will be 7 members. " There has been no AGM for a significant period of time. The committee as currently formulated with several married couples could theoretically see a majority for a meeting comprised of Mr Kershaw and his wife, along with one other couple. This is most unrepresentative.</p> <p>4.2 Officers - The constitution states "3.4 The Committee will elect the following officers of the Forum from its number: Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and Treasurer. Officers will serve for one year and be subject to reelection, and there will be no limit to the number of terms an officer may serve. The Chair (or the Vice Chair when acting as Chair) will have a casting vote at any Committee or General Meeting." The objections to this are as for 4.1</p> <p>4.3 Accounts - As the forum will be obtaining public funds, the accounts should be published and freely available for inspection. This is not adequately dealt with and there is no transparency "3.18 The Treasurer will maintain accounts for the Forum even though this is not a statutory requirement and present them in summary form at the AGM."</p> <p>4.4 Amendments to the constitution - A publicly funded body, where two married couples can amend the constitution is clearly very flawed "6.1 Amendments to the body of this Constitution will be by a majority decision of the Committee"</p> <p>4.5 Dissolution - This states that a majority of 75% of attendees of an AGM must vote for dissolution for it to be carried. This seems to be a very high threshold. Surely if 60% of the membership are unhappy, this should be sufficient "6.2 MHNF may be dissolved by decision of a General Meeting specifically called for this purpose and carried out in accordance with 3.11 and</p>	<p>4) The Council recognises the concerns on the proposed Constitution and has advised the applicant to seek third party help from Locality. Support is available for making a successful application for designation of Neighbourhood Areas and Forums.</p> <p>5) Planning Committee noted the issues of safeguarding when considering the application for re-designation July 2019. The issue of safeguarding has been highlighted as an element of the request for support from Locality.</p> <p>6) See response at item 3. The Forum will not be handling substantial amounts of public money. Any CIL generated by development in the Neighbourhood Area will be managed by the Council. An adopted Neighbourhood Plan can set out priorities for how this should be spent. The legal remit of the Forum ceases once the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted.</p>
--	--

	<p>3.12 above, with the exception that such a vote will be carried only if supported by three quarters (75%) of those present at the meeting."</p> <p>5) The Previous MHNH foundered on serious safeguarding issues. There appears to be no attempt to have rectified these deficiencies, beyond a change of chair. In my discussions with Mr Kershaw, I have not been convinced that he has recognised these issues or put anything in place to resolve the structural problems that caused the failure of the previous forum.</p> <p>6) It is clear that the the purpose of the Neighbourhood plan is to ensure that the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum has access to the substantial amounts of cash that such an organisation are required to manage. Whilst I 100% support the concept of this money being used in Mill Hill, there is no clear statement which demonstrates that this committee will be able to manage these finances in a manner beneficial to the well being of Mill Hill Residents. An organisation that has failed to hold AGM's or produce accounts clearly cannot claim to have the infrastructure in place to do this effectively. This should be clearly and transparently demonstrated. In summary, I do not believe that this proposal is right for Mill Hill in its current format. A wider based committee is required, with solid support from existing Mill Hill institutions is necessary. The constitution should not allow partners to serve on the committee. There should be proper financial and safeguarding controls in place and a public meeting held, with all local institutions invited, to discuss the submission, prior to submission to the council. I strongly urge the council too ask Mr Kershaw to put together a plan with a degree of credibility. or preferably find a new chair who can deliver what is needed.</p>	
Local Resident 2	<p>In my previous response to Forward Planning last year regarding the re-designation of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum I said at the time that the proposed forum needed to have a complete change of officers and committee and should be run on a completely transparent basis. On the basis of the application submitted to re-designate the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum I can see no evidence of either transparency or even an attempt to run the proposed forum as a partner of the existing voluntary bodies and associations in Mill Hill. There have been no public meetings of this proposed body. Under the proposed constitution, the committee can choose not to publish minutes citing commercial confidentiality. Members can only join the forum using the website and only committee members may call general meetings. This is not at all acceptable as it allows the committee to be unaccountable to the wider public. I note the new constitution has been written to give all decision making powers to the committee alone. Under the constitution, the committee can meet with a quorum of seven members. If two of the married couples who are members of the proposed committee attend such committee meeting held under this constitution, they alone can control all decision making. I note that several voluntary bodies in Mill Hill are not only excluded from the proposed committee, under the proposed constitution of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum the committee controls the decisions made by the proposed forum and not the voluntary bodies. It is surprising that bodies like the Mill Hill Residents Association and other groups such as the Mill Hill United Services Club and the several churches and Synagogue have no representation under the proposed constitution. I would urge the Council to reject the above application as it does not give the many voluntary groups in Mill Hill a say in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan and the proposed Neighbourhood Forum would be run effectively as an unaccountable private club rather than being open, transparent and accountable to the whole community.</p>	<p>As highlighted above the Council expects Forums to be managed in a way that promotes good governance and transparency enabling the local community to be engaged and able to contribute to the production of a Neighbourhood Plan. A Forum has to be inclusive in order to succeed.</p> <p>The Council recognises the concerns on the proposed Constitution and has advised the applicant to seek third party help from Locality. Support is available for making a successful application for designation of Neighbourhood Areas and Forums.</p>

Local Resident 3	<p>I write regarding the application to create a local neighbourhood forum under the Localism Act 2011, by a group known as the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum. I note that this is the same group who previously were designated and had an application refused. I would like to register an objection to the application, and provide background as to why. Since the previous application I have had numerous conversations with Mr Stewart Kershaw who now claims to be the Chair of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum. These conversations have occurred, both in person (one with the claimed ex-Chair Mr John Gillet) and via email. During these conversations I became exceptionally concerned about the data protection provisions of the group. In January 2020 I requested a copy of all data stored on me by the Forum. Mr Kershaw replied just within the deadline with a package of information. In that package, Mr Kershaw revealed personal data on two members of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum, and also that the group has published my personal information (along with others) on the group's website. Mr Kershaw also refused to acknowledge whether this was a complete set of data. Indeed his tone became quite inappropriate for a Chair of an organisation representing the general public.</p> <p>On further discussions, I noted that the original legal basis for collecting my data was consent. I questioned where they got this consent from to which Mr Kershaw could not provide a satisfactory response. Mr Kershaw then changed the legal basis to legitimate interest, but has not provided information as to how this is justified. This whole response has left me so concerned about the attitude the group takes towards data protection that I have reported the group to the Information Commissioner's Office. I am awaiting their response. I do not feel it is appropriate that a group under review by a supervisory authority be designated at this time. Even should the ICO feel their actions are within the guidelines, the attitude of Mr Kershaw to data protection raises serious concerns about how the details of the members will be held and secured. There should even be a question as to whether they are legally required to have a Data Protection Officer. Consequently I object to the designation of this group, and feel that should the council go ahead, they put the personal data of the citizens of Mill Hill at risk.</p>	Data held by the Forum should follow the data protection principles set out in the Data Protection Act 2018
Historic England	In the event of agreement to the designate the proposed boundary and Neighbourhood Forum, we would be happy to comment further on the developing plan. We would urge the Forum and local authorities to consider how they can work together to update the heritage evidence base for the area and how heritage can help underpin the wider aspirations for the neighbourhood.	Noted.

<p>Local Resident 4</p>	<p>While I am very much in favour of the idea of having a Neighbourhood Plan I am extremely worried that the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum is trying to get the mandate to take responsibility for this Plan and the legal mandate that will let them manage the large amounts of public funds (our money) in our name. There are three main areas of concern regarding the designation of the Forum for this role:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Forum does not seem to represent and speak for the residents of Mill Hill 2. The Forum does not seem to be a fully democratic organisation 3. The Forum does not seem to operate in an open and transparent manner. 4. Other General Issues <p>As a precursor, I wanted to state that the reason why these points are so important to me is that any organisation that wishes to develop and manage the Neighbourhood Plan (which will have such an impact on the day to day lives of Mill Hill residents), and any organisation that is looking to manage large amounts of public monies (the CIL) for the benefit of the residents of Mill Hill has to demonstrate, more than any other associations or groupings in Mill Hill, three primary characteristics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That its committee is truly representative of the people of Mill Hill. 2. That the organisation is run in a democratic manner. This means that the residents of Mill Hill are fully sovereign in all matters relating to the NP and the CIL, and that the Committee is and remains at all times fully subservient and accountable to the residents of Mill Hill. If the organisation claims to speak for all the residents of Mill Hill and, more importantly, if the organisation controls funds for and on behalf of all the residents of Mill Hill, then it is vital that this organisation is set up with a constitution that is democratic and that ensures that the committee represents and serves the residents and is always accountable to the residents. 3. That its discussions, its decisions, its management of finances and all its procedures are fully open and transparent to all the residents of Mill Hill at all times. <p>Let me address each one in turn.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Forum does not seem to represent and speak for the residents of Mill Hill Currently there is a list of committee members, most of whom are individuals who don't speak for any of the residents of Mill Hill. I know a number of them and can vouch for their credentials. However, as a committee, it seems as if they are a group of individuals who, as well intentioned as they might be, have no constituency of their own. Except for possibly one or two, most of them do not represent a local membership, most of them are not involved in leading or in coordinating activities or communities here in Mill Hill, most of them do not claim to represent any other residents other than their own personal point of view, etc. As a result, I find it difficult to understand how the committee can claim to speak for the residents of Mill Hill and make decisions on their behalf. At the very heart of our democratic system lies the principle of representation and I feel that this committee lacks that very important ingredient. I feel that before any organisation comes forward to speak for the residents of Mill Hill, it should first invest more time and effort to ensure that it is much more fully representative in the makeup of its committee. So, for example the Chair of the Preservation Society should be officially on the committee, the Chairs of the Residents Association and of the Friends of Mill Hill Park are not on 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Council also has concerns about the Forum Committee and the absence of groups representing Mill Hill residents. The Forum is expected to be representative of the community. A Forum has to be inclusive in order to succeed. 2) The Council recognises the concerns on the proposed Constitution and has advised the applicant to seek third party help from Locality. Support is available for making a successful application for designation of Neighbourhood Areas and Forums 3) The remit of the Forum is to produce a Neighbourhood Plan. As an unincorporated body there are limits on its handling of any grant funding. The Forum will not be handling substantial amounts of public money. Any CIL generated by development in the Neighbourhood Area will be managed by the Council. An adopted Neighbourhood Plan can set out priorities for how this should be spent. The legal remit of the Forum ceases once the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted. 4) Planning Committee noted the issues of safeguarding when considering the application for re-designation July 2019. The issue of safeguarding has been highlighted as an element of the request for support from Locality. The message on focusing on Plan production and staying within the limit of what a Forum can do was clearly expressed in the refusal to re-designate the 2014 Forum. Neighbourhood Forums should not be diverted from producing Neighbourhood Plans. Other groups in Mill Hill should be capable of organising events such as markets or festivals and commenting on planning applications. The Council have sought clarification on what the applicant has done to reach out to the wider community of Mill Hill and Hale. Data held by the Forum should follow the data protection principles set out in the Data Protection Act 2018
-------------------------	--	---

	<p>the committee, the Chair or Heads of the Services Club and of Rotary, The Copthall Strategy Group, the leaders of the various faith groups, more governors and heads of our local schools, the Chair of the NW7Hub, etc. There are so many groupings that have legitimate membership of their own and can legitimately speak for their members who are blatantly absent from this committee that it is hard to understand how the current group of individuals on the committee can claim to speak for the residents of Mill Hill and create a plan in their name and manage public funds in their name without the participating of the heads and leaders of these groups on the committee. From my discussions with a number of heads of local groups in Mill Hill, most of them have not been approached by the current Forum with an invite to join the committee. I think more work needs to be done here before this group of individuals can legitimately claim to speak for the people of Mill Hill.</p> <p>2. The Forum does not seem to be a fully democratic organisation. In Clause 3.11 it states that "An Extraordinary General Meeting may be called by decision of the Committee on a majority vote." Why are only committee members entitled to call an EGM? Why not a reasonable number of members? To me this is a very fundamental issue of democracy. The membership of any organisation must remain sovereign and its committee is, and must always be, fully accountable to its members. I understand that there was an issue about a year ago where members demanded to call an EGM to hold the Forum's committee to account and, from what I understand, the committee ignored this constitutional right of its members. Could this be why this clause was amended to make it impossible for members to have control over their own committee if they feel that they have legitimate concerns? However, this strikes at the very heart of a democratically run organisation and is a very worrying attempt to block a very basic democratic right. On a related matter, in Clause 6.1 it states that "Amendments to the body of this Constitution will be by a majority decision of the Committee". Here again, why only committee members? Are the Forum members not able to change the constitution of their own organisation? Again, the constitution of a body that claims to speak for and act on behalf of the residents of Mill Hill needs to enshrine the principle that the members are always sovereign, not the committee. On another matter, in Clause 3.21, it states that "Committee Members will be expected to show that their comments and actions at Committee Meetings and outside, are in line with decisions taken and supported by the Committee" I find it extremely worrying that a committee member is not allowed to disagree with decisions made by the committee? Our MPs in parliament are expected to argue their case passionately and we expect them to disagree if they feel strongly about matters. This is what we call Democracy. So why should the Forum's committee members not be allowed to disagree at Committee Meetings (which is exactly the place where open and free discussions should be taking place before any decisions are made). Further to that, why should any committee member not be able to report back to his or her constituency or to the Mill Hill public at large to voice concerns about any decisions made by the committee if they feel strongly about any matters. This kind of gagging order of committee members is simply not democratic in nature and I don't understand why the Forum is trying so hard to muzzle its committee members. What is it trying to hide? In Clause 3.20, it states that "Members may be excluded from continuing their membership of the Forum or from acting on the Forum Committee or Topic Groups for conduct and behaviour... which does not promote the purpose and objectives of the group ... Exclusion of members will be at the discretion of the Committee, by a majority vote at a quorate Forum Committee meeting." Here again, one must be</p>	
--	--	--

very careful that someone who passionately disagrees and stands his or her ground does not fall foul of this Clause. It is too easy to demonise dissenters and carry out a witch hunt. To protect dissenters from becoming victims to this Clause, I suggest enabling an external appeal process (or appeal to the members at an EGM, that can be called by the members) to provide a reasonable procedure of checks and balances on this matter. Also, the exclusion period should be limited to a reasonable period of time (1 year?), not indefinitely. On other matter relating to being democratically run, the constitution mentions the concept of an AGM but does not specifically state that an AGM must be held every 12 months. I think this is a very important omission that needs to be rectified.

3. The Forum does not seem to operate in an open and transparent manner. There are a number of issues that I noticed in the constitution that are of concern to me. Money Matters: The first relates to money matters. As the management of the CIL is a matter of managing public monies that will affect all the residents of Mill Hill, it is extremely important that financial accountability and financial transparency be impeccable. I understand that, despite numerous requests from various sources and also after the committee explicitly decided to complete and publish its finances (see its own Minutes), it still has failed to publish its financial report. With this in mind and noting that they have the same Treasurer in place for the new Forum, I fail to understand how we can trust the Forum to manage such large amounts of our public money properly. I think simply stating that they will do so is not enough reassurance as they have claimed this in the past but failed (or refused) to provide such accounting of their finances to date. In Clause 3.18, the states: "The Treasurer will maintain accounts for the Forum even though this is not a statutory requirement and present them in summary form at the AGM."

Specifically because of the Forum's terrible record of being financially accountable in the past and because they have kept the same Treasurer who clearly was not able (or refused) to provide full and robust financial control and reporting in the past, I think it is crucial for financial matters to be much more transparent and that full details be kept in the public domain at all times, not just a summary once a year. This way we can all see what is happening at all times to "our money". I don't see any reason to hide this information from the residents of Mill Hill.

Further, in clause 3.19, the constitution states that: "The Secretary will keep a Register of Committee Members' Interests detailing any financial interests in the Area or any other interest which could be deemed to have an influence on decisions likely to come before the Committee. The Register of Interests will be held by the Secretary and updated as necessary as a private document. It may be shared with the Council if requested with appropriate rationale." Here again, why a private document and why such secrecy? There is no reason for secrecy when it comes to anything to do with managing public funds. If any committee member has "secret" interests that might affect the decision making process, then maybe they should not be on the committee that represents such public interest in the first place. Here again it feels that they are trying to hide something and this is very worrying and does not inspire trust.

Confidentiality- The next issue of concern is that of confidentiality. In Clause 3.9 it states that "...the content of Committee Meetings, can by its nature, be confidential and may only be released more widely, once its confidential status has been removed. Committee members may not release, discuss, review the content of a Committee Meeting, other than with other Committee members, until such time as they are released without their confidential rating"

Again, why the secrecy? Surely nothing relating to the managing of our Neighbourhood Plan and nothing relating to the way the CIL is managed on behalf of the residents should be kept in secret for any reason? Here again, this does not inspire trust in the Forum or its management of our local affairs and finances. On the contrary, as the entire point is to manage the plan and manage the CIL on behalf of the residents and for the residents, it then follows that open and free discussion and publication of any committee discussions should be actively and freely promoted and encouraged at all times, so that residents and members can have the opportunity to be fully aware of, and participate in the decision making process. Here again, we must remember the notion that the membership is sovereign and the committee merely serves it membership. So, why the insistence of secrecy?

4. Other General Matters of Concern - **Safeguarding Issues** - I understand that one of the reasons why the Councillors were told to distance themselves from the old Forum in the past and one of the arguments cited by the Council when it refused to redesignate the old Forum last year was that there were serious safeguarding concerns relating to the John Gillet, the past Chair. I note that, while the past Chair is now not officially on the committee, he is still very much involved as a consultant. He is still extremely close to the decision making process and I note that his wife is on the committee. While this might be technically a different leadership, this kind of technical manipulation and trickery does not inspire trust from the people. We all know what is going on and this is not really a new Forum with a new leadership. It feels more like a veneer to cover up the old guard who are still controlling the Forum. Also, there are still a number of committee members from the last Forum. We must remember that the previous committee members should be held responsible for the safeguarding issues too. In the old Forum, they did not do anything to resolve the concerns of the residents on this matter. However, a number of them are still on the new committee. Why have they not resigned?

Again, trust is a huge factor and, for the Neighbourhood Plan to be accepted by the people in the referendum, it is important to ensure that the new committee is seen to be new and not tainted by past safeguarding issues and other concerns.

Focus on the Plan - Another of the comments raised by the Council when it decided not to redesignate the old Forum last year was that the Forum seems to lose focus on its primary objective of creating the Neighbourhood Plan. Looking at the last published Minutes of the Forum (which I believe was after the decision by the Council last year) I note that they are still thinking of getting involved in other matters such as the French Market, etc. I really don't understand why they continue to insist on getting involved with other community matters? Surely that is what the Mill Hill Residents Association is there for? The Forum's only reason for being set up in the first place was to create and manage the Neighbourhood Plan – and nothing else. It seems that they are not listening and I am not convinced that they will fall foul once again of trying to be everything to everyone, when this is not the reason for their existence.

Representations from the Public. - In the current set of documentation submitted by the “new” Forum, it claims to have canvassed the opinions of all the residents to understand what they want. If this is indeed a “new” Forum, as they claim, then I think it is a gross misrepresentation and very misleading to claim in their new application that they have reached out to the residents. This was many years ago and part of the old Forum - not the new Forum. This gives a false impression that they represent the current wishes of the people as part of the current application process.

	<p>Membership - In their application they also state that they have 3000 Facebook followers and 650 subscribers. However, again, this is for the old Forum and if they are claiming to be a new organisation with a new legal status, then it would be a serious breach of GDPR to claim this data for the new Forum and claim it is the property of the new Forum. These kind of manipulative claims again point to an intent to mislead and misinform and, importantly, break GDPR laws. Is this the kind of organisation that should be in control of so much public money?</p> <p>CONCLUSION: While I am very supportive of the Neighbourhood Plan and of an organisation that will move this forwards for the residents of Mill Hill, I personally feel that this new Forum in its current form and with its current committee, its current lack of representation of the residents it claims to want to serve, and it's current constitution is simply not yet ready to take on such an important task and has not demonstrated that it has the capability to be the voice of the residents of Mill Hill or the ability to manage the Plan or public monies in a way that represents the community, builds trust and unites our community here in Mill Hill.</p> <p>I feel that the Forum should withdraw its current application and start a real discussion with resident groups and properly address the issues above it is wishes to be designated to carry out such an important role in our community.] Failing that, I urge the Council to reject its application for designation.</p>	
<p>Councillor Val Duschinsky Mill Hill ward</p>	<p>I would like to register some of my concerns about the re-designation application for the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum. After the resignation of a number of the committee members (including myself) it is clear that six of the original members have now been joined on the committee by their partners so there are now six married couples including the partners of Stuart Kershaw and John Gillett. It is very concerning that the committee has not reached out to the wider community to include representatives from the various Residents' committees and faith organisations who have many members committed to working for the improvement of Mill Hill. Another concern is to do with the lack of transparency as far as the finances of the forum are concerned. This is a particular worry where, if there were to be designation and referendum approval, the Forum would be entitled to have access to a percentage of the community infrastructure levy (CIL) funds and to determine how these were spent.</p> <p>A further concern is to do with safeguarding where the then chairman showed poor judgement in not taking potential safeguarding issues seriously which led to the Mill Hill and Hale councillors resigning from the committee following advice from Governance. Although he has nominally stepped back it is understood that the former chairman continues to lead the Forum committee.</p>	<p>The Forum Committee has not sufficiently demonstrated that it has reached out to residents and other bodies that are active in Mill Hill. It is disappointing that in one of the largest Neighbourhood Areas in London some households have two representatives on the Forum Committee.</p> <p>The Forum will not be handling substantial amounts of public money. Any CIL generated by development in the Neighbourhood Area will be managed by the Council. An adopted Neighbourhood Plan can set out priorities for how this should be spent. The legal remit of the Forum ceases once the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted.</p> <p>Planning Committee noted the issues of safeguarding when considering the application for re-designation July 2019. The issue of safeguarding has been highlighted as an element of the request for support from Locality.</p>

<p>Mill Hill Preservation Society</p>	<p>As a stakeholder with an interest in the Mill Hill and Hale area, we have been aware of the work of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum since its inception in 2014. The Society has been involved in all the consultation processes in the development of the Area Action Plan (AAP) and we considered this process worthwhile. Indeed the Society was saddened when the initial request for re-designation was refused, but we did understand and appreciate the reasons given following due consideration by the Council. We were also aware that at that time the draft plan, 80% complete, had been submitted to the LBB for comment. Our Planning Group does agree in principle that MHPS should support this new application, so that all the good work put in by the previous forum is not wasted. In the spirit of this opinion we have examined the three documents submitted with this new application for designation and we wish to register some concerns. The first MHNF did become side-tracked, by local planning issues rather than concentrating on the production of the actual plan and if granted designation this time they must stay absolutely focussed to produce the Local Plan. We note that in the documentation the map of the MHNF area includes Mill Hill East and Hale Ward lying within NW7. We presume when the proposed boundary changes come into effect in 2022 the proposed map will be changed and from the documents we are not sure whether these changes will become relevant. The Society does not know what powers the Council has to suggest changes to the documents, especially the Constitution, but we wish to add a few comments on this aspect. Clause 3.9 covers the issue of minutes, and it implies that if there is a confidential item discussed then the minutes should not be made public. Surely, the confidential element could be redacted, or included in an separate addendum, so the remainder could be published. Previously an EGM could be called by 30 members of the Forum; this has now changed and can only be called by the committee itself, which limits its accountability to its membership. With this in mind, a public meeting needs to be held shortly after designation to authorize and elect committee members rather than waiting up to 12 months for an AGM. Similarly we wish to emphasise the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The Forum should prioritise the development of the draft Neighbourhood Plan above all other activities · The Forum should publish a programme for preparing the draft Neighbourhood Plan and provide an annual review of progress · The Forum should publish proposals for actively consulting with the community including regular public meetings to discuss the draft Neighbourhood Plan · Meeting minutes and annual accounts should be published on the forum website within one month of a meeting (see our comment above concerning 'confidentiality') · For transparency annual accounts should note all sources of income and payments to advisors, consultants and so forth <p>With all these points in mind, the Society does feel that a Neighbourhood Forum that actually produces the Neighbourhood Plan for Mill Hill would be an attribute to the locality and as such MHPS supports the designation of the Neighbourhood Forum in this new guise. However, the points we have made above are serious and we do not know whether the Council has the power to make the designation 'conditional'.</p>	<p>The Council notes the support of MHPS for the Forum but would expect MHPS to be part of the Forum Committee and to have had a more active role in the preparation of this application including the Constitution and the production of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is disappointing that this opportunity has been missed.</p> <p>The geographic area of the proposed Neighbourhood Area has been set with reference to current ward boundaries. If there is a future application for a Forum it could have regard to the ward boundary changes in 2022.</p> <p>The express purpose of the Forum is to produce a Neighbourhood Plan and engage with the local community to contribute to the production of a Plan. Commenting on planning applications is a role that can be performed by other groups in Mill Hill</p> <p>The Council expects Forums to be managed in a way that promotes good governance and transparency. It recognises the concerns on the proposed Constitution and has advised the applicant to seek third party help from Locality. Support is available for making a successful application for designation of Neighbourhood Areas and Forums</p>
---------------------------------------	--	---

Local Resident 5	I am extremely worried by the lack of due diligence done in selecting the new forum. I feel that before a forum is selected, clear investigations as to who the forum is and how they operate should be looked into. This has not been done. As a resident of Mill Hill, the monies given over to the forum are for the good of Mill Hill and residents' views should be represented. Therefore a broad spectrum of members should be on the forum to air different points. I am worried that the forum does not have a true representation of Mill Hill residents. Before any decision is made, Barnet Council must take action to protect the people who live in Mill Hill from a forum that does not represent the residents of Mill Hill; a single parent might have a different view from a retired couple. I hope that the council look into this matter with urgency and understand the importance of having a forum that has fair representation.	The Forum Committee has not sufficiently demonstrated that it has reached out to residents and other bodies that are active in Mill Hill. It is disappointing that in one of the largest Neighbourhood Areas in London some households have two representatives on the Forum Committee. The Forum will not be handling substantial amounts of public money. Any CIL generated by development in the Neighbourhood Area will be managed by the Council. An adopted Neighbourhood Plan can set out priorities for how this should be spent. The legal remit of the Forum ceases once the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted.
Local Resident 6 – NW7 4BY	I have written to you earlier to propose that the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum application for re-designation should be rejected. I have been made aware today that several residents have been sent messages by the so-called Mill Hill Traders group operating on Twitter in which they are being threatened with police action unless they withdraw their objections to the re designation of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum. I myself have been targeted by one the associated twitter accounts, as attached. These attacks on well regarded members of the community are not acceptable and I urge you therefore to reject the re-designation of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum.	Neighbourhood Plans need to support community cohesion. Concerns about threats on social media should be reported to the Metropolitan Police.
Local Resident 7 – NW7 2LR	I have been made aware that having been disbanded for incompetence, the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum is about to be re-commissioned. And that it is those same incompetents (including a convicted paedophile) who are set to reconvene. They do not speak for the majority of residents of Mill Hill. They silence all dissenters. They can not be allowed, to put it politely, to fail the people of Mill Hill again. They were supposed to draw a plan for redevelopments. They did not. And now this once beautiful, green suburb has been raped by developers. And no-one has stopped them.	The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum
Local Resident 8	The old one should never have been closed down as was a phenomenal non political group that achieved remarkable things for the good of everyone in this area. Please ensure the new one is formed as soon as possible	The Council notes your support. The reasons for why the previous Forum was not re-designated were set out in the report to Planning Committee in July 2019.
Local Resident 9	Yes to the new mhnf	The Council notes your concise expression of support.
Local Resident 10	I have been made aware of a new campaign to re-establish the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum. I fully support this as I live in Mill Hill and want us residents to have a platform to enable the network of local people to voice their opinions and concerns.	The Council notes your support.
Local Resident 11	I would I would like to declare my interest in MHNf being able to continue. I am a mill hill resident	The Council notes your support.

Local Resident 12 – NW7 3LY	As a resident of Mill Hill, I support the establishment of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum.	The Council notes your support.
Local Resident and business owner 13	I support the excellent application for a Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum as being fully representative of our community in which I've lived/worked since 1987. It is essential for the democratic process that they are allowed to present the residents with a Neighbourhood Plan on which we can have a democratic vote. I have full confidence in the extremely talented committee which includes senior figures from our NW7hub and largest organisation Saracens. Please make this happen for residents. Thank you.	The Council notes your support.
Local Resident 14 – NW7 4LE	The old one should never have been closed down as it was a phenomenal non political group that achieved remarkable things for the good of everyone in this area. Please ensure the new one is formed as soon as possible.	The Council notes your support. The reasons for why the previous Forum was not re-designated were set out in the report to Planning Committee in July 2019.
Local Resident 15	I am a resident of Mill Hill and it has been brought to my attention that a NEW forum has been established which will has a lot of say as to where monies are spent in Mill Hill. I am very uncomfortable about the NEW Forum as I believe that this Forum has basically taken over from the old forum, using the old Forum's data, and not establishing anything new. Opinions, views, ideas that the new forum claim they have researched and canvassed seem to be untruthful. The information that they are using is from the old Forum and this is worrying. The information is out of date and probably not as relevant to the situation today. The current views are out of date and it my eyes the new Forum is not working for Mill Hill as they have not put effort into compelling new information that would help the community. I cannot trust a forum that is doesn't display update, relevant information, in a clear and transparent manner. Please can you look into this immediately as I do not want them to represent Mill Hill.	The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum
Highways England	Having examined the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Plan Area and Forum Designation Application documents, we are satisfied that its policies will not materially affect the safety, reliability and / or operation of the SRN (the tests set out in DfT C2/13 para's 9 & 10 and MHCLG NPPF para 109). Accordingly, Highways England does not offer any comments on the consultation at this time.	Noted

<p>Local Resident 16 – NW7 2RL</p>	<p>I am writing you to express my concern regarding the appointed "Mill Hill Forum Committee" to manage part of the funds coming from planning applications. This money should be spent in transparency and in open discussion with the people of Mill Hill. This doesn't seem to be the case and I'd like to explain you why. In Clause 3.9 it states that committee members can't speak about the matters discussed in a meeting until they are made public. I wonder why meeting notes aren't made public immediately? This is government's money, we as residents have the right to know why and how it is spent without further ado. In clause 3.21 it says that committee members are expected to act in line with the decisions made by the committee. It's worrying that they can't disagree and express their free will isn't it? The new Forum, as it was set up as new legal entity by the Council last year, says it has reached out to the people of Mill Hill to understand what they want. I live in Mill Hill for 7 years and I can't recall any attempted contact by the Forum. I do recall an attempt 5 years ago but that was the old Forum. Why are they lying? So I'd like to conclude that although I'm in big favour of a committee that is responsible for Mill Hill's neighbourhood plan, I am very worried about the secretive nature of the "new" Forum and I'd like to object against it's power to use "our" government money without us having a proper say.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money and the Constitution.</p> <p>The Forum is not a legal entity until the Council decides to designate it.</p>
<p>Local Resident 17</p>	<p>I heard from a neighbour that the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum is planning to spend our government monies without full transparency and I don't agree with that. They seem to be almost like a Freemason organisation that isn't allowed to talk about what happened in their meetings... full of secrecy! And they have private documents about their finances that are not necessarily published. Not good! And so I read up on them and I read that Barnet Council decided to set up a new Forum last year, so it's a new legal entity, but the old chairman Mr Gillet is still attending all committee meetings and very close to the decision making. Him having such fingers in the pie just doesn't reflect a new entity at all. There are loads of other points I could make, these are a few highlights, but I just want to bring this to your attention... it really worries me and I'd like to object to this "new" (old?) Forum and how this organisation works. It doesn't represent me and us as people of Mill Hill.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money and the Constitution.</p> <p>The Forum is not a legal entity until the Council decides to designate it.</p>
<p>Local Resident 18</p>	<p>I simply can't believe that this group of people on the Forum have the nerve to try to pull the wool over our eyes so blatantly. What is even more unbelievable that you guys at LBB actually seem to be taking the Forum's application seriously. Are you really so terribly naive, am I the only one that sees what is really going on and sees the misleading information they are giving us and the way they are twisting the truth and the blatant attempt to keep us all quiet. Have you seen their disgraceful constitution that keeps everything hidden and secret and gags committee members from talking to anyone outside the committee and refuses to let members have any real control of their own organisation.? Also no matter what they say, this John Gillette fellow is clearly still in control of what goes on. Why is he still there? We are still very worried for our children and can't understand why you are allowing him to continue to attend Forum meetings and run the Forum. Why is he allowed to have any status at all, let alone still have so much control and sway over the Forum Special Consultant???? You have got to be kidding!!!! Can't you guys see this? Please don't let this happen. I trust that you won't be fooled by these people and allow it through. In case this is not clear, I very much object.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum</p>

<p>Local Resident 19 – NW7 1LJ</p>	<p>I am a life-long resident of Mill Hill and I am aware that the organisation "Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum" is applying for a legal mandate to formally take responsibility for The Mill Hill Neighbourhood Plan and management of significant public funds. I share with other residents various concerns about the Forum and the way it is organised. The concerns I have are relating to constitution and management of the organisation - it appears to be an opaque and closed-off, autocratic organisation which does not fit in with the democratic values which should be used to govern public funds and long-term planning matters. Secondly I am concerned about the way that the Forum engages with the wider community and other important community organisations. The forum has not engaged well with other groups such as the Mill Hill Residents Association (of which I am a member), Mill Hill Preservation Society or any of the local faith groups. In fact I have heard of the Forum actively stifling debate and discussion on local matters. As a tax payer and local resident I feel strongly that if local funds are given by the Council to any other organisation for appropriation, then that organisation must be properly managed in a transparent and accountable fashion. If no such organisation exists then the council should retain all spending powers. Therefore I urge you to reject the application for designation from this organisation.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money and the Constitution.</p>
<p>Local Resident 20</p>	<p>I'd like to submit my objection to the designation of the applicants as the new Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum. It was with great sadness that I watched the previous Forum collapse in ignominy and bitter recriminations. I was excited to hear that a new group was forming to take up the challenge, but my pleasure quickly turned to fear when I read the proposed constitution and also when I realised that this group was really the old group all over again, not really a new one at all. Instead of taking the opportunity to learn from their past mistakes, this document indicates that the new committee wants to make sure that they cannot possibly be held accountable by the people they claim to represent. They have written a confidentiality clause into their constitution that makes all committee matters confidential by default. Such an overt rejection of the principle of transparency is guaranteed to set the tone and style for yet another Forum that will eventually fail again like the last one. Also, they have clauses that hide their financial matters and only allow a summary to be published once a year at AGM. Here too a rejection of the principle of transparency. Do they forget that this is not private membership money but public money and much more transparency is called for. I strongly urge the Council not to set us up for another failed Neighbourhood Forum. Last time this failure caused a rupture in our community and I fear that the same is about to happen again.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money and the Constitution..</p>

Local Resident 21	<p>I felt compelled to comment on the designation of the forum to say how dismayed I feel with the form of the proposed new Neighbourhood Forum in Mill Hill will take if successful..</p> <p>I run the social media group called Inside Mill Hill, we have nearly 9000 members, we like honest and constructive debates which may not always be what we feel but it is a social media Forum, and unless people have been rude and or abusive they remain free to join discussions. , the "new " forum is basically the same as the old forum in terms of the censorship applied to anyone who does not agree with their view. We have seen what they are like with a post from the new Chair. and responses from "The Author" this weekend just past, they attacked anyone who disagreed with their views, not just generically but personally attacked a school governor, business owner and resident, as she dared to question them. This is not what I would expect from a body that is supposed to represent the people of Mill Hill, I feel that there is no one on the committee that represents disabled people, no representation from unemployed, although the law does not permit anyone to ask ones sexual preference they actually have stated that their representation is from "both gender", how can this be a fair organisation without a balanced range of residents, this is a direct contradiction of the due regard that needs to be paid to those identified in the Equality Act 2010. If the officer or members are in any doubt about this being a fair comment , consider this, either the committee had the draft Constitution circulated and did not comment of this status or the agreed constitution was written and submitted by the Chair and or the consultant. Either way this is a poor example of Neighbourhood representation or an assurance that they even understand the demographics of the area upon which they propose to write a plan to mould the future of the area. Despite evidence to say that in July 2019, that the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum chair had severed all ties with regards to concerns to safeguarding, many still remain. For example, only today the official MHNF page was engaging with the same person who was the centre of concern yet gagged voices who are as entitled to engage as the next.</p>	Neighbourhood Plans need to support community cohesion. Concerns about threats on social media should be reported to the Metropolitan Police.
Local Resident 22	<p>I am writing to you as a long-time, passionate and caring resident of Mill Hill, NW7, and am writing to formally object to the current actions and the current membership of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum as they attempt to re-apply for designation to Barnet Council. I note letters of objection need to be submitted by 6th May, so was keen to put "pen to paper" before this deadline passes. Calling themselves a "new " Forum is misleading, with only 50% of its current 24 members being "new", but this only scratches the surface of my objection. I believe that this Group are attempting to take responsibility for the Neighbourhood Plan, on what I regard are immoral and unlawful grounds. There is much harm that can result from this, but above all the opportunity for this Group to irresponsibly manage large amounts of public funds- in our name. I will try and keep my objections brief and concise. Firstly, I do not believe this Forum speaks on behalf of the wider Mill Hill Community. Surely any "local committee" needs to be representative of its local populous? Surely, any "local committee" must formally report in an accountable, democratic manner. From a financial and moral perspective, any organisation must not only be formed democratically but must also be accountable to its local residents. Transparency of all operational procedures and transparency of any decision making are both key-this is not something I see with the proposed make-up of the Forum.</p> <p>Most of the current constituent committee members are individuals who don't speak for the residents of Mill Hill - they do not represent a local membership-this may not be intentional of course but many of the Group do not coordinate local activities. Most are on the Forum Committee</p>	The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution.

	<p>as individuals in their own right, and not correctly appointed to speak for the people of Mill Hill. Without wishing to over labour the above, a group of individuals is a group of individuals and I think this needs to be appraised further before this Forum can legitimately claim to speak for the residents of Mill Hill. Having looked through their constitution there is much that concerns me. Public monies are managed through the Forum, but as touched on above, it appears there is little or no financial transparency. Having spoken to other local NW7 residents, I am told by many that no financial reports have ever been published. This is local public money we are talking about; money coming from our own resident's pockets. Accounting of any finances in any organisation is paramount-it's the same in any local neighbourhood forum. While I am all pro the Neighbourhood Plan and will always support a local organisation that will move matters forward on behalf of Mill Hill residents, I believe that this "new" Forum in its current set up is not fit for purpose. I do not believe they echo the voice of Mill Hillians, nor can seemingly manage our money in a fair and representative way.</p> <p>I am writing to you to therefore urge Barnet Council to reject the formal application for designation from this particular group of individuals.</p>	
Local Resident 23	<p>I am writing with regard to the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Area Forum Designation Applications consultation and the application made by the 'New Mill Hill Neighbourhood Area Forum' and wish to object to the acceptance of their proposals. The application has been made largely by the existing committee members that were previously authorised by the Council to be responsible for the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Development Plans and that had that duty rescinded by the council planning committee in 2019 namely the original Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum. As a local resident I have become aware of this application and having read their proposed constitution I was quite surprised as until recently I was unaware that they existed and for the past 18 years I was unaware that this committee represented me and other local residents and businesses to the Council. Reading through their constitution I would comment on the sections as follows :-</p> <p>1.1 Membership of MHNF is open to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • residents living in the Area, either as individual members or via representative bodies such as those outlined below; • local businesses and public sector bodies based in the Area. • individuals who work in the Area; • Mill Hill and Hale Ward Councillors within the London Borough of Barnet. <p>Members must register on our Website to show their interest in our activities in order to gain voting rights and to receive our regular bulletins. All correspondence within the Forum shall primarily be by email. For those who cannot register on our Website, they or a representative can send an email to millhill_nf@btinternet.com to include their instructions requesting that we add them to our register of people interested in the work of the Forum. This email must include a valid return email address which will be used for all correspondence. Their full name and postal code must be included (to verify they are a resident or business owner in the Area) together with a contact telephone number. There is no mechanism in place to advise of the existence of and the activities in place or planned by the Forum, therefore many local residents and businesses are unaware of their existence and have no input to the Forum and its projects. The projects that the Forum are and have been involved in are those that are chosen by and voted upon by committee members . Clearly any benefit to local residents and businesses are decided by the committee and</p>	The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to inclusivity and the Constitution.

	<p>shows that the forum is not run in a democratic manner. 5.2 MHNF will seek to consult as widely as possible with all residents across NW7 and with business owners in the Area to determine their views and will attempt to reach consensus in our Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>There is no evidence to show that this has taken place over the past 5 years + of the current committee and no apparent plan or mechanism to believe this lack of consultation with local residents and businesses will change under the new forum</p> <p>5.5MHNF will encourage all interested residents and all representative groupings of residents or businesses in the Area to become members of MHNF and to work alongside MHNF to further their joint objectives.</p> <p>As with the previous point there has been a total lack of consultation by the existing committee locally and no mechanism in place to gain consultation, therefore the forum not only doesn't speak for local businesses and residents but I also note that the affiliate groups/societies listed have no inclusion and no vote. Having looked at the history of the forum and its application for the 'New forum', there are many grey areas as to how this committee has been run in the past that cause me concern not least of which is the Council raising safeguarding issues and the loss of focus on its primary objective of creating the neighbourhood plan both of which question the make up of the new committee , a large percentage of who were on the old committee and did not deal with these issues. In addition, there is little inclusion and consultation with local residents and businesses by this organisation who are charged with representing them, there has been no financial reporting and the minutes of meetings have been sparse and late being prepared. There is nothing to demonstrate that the applicants will run the forum any differently. My view is that this application should be refused and that a committee should be elected of new members with a clear plan to consult and engage with local residents and businesses, create a clear neighbourhood plan that is shared and includes local residents and businesses views and will be open about their plans and actions at all times.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>Barnet Cycling Campaign</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of the Barnet Cycling Campaign (BCC), affiliated to the London Cycling Campaign (LCC), regarding the application to designate the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum (MHNF) a local Neighbourhood Forum. BCC does not believe that the MHNF should be designated, and consequently object to the application. To put the objection in context, please note the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The MHNF website states that: "While principally addressing planning matters, we will consider these within the context of demands for...transportation (including parking)...paying attention to reducing our carbon footprint, notably around Mill Hill Broadway Town Centre." (http://millhillforum.org.uk/nw7/) 2. The MHNF states on their website that the Neighbourhood Development Plan is 90% complete (http://millhillforum.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Pres-for-SK.v5.2.pdf) 3. The MHNF constitution states that the Neighbourhood Development Plan will "express aspirations for the future development of traffic and transport serving or passing through the Area" BCC believes that these statements are directly contradictory and unachievable. The links between traffic development and pollution are well proven, and any organisation "aspiring" to develop traffic will not succeed in reducing the carbon footprint. BCC has seen first hand the approach that the MHNF takes to active travel and low carbon transport. The response to the Pentavia Park planning application made on behalf of the MHNF clearly stated that the organisation thought there were not enough car parking spaces. In public meetings, evidenced by the minutes and presentations on the organisation's website, the idea that residents of the site would want to cycle were constantly mocked. The MHNF claims to be "not another talking shop", however they are not open to new ideas and would risk entrenching one of the largest post code areas of London in a transport strategy that is outdated and not fit for purpose. <p>For these reasons, the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum cannot be allowed to be designated.</p>	<p>The express purpose of the Forum is to produce a Neighbourhood Plan and engage with the local community to contribute to the production of a Plan. Involvement in non-planning matters is a role that can be performed by other groups in Mill Hill</p>
<p>Local Resident 24 – NW7 2LE</p>	<p>As a resident of Mill Hill, I wish to convey my objection to the designation of the Forum. I am concerned about the undemocratic manner in which decisions are being made within the Forum. Notably, this committee has no constituency or membership in the community of its own, yet wants to control a significant amount of public funds. Also of note is that they still have not published any accounts regarding past spending, which is crucial for establishing trust between residents and the Forum. Furthermore, in its current form, I feel that the Forum is not able to represent Mill Hill residents like me to have a say in matters relating to the NP and the CIL especially since existing local groups have not been invited to be part of the proceedings and are not allowed to have any vote in any decisions. I don't see how the Forum can represent us, residents, without ongoing consultation and constructive cooperation with any of the other Mill Hill groups. Also, I note that Forum members are not allowed to summon an EGM or even amend the constitution. If we wish to have a body that speaks in our name, then we must begin a broader inclusive conversation with residents to form a constitutional framework that is open and that conducts itself in a fully democratic way and with transparency to all the residents of Mill Hill at all times.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution.</p>

Local Resident 25	<p>I am a resident and active member of the Millbrook Park community and have begun establishing the Millbrook Park Resident's Association. It has been brought to my attention that the application for a new Mill Hill Neighbourhood Area and Forum designation was requested by John Gillett and others. The main concern for myself and community is the actual safeguarding issues in the former forum which were ill handled and ultimately led to the need to reform itself as is seen now. Millbrook Park is a large and growing community within Mill Hill that has many new families and safeguarding should always be at the forefront of all forums with appropriate protocol in handling and never tolerated. It is my understanding from the below response that occurred that the safeguarding issues were not handled appropriately and have only led to a new version of the old forum. The chair of the old forum continues to obviously represent the forum and therefore I can have little trust that the safeguarding issues will not repeat itself. As a father of three young boys, this is of utmost concern and should cause concern from the council to allow time for others to apply or make sure that these safeguarding policies are appropriately in place. Next, having a quick read of the constitution, it does not seem to truly represent the community of Mill Hill as the voice of Mill Hill is ultimately silenced by lack of voting rights. This is important in order for any forum to use any public monies according to what the whole of Mill Hill deems a priority since previous spending did not seem to act in the greater interest of Mill Hill. Thanks for allowing our objections and hope you take them seriously</p>	<p>The Council would expect the new community of Millbrook Park to be represented in the Forum</p> <p>Planning Committee noted the issues of safeguarding when considering the application for re-designation July 2019. The issue of safeguarding has been highlighted as an element of the request for support from Locality.</p> <p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to inclusivity and the Constitution.</p>
Local Resident 26	<p>I object to the designation of the new Forum. Mainly because it convened this time without reaching out to residents to find out what it is they want from a neighbourhood plan and not conducting themselves with transparency. I feel that anybody seeking to speak in the residents' name, and especially to manage funds on their behalf, should be open for scrutiny. As this is not the case with the current Forum I am unsure how wise it will be to continue supporting the new Forum in its current assembly.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution.</p>
Local Resident 27 – NW7 2RA	<p>Please find below my response to the Mill Hill Area Forum Designation Applications consultation in my capacity as a Mill Hill resident.</p> <p>Representing the broad Mill Hill Community</p> <p>The Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum Constitution states at paragraph 1.3 that it will aim for “as wide a representation of communities in the area as possible”. I do not know most of the Committee members and it is not clear from the documents submitted which, if any, Mill Hill communities are represented by most of them. Various affiliated bodies that do represent Mill Hill communities are listed in Appendix 2 but the Committee members do not seem to be associated with these affiliated bodies and the affiliated bodies have no voice as they have no vote. If Mill Hill residents are to be represented broadly in the way envisaged by the Constitution, it seems to me that representatives of the affiliated bodies, and other community organisations in Mill Hill, should be Committee members or it should be made clear what parts of the community the Committee members listed represent. I note from the postcodes of the Committee members that a large number, 9, I think, seem to live close to each other on and around The Ridgeway. To be properly representative of Mill Hill, membership of the Committee needs to be more widely spread around Mill Hill.</p> <p>The Constitution</p> <p>In my view there are some weaknesses in the Constitution. The Constitution provides for the Committee to be voted in at the AGM, with one vote for “each member present”, which I assume is</p>	<p>The Council would welcome participation from Copthall School in a Neighbourhood Forum for Mill Hill</p> <p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution.</p>

each Forum member present (although this is not explicit in the document). Given that any resident of Mill Hill can be a Forum member, it is good, and appropriate, that Forum members vote for the Committee members so they can vote for those people they believe best represent their interests. However, I was surprised to read that the Constitution allows for the Committee to co-opt an uncapped number of additional voting members to the Committee without approval of the Forum members (paragraph 3.7) and that there appears to be no mechanism for Forum members to remove Committee members. This could result in Committee decisions being made by people not voted for by Forum members. I was surprised to read that the quorum for Committee meetings is only seven - one third of the minimum number of Committee members. The Constitution does not state what decisions can be made by a quorum of just seven, what decisions have to be decided by the whole Committee and what decisions have to be put to the Forum members. In my view, this is an omission and, again, could result in important decisions being in the hands of people who are not, or have not been voted for by, Forum members. The way the Constitution is currently drafted means that a group of seven people, co-opted by the initial committee and so not voted for by the Forum members, could be making all the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum decisions on behalf of Mill Hill residents and be responsible for a large sum of money. Given that some of the committee members live at the same address as each other, the control of the Neighbourhood Forum could, in fact, rest in the hands of even fewer households. This would clearly not be representative of the whole of the Mill Hill community. An omission from the Constitution is an obligation for the Committee to report regularly to Forum members. I note the Committee says it has had a number of meetings since September 2019 but I could not find the minutes on their website. I note also that Forum members cannot call an EGM. If the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum is to be accountable to the residents of Mill Hill then regular (more than once a year) reporting must take place with opportunities for Forum members to question, challenge and hold to account Committee members, and Forum members need the right to call EGMs. I was confused by paragraph 3.21. I understand that Committee members must abide by democratic decisions taken by the Committee but this paragraph seems to imply that Committee members cannot say if they have disagreed with any decision or action by the Committee. Disagreement is important and necessary for the democratic process so hopefully the intent of this paragraph was not to silence dissenting members! I suggest that this clause is re-worded.

Contact with Mill Hill Residents

The Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum says it has sent out a structured questionnaire and leaflets to residents. I could, of course, have missed these but I don't recall seeing a questionnaire or leaflet or notice of meeting. Neither do I recall seeing a request for new committee members. Given that I am a Chair of Governors of a local school, and so represent an important part of the community, it would have been nice to at least be asked if I, or another representative of the school, would like to join the new Committee. In conclusion, I am concerned that the current committee does not properly represent the interests of a broad spectrum of the Mill Hill community, that weaknesses in the Constitution mean that too much power can end up with too few people and that there is a lack of accountability. I urge the Council to reject the application until the rectifications I have identified have been made.

<p>Local Resident 28</p>	<p>In the Council's own comments Appendix 4 – Responses and representations Report when you refused to redesignate the Forum last time, the Council stated a number of times: "We expect Forums to be managed in a way that promotes good governance and transparency enabling the local community to be engaged and able to contribute to the production of a Neighbourhood Plan. Such plans can only succeed as the products of joint working and co-operation." The new Forum constitution shows that the issues of good governance have not been dealt with in any way. On the contrary, based on the new constitution, it is now actually less democratic and less open and less transparent than it was before. Also, the new Forum has also still not addressed the issue of no real engagement from the other main community bodies in Mill Hill. The Forum has no official representation from the broad range of residents groups in the community and actually bans any of them from having a vote in the making of the plan.</p> <p>Also, not only did they refuse giving other local groups a real voice but a few days ago I saw how the Neighbourhood Forum publicly attacked Wendy Kravetz on their Facebook page for disagreeing that the Forum should be given the designation. This is her right but they were very offensive to her in public and threatened her. Amongst other points, Stuart Kershaw himself said that her arguments reminded him of the conspiracy theory link between 5G and the Corona virus. This was a very disrespectful comment. They then allowed Mark Richards (is he not the "safeguarding issue?") and other "supporters of the Forum" to make more attacks on her on the Forum's Facebook page. They not only attacked and threatened her but also other residents but, from what Wendy said, they blocked her from defending herself in public. It felt as if the Forum does not like or support free speech and open conversations. I see that the post has now been deleted but there has been no public apology to Wendy or to the residents that they claim to represent, and no public comment from the Forum about allowing its own members to attack the democratic fabric of our society on the Forum's own Facebook page. Not only does his kind of vicious behaviour strike fear in me but if you look at the secrecy clauses in their constitution and look at how members are not allowed to change their constitution and how members are not allowed to demand an EGM and how other organisations in Mill Hill are not allowed a vote and how everything about handling money is also kept secret and you put all of that together, you get an organisation that should strike fear in all of us. I understood that one of the important objectives of neighbourhood planning is to bring community together by working together on the plans. From what I am seeing, this new Forum is not set up to bring the groups together. On the contrary, it is banning them from having a vote, keeping all matters secret from the residents and then openly threatening them when they dare to disagree.</p> <p>My last point is about protecting our children. I see in the document above mention of the safeguarding issues and how, as a result, "the 5 Cllrs listed as members of the Committee will not participate within the Forum until this issue of safeguarding is resolved". I see that 50% of the committee that should be responsible for any and all safeguarding issues are still on the new Forum committee. I see that the previous Chair (John Gillett), who must also take responsibility for not properly addressing safeguarding issues is still very involved in the new Forum as a consultant. All these people from the last Forum should not be allowed anywhere near the new Forum. They did not make any real stand to protect our children last time and so should not be allowed to take a position of public responsibility this time. The safeguarding issue is still around and we need a committee who will put our children's safety above anything else and am very worried that the</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution.</p> <p>It is disappointing that the Forum has not absorbed the Council's message on good governance and transparency.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans need to support community cohesion. Concerns about threats on social media should be reported to the Metropolitan Police.</p> <p>Planning Committee noted the issues of safeguarding when considering the application for re-designation July 2019. The issue of safeguarding has been highlighted as an element of the request for support from Locality.</p>
--------------------------	---	---

	<p>Council will allow these same people with the same bad safeguarding record to have such a public role in our community again. God forbid anything should happen to any of our children in the future, I don't want the Council to say that they did not know or did not have suspicions. The Council must not allow this risk in our community.</p> <p>I absolutely object to this kind of group being given any mandate at all in the name of the residents of Mill Hill. Instead of bring this community together, they will strike fear in it and tear it apart and not protect our children.</p>	
<p>Councillor Gabriel Rozenberg</p> <p>Garden Suburb ward</p>	<p>I write in connection with the need to set up a Neighbourhood Forum for Mill Hill that would draw up a neighbourhood plan. One of our activists, Richard Logue, who lives in Mill Hill, has raised with me a range of significant concerns that he has with both the constitutional structure of the proposed 'Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum', as set out by Stuart Kershaw and John Gillett, and the behaviour of certain individuals closely linked to that group. Richard's comments (see below) speak for themselves. There is a lack of transparency and a lack of inclusivity. Furthermore there is a pattern of harassment which it appears the leaders of the proposed Forum have failed to properly distance themselves from. Can I ask therefore, on behalf of the Liberal Democrats Group, that you reject the application by Mr Kershaw and Mr Gillett. You will see that Richard is working with other likeminded residents to try to set up an alternative forum which would operate on the basis of openness and inclusivity. While this group should of course also be considered on its merits, I hope that you could be in contact with Richard directly (he is cc'd) to help him submit an acceptable alternative bid for the designation.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution. These have addressed the issues raised by Mr Logue.</p> <p>Planning Committee can only determine the application in front of it.</p>
<p>Local Resident 29</p>	<p>I was wondering if any of you noticed what happened on the weekend before last in April. One of our residents, Wendy Kravetz, put her thoughts about the Forum on the Inside Mil Hill Facebook group and the Forums' own Facebook page then started to attack her in a very mean. It was really frightening so see a group like this, that tells us that they want to speak for all of us and make this plan for the residents, make such a horrible attack on a concerned resident who was just exercising her right to speak her mind. I understand that she was really intimidated and that she took down her objections from Facebook because of this bullying. ? How dare they act like this and cause such fear! What next? This is really worrying. I do not want these people to represent me in any way. I am Disabled and have learning Difficulties. I signed to stop them from ruining the area because they dont care about people like me.</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plans need to support community cohesion. Concerns about threats on social media should be reported to the Metropolitan Police.</p>

Local Resident 30	<p>There are several reasons why I object to the designation of the above group as the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum, but the one that I wish to focus on is one that raises the highest level of concern, not just for Mill Hill but sets a similar dangerous precedent for other such designations across Barnet. The constitution submitted with this application contains a number of elements that are very undemocratic and worrying to see enshrined in writing. This Forum wants to make decisions for the public and, with this public role it makes me extremely concerned to see so much stress on confidentiality at the expense of the spirit of transparency that one should expect from our public representatives. The clauses relating to confidentiality in this constitution create opportunities for exploitation. Any wrongdoing or inappropriate acts can be hidden with this broad brush approach to confidentiality. Whilst I do not suggest that the current applicants have any intentions of abusing their positions, they have created a constitution that leaves a wide door open for any committee (current or future) to hide inappropriate behaviour and generally hide things from us, the public. I ask the Council not to agree to a group that promotes secrecy above transparency. To endorse this group is to undermine the commitment of the Council itself to the democratic spirit.</p>	<p>The Council expects Forums to be managed in a way that promotes good governance and transparency enabling the local community to be engaged and able to contribute to the production of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Local Resident 31	<p>Thank you for your email. The documentation reassures me that the proposed new Committee will be focussed and diligent. I support the designation of the MHNF if it meets the following :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It focusses on its key objective, that is to create a plan which is a true reflection of the views of the residents in the NW7 postcode. Consultation is very important . 2. It is transparent in terms of minutes and financial accounting (including any restricted grants), publishing meeting agendas ,minutes and end of year accounts. 3. Equipment which has been purchased by the MHNF or donated to the MHNF is listed in an inventory for public scrutiny. 4. If the committee uses its position to comment on planning applications, it is the agreed decision of the committee. Decisions are recorded. 5. Projects which do not deliver the MHNF plan are not a priority. 6. Policies and procedures (eg Child Protection, GDPR, Risk Assessments) ensure the committee operates in a safe and responsible manner. 7. Appointment /dismissal/ resignation of members of the committee are carried out in accordance with MHNF constitution. <p>The MHNF is very much about the future, other local organisations deal with the current and preserving the past. It is vital that the Forum works hard to ensure this is its primary focus.</p>	<p>This support is noted</p>
Local Business Pond Life at Finchley Nurseries	<p>With regards to the proposal for re designation of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood forum to draw up a Mill Hill Neighbourhood plan. I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to this proposal. Does the previous Chairman remain "hands on"? The minutes from their last meeting make it clear that there were serious issues regarding CRB checks . Their Facebook site states that 50% are the same members as it's previous incarnation. Have all of these matters been addressed? Could the constitution allow four married couples on the committee to form a quorum and force through decisions concerning thousands of people in Mill Hill?</p> <p>I don't believe the "new" Forum to be representative of Mill Hill. As a business owner, Pond Life at Finchley Nurseries on Burtonhole Lane, we are suffering major negative impacts from Barratts arrival in Mill Hill, including unannounced explosions, traffic congestion, dust migration and run off from the recent toxic NIMR/Ridgeway Views development. I am thus especially concerned by any potential relationship between any committee members and local developers, particularly Barratts</p>	<p>The Council expect Forums to be managed in a way that promotes good governance and transparency enabling the local community to be engaged and able to contribute to the production of a Neighbourhood Plan. This includes clarifications about finance.</p> <p>Planning Committee noted the issues of safeguarding when considering the application for re-designation July 2019. The issue of safeguarding has been highlighted as an element of the request for support from Locality.</p>

	<p>London. There could be a conflict of interest. Was the Forum or “unofficially” associated publications paid in any by Barratts and for what services? I have been told that this is not the case, however, they claim on their Facebook page to have brought £274K of investment into the area. Are there accounts? I asked the question regarding any Barratts funding on their Facebook page only to be “trolled” by a third party, something about “fake news” and conspiracy theories. Check their Facebook site for the full transcript.</p> <p>If the organisation has been sponsored by Saracens in the past, should any of the new committee members work for them? They have submitted several planning applications affecting Green Belt and sites of importance. Again a possible conflict of interest with Mill Hill’s residents already acting as generally unwitting bankers for this multi-million pound organisation recently relegated for twice wage-cap “cheating”. I had never heard of many of these proposed committee members. On what grounds have are they claiming legitimacy to represent people? The former chair and deputy chair of the Forum was elected at a public meeting of Mill Hill residents. It seems this requirement has been dispensed with. They certainly do not speak on behalf of myself nor my family. Please reject this proposal..</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plans need to support community cohesion. Concerns about threats on social media should be reported to the Metropolitan Police.</p>
<p>Local Resident 32 – NW7 2DW</p>	<p>I am writing to object to the designation of the proposed Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum as it currently stands.</p> <p>The Past Forum Wasn't Effective When I first heard about the MHNF a few years ago I was excited, an NDP sounded like a great idea. I joined up and started attending the monthly meetings. I soon realised there was no governance and no direction, just a small group of people pushing their own goals. While the old forum was effective in some ways and some good came of it (the pocket park, Salcombe gardens, the Markets) it absolutely missed it's mark (the NDP) and - most worryingly - was neither transparent, honest nor democratic. I eventually left to join other Mill Hill organisations when I realised even my meagre opinions weren't welcomed.</p> <p>This forum is not new I do support a Neighbourhood Forum but I cannot support this one. They're claiming to be "new" yet they're 50% the same people and still guided by the same leaders. I have no reason to believe this incarnation will be any different from the last.</p> <p>However the one currently proposed does not have the support of the neighbourhood, does not have a good past track record or - even if we believe their claims to be "new" - do not have a good first impression. Their aggression and cult-like tactics of a handful of friends on social media are a scary view into how they intend to work in future. Their Quorum is too small I am concerned that the forum constitution says only 7 members are needed for a quorum, combined with the lack of transparency the forum is showing this is open to abuse. This forum will divide, not unite, Mill Hill Accepting this designation will lead to division and tension within the area it is proposing to unify. This forum cannot accomplish their goals simply because they're not interested in hearing other points of view. They've inherited and created too much bad blood to be effective. I want a Forum, just not this one. I would urge you please to reject this designation, as much as I want to have a Neighbourhood Forum this is not the right group. This designation needs to be rejected to give us residents time to sort this mess out and come back to you with a more united organisation. To give the MHNF a chance to properly regenerate, truly open up to the community, take criticism on board, advertise to get new members involved and hold open nominations for key positions. Or to let a new group do the same. Either way, the next MHNF must have the support of its residents to be able to succeed where the current one has failed.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution.</p> <p>The express purpose of the Forum is to produce a Neighbourhood Plan and engage with the local community to contribute to the production of a Plan. Involvement in non-planning matters is a role that can be performed by other groups in Mill Hill</p>

<p>Local Resident 33 – NW7 2LR</p>	<p>I am a resident of Mill Hill and have read the MHNF's application, and its supporting documentation, to be designated by the Council as our local neighbourhood forum.</p> <p>General Views: The "old" MHNF has done much valuable work demonstrating the hard work of a number of volunteers, which is to be commended. However, having studied the application documents, I consider the "new" Forum needs to make some significant changes before it is ready to be designated as the neighbourhood forum for Mill Hill under the relevant statutory powers. I have the following reservations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the new body needs to demonstrate that it has a solid membership comprised of local people. Their rules for becoming a member need to be less restrictive and the voting rights of members need to be enhanced as part of a wider initiative to recruit significantly more members. • it also needs to be seen to engage far more with local community organisations (including charities working locally) who could help the Forum to obtain views from those in our local community who are disadvantaged for whatever reason, or are simply hard to reach. Again such organisations are unlikely to engage unless they are given a realistic opportunity to influence matters. Affiliate organisations should not be confined to those with a direct interest/expertise in development planning, housing provision etc. but extend to the community leaders who are in touch with significant sections of our local population and are able to represent their views directly to the Forum. <p>Apart from these general comments about the application, my strongest concerns relate to the "new constitution" attached as part of the application. There are a number of drafting issues relating to the constitution, not all of which I include in my comments below. My view is that the application should be put on hold while the Council's lawyers look at the constitution, if this has not already been done. But if the new MHFM is unable or unwilling to amend its constitution in key respects then the application should regretfully not be approved.</p> <p>Comments on the new constitution:</p> <p>Clause 3.1: This clause limits membership applications to applications made on the MHNF's website or to applications made by email by the individual or someone acting on her or his behalf. The process would be a good deal more accessible for many people who are not "wired up" if applications could be made by post or delivered to a specific address in the locality.</p> <p>Clause 3.2 and Appendix 2: I understand that the listed affiliate organisations can be added to by the Committee but there are many more community organisations within our area who are capable of giving a wider range of views of sections of the population who do not engage with any of those selected organisations. It is provided too that affiliate organisations are members but are not able to vote. For many organisations, this would might well deter them from engaging with MHNF if they had no prospect of influencing decisions.</p> <p>Clause 3.3: It is provided that the AGM should elect "at least 21 Committee members". It would surely be wiser to amend this to "up to 21 Committee Members"? On present drafting, if the AGM fails to elect 21 Committee members presumably the organisation is unable to have a functioning committee. And if it can elect any number greater than 21 members, this would seem to be open to abuse. There is after all provision to co-opt members too.</p> <p>Clause 3.9: This is a drafting point only but I do wonder if the word "Committee" has been omitted where it should appear immediately after the word "Forum".</p> <p>Clause 3.11: The constitution only enables the Committee to call an AGM. This seems undesirably</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution.</p>
------------------------------------	---	---

	<p>autocratic. It would be more normal in a membership organisation to provide that a specified minimum number of members can call an EGM. There would then be an added notice process to enable this to happen.</p> <p>Clause 3.13: Notices should be sent to the member's last known postal address if no email has been registered.</p> <p>Clause 3.18: It would be useful precaution for an independent person to certify the final accounts as prepared by the Treasurer.</p> <p>Clauses 3.19 and 3.23: How personal and business interests are dealt with is critical. There should be a requirement on members to declare an interest at the start of any meeting and for that member to absent themselves from the meeting for the relevant item. I see no reason why the register should not be public.</p> <p>Clause 3.21: The provision that committee members are required not to make comments etc at Committee meetings or outside unless they are in line with decisions taken and supported by the Committee, is both draconian and unworkable. This should be deleted.</p> <p>Clause 6.1: It is unusual and unacceptable in the case of a membership organisation for a committee alone to be able to amend the constitution. Such amendments should need to be authorised at a general meeting at which they are approved by two thirds of the members present and voting.</p> <p>Conclusion: For the above reasons I object to this application if appropriate amendments to the constitution prove not to be possible.</p>	
Local Business	<p>I am objecting to this Neighbourhood Forum not because I dislike their ideas but because I do not believe that the people in the Forum are representative of Mill Hill. Although I appreciate that this is a new forum, 50% of the members are still the same and the old chairman is an advisor. I live and work in Mill Hill and have made an effort to be a part of the community including joining the Forum for a while. While I was a part of the Forum, most of our time was spent fighting planning applications rather than working on the Neighbourhood Development plan and so I decided to use my time for more productive community-focused initiatives and so left the forum. As part of my work and social life I have had a lot of dealings with the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum and unfortunately I have to object to this new Forum as I can already see the warning signs of the new Forum being the same. The way the Forum is run is purely from entitlement. They expect everyone, residents and businesses alike, to do and want everything the Forum wants with no discussion and no explanation. They assume they have support, rather than earning it by building relationships. From what I have seen of the new Forum, they have not learnt from the previous Forum and are repeating the same mistakes by not keeping residents informed or giving them the opportunity to take part. I have been in countless situations with certain members of the old Forum which have left me feeling angry at the way it is being run again, nothing seems to have changed with the new Forum as I am still witnessing threatening and excluding comments being made to residents then deleted so no one else can witness this. This includes the following interactions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being shouted at on the Broadway for not having bought an advert in the Mill Hill Guide (even though we had, in fact bought one!) Again, the new Forum is misleading the public into saying the Guide was printed last October when in fact it wasn't printed, it was only published online and won't be printed until June this year. Something that local traders were not made aware of when paying for their advert in the Guide. 	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution.</p> <p>The express purpose of the Forum is to produce a Neighbourhood Plan and engage with the local community to contribute to the production of a Plan. Involvement in non-planning matters such as producing the Neighbourhood Guide is a role that can be performed by other groups in Mill Hill</p> <p>The Council would expect representation of the NW7Hub in a Neighbourhood Forum for Mill Hill</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offering the Forum a discounted rate for our services and then not being paid as they thought it's something we should do for free and on another occasion being told that we should not expect them to pay a deposit. This highlights their sense of entitlement and assumed support. • As a local trader, I went to their Traders Association meeting and was the only one to attend who was an actual trader. The day following this unsuccessful meeting the neighbourhood was telling locals that money raised from the Neighbourhood Guide would go to the Traders Association which at the time was non-existent and has never progressed. • I have also seen the Neighbourhood Forum deny that certain members of the public are working with them on certain projects despite that person being sent to represent the forum when doing business with me. I have only once mentioned this when I saw it online and my comment was immediately deleted by the new Forum. • The Neighbourhood Forum used to be very involved with our local NW7hub charity, the chairman of the Forum was closely linked to the two, however since they had a falling out, the Forum has done it's utmost not to support the NW7hub without any explanation to the public. It's OK for people to have differences of opinion and to part ways, but it's not acceptable to act like children about it while claiming to have Mill Hill's best interests at heart. <p>Before writing this objection, I appealed to the Neighbourhood Forum's Facebook page explaining my previous issues and asking them to acknowledge what had changed with the new forum by way of trying to see the good they would bring to Mill Hill. Instead of replying to my comment, they instead chose to persecute a separate local accusing and threatening them and their business as well as lying to protect the previous forum. I then saw all their comments and the local resident's comments deleted in real time. This shows that the new Forum is still only representative of the people it has selected as its members rather than representative of all Mill Hill residents. I'm sorry but our old and new Forum is tainted, there was and still is no accountability for their actions/decisions, it does not represent the majority of Mill Hill despite their supposed changes and most importantly – while it's heart may be in the right place it's head is not open to other opinions. I'm not denying that the Forum achieved certain positive things for Mill Hill but the way this was done was not in the professional way I would expect.</p> <p>I appreciate that this objection may come across as overly personal but to me it is. I love Mill Hill and a Forum could be an amazing thing for us but the way that it is and has been run is not in sync with what a Forum should be achieving. I appreciate that this does not apply to the majority of committee members but there is a small force that has and still is overpowering those that do have Mill Hill's best intentions.</p> <p>To conclude my main issues with this Forum are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of transparency with Mill Hill residents as to who is involved and how decisions are made • Failing to get the opinion of the locals when making decisions • Misleading locals by not allowing those who disagree with them to have a voice. 	
--	--

Local Resident 34	<p>In response to the Consultation regarding the current application for designation as the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum, I would like to submit a formal objection. .The previous Forum was marred by practices that were divisive, intimidating and contrary to the spirit of an inclusive community organisation. Based on the details of the constitution for the proposed replacement group and based on the behaviour of the new leadership, it seems that sadly this Forum will proceed in the same manner as its predecessor. The previous Forum stifled any dissent or disagreement with the leadership in an aggressive and undemocratic manner. This proposed group has demonstrated that they intend to perpetuate this approach. Only a couple of weeks ago a Mill Hill resident published her objections to the proposed constitution. She was maligned publicly in a way that can only be described as hysterical, personal and malicious. These tactics ultimately succeeded in pressuring her to retract her objection. This bullying was not addressed by the Forum applicants who allowed the conversation to happen in their official Facebook page. When they finally and belatedly removed the thread, no apology was offered nor was any comment made to demonstrate that such behaviour was not endorsed by them.</p> <p>A leadership with such poor judgement and lack of sensitivity towards the members of the community that it claims to represent is not what we need or deserve in Mill Hill. My worry is that these applicants are taking the same approach to disagreement and debate as their predecessors – only this time they are institutionalising it in their constitution. It states that members cannot call an EGM; that any dissenting members can be dismissed from the committee without right of appeal; and that all committee discussions must be kept secret....</p> <p>I note that half the applicants on this proposed committee were members of the previous committee. In light of this I would expect to see a proposal that reflects an attempt to address the issues that led to the former Forum's demise. Consequently I would expect to see measures enshrined in their constitution to guarantee transparency in all matters, to protect the community, and to provide the community members with a safe space for discussion and difference of opinion. Instead I see a constitution that seeks, above all, to make sure that the leadership cannot be challenged by anyone or by any organisation. Without doubt the applicants have learned from their mistakes: it's just that they've learned the wrong lessons. Rather than providing a Forum that will reflect the wide range of opinions and interests in Mill Hill, they are proposing a Forum that will protect their own committee leadership from any dissent – internal or external – and from any public scrutiny. I implore the Council to proceed with great caution before endorsing this application. It bears all the hallmarks of a Forum that will be as ineffective and damaging as the previous one. Mill Hill residents do not need or deserve to be represented in this way.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans need to support community cohesion. Concerns about threats on social media should be reported to the Metropolitan Police.</p>
-------------------	---	--

Local Resident 35	<p>I am writing to you regarding the plan to implement the new Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum. The current group of people proposed to take this position are, as far as I am concerned, not a good representation of the views of the community in Mill Hill. I have lived here my whole life (over 30 years) and have yet to speak to one local person who is in support of this group. They have used bullying and intimidation tactics towards anyone that has remotely disagreed with their own opinions and have even gone as far to slander local business' and individual local people. As well as this they have unduly censored the free speech of those who have spoken against them, deleting posts on social media of those whose views do not match their own, and then taken what can only be described as revenge by posting public messages about these individual and their business'. If they cannot listen and respect different opinions of those in the local community now, I can not see how they could possibly be given the power and responsibility to do this on a wider scale. I know these views are unfortunately not just mine, and many others locally feel the same. Please consider these thoroughly and seriously when making the final decision.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans need to support community cohesion. Concerns about threats on social media should be reported to the Metropolitan Police.</p>
Local Resident 36	<p>I wish to object to the application for a new Forum, I think the Council should refuse the current application for designation of the MHNF. There are a lot of reasons including lots of problems in their really bad constitution. One question that is high on my mind is that it does not look like any of the other groups in Mill Hill are part of this thing at all and in my reading of the paperwork, I reckon that the Forum is trying not to have them involved in any way? Am I right? I don't see any of them on the committee and actually in the constitution it says that none of the other groups can have any vote. This seems wrong as this is meant to be a group community thing, no? they then said that they had people on the committee that were on other committee . That doesn't mean they speak for them officially, no official endorsement.</p> <p>I wonder if these groups were not really invited to join or if they refused to join. It does not matter which because if they are not part and parcel of this plan then I can't really see how this plan will be the product of the voices of our community, so it misses the whole point of the plan. Also, I was a signature for the stuff related to the past Chair and the past committee. There was some child protection problems, as well as other poor management. I see that 50% of them are still there. I also see that the past Chair is still running things? I don't think that is right. The Council is meant to be protecting our kids, not letting the same people cause the same problems and put our kids in danger again. It seems that the only person that is allowed free reign to comment on their Facebook page is an account known to be a "former" associate of the Forum and was paid to do some work . This cannot be right.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity, safeguarding and the Constitution.</p>

<p>Local Resident 37 – NW7 4DY</p>	<p>I would like to express my concern about the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum application, which I believe is being taken in to consideration by Barnet Council in the near future. I am a resident of Mill Hill and my husband has a dental business on Daws Lane NW7. A neighbourhood forum would be most welcome by us and we would support a new committee.</p> <p>However, looking at the history of this committee and it's recent application, it inspires me with little or no confidence. The main body of people involved has not changed from the last committee, which was withdrawn by the Council at the time. At that time the forum did not manage to do what it was set up to do - they did not come up with a Neighbourhood plan. I would be concerned that the same thing will happen this time. I don't know how this current group was set up or who voted for the committee - there appears to be a clear lack of transparency in this group and the minutes of their meetings. The committee doesn't not appear to have a wide range of subgroup involvement. I see nobody representing the different schools and only one person representing one faith group. Mill Hill has numerous state and independent schools within the borough and encompasses many different faith groups which should all be clearly represented. I have never received any communication from the MHNF - not as a resident nor as a local business owner. All the information I have has been from my own research and the discussions on social media, where there appears to be a 'war' between the proposed MHNF and anyone who doesn't necessarily agree with them. I get the distinct impression that the new forum is not happy with anyone who doesn't agree with them. They are naming and shaming people who dare to question them and their motives. I have been observing this from a quiet distance and find it very disturbing to say the least. To think that these people would be in charge of 'community relations' and of distributing local funds would be quite a scary thought. I would be hopeful that the council will do more research in to the background and motives and make up of this group of people who pretend to have the best interest of us local Mill Hillians at heart.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans need to support community cohesion. Concerns about threats on social media should be reported to the Metropolitan Police.</p>
------------------------------------	--	--

<p>Local Resident 38 – NW7 2RE</p>	<p>Having carefully researched and discussed with active members of the local community, the current role and activities of the above named group, I would like to raise my objections to them being given another five years in this role.</p> <p>The reasons for the objections are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This group did not meet its objective of creating a neighbourhood development plan during the five years it was give to do this. • The group has failed to meet other objectives it has outlined such as establishing a Traders Association. • The 'new' group consists of 50% of the old group, and is still strongly influenced and led by the old groups previous chairman. • The group lacks transparency about its membership, decision making processes and use of public and private money. • Many objections have been raised locally about the conduct of members and associates of this group and their conduct in public and on social media. • The group has a limited public profile in Mill Hill in terms of activity contributing to the neighbourhood or support for organisations acting on behalf of the neighbourhood. For instance throughout the current pandemic and lockdown, NW7 Hub and its associates have been active in the neighbourhood, whereas MHNH have had no visible profile. • The group is not representative of the population of Mill Hill, and does little or nothing to ensure they are engaging with the whole community in order to appropriately represent them. • I do not believe this group has maintained an adequate level of accountability, a proven record of meeting its objectives or an acceptable level of public engagement and support locally to justify giving it the authority to represent the neighbourhood and be trusted with decision making about the future of the area or the use of public money. 	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution.</p>
<p>Local Resident 39 – NW7 3TG</p>	<p>I right in to disagree to the people who will be running mill hill.I have had personal abuse made about me and my business made public on a blog run by these people absolutely disgusting They are taking money for non existent adds on the mill hill guide. John Gillett passed me on to them and now deny all knowledge of knowing them even though I have emails. They work with 0 accountability and immunity. Have multiple account on social media's to troll locals and business and now find out they also have a convicted pedophile on the board. I protest vigoursly in allowing these people to have any power of any thing to do with mill hill.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution. Neighbourhood Plans need to support community cohesion. Concerns about threats on social media should be reported to the Metropolitan Police.</p>
<p>Local Resident 40</p>	<p>I am writing to you as I need to object to this designation. As a long-time resident and member of the Mil Hill Residents' Association (although I speak as an individual in this email) I've been aware for some time now of the existence of the MHNH. From what I understand, 5 years ago the Forum was given local government or taxpayers money to produce the neighbourhood plan for all the residents. As they have been working on this for a long time already, you would therefor expect after 5 years that such a body would by now include a fair section of society, include a large number of local associations on its committee and as part of its DNA by now. However, I don't see evidence of this either in the old Forum or the new Forum – even though a huge number of old committee members are still on the new committee. I find none of the Associations (MHRA, MHPS, Friend of the Park, Good Neighbourhood Scheme, the NW7Hub and more) properly participating on the committee or have any official representatives sitting on the committee. As far as I know</p>	<p>The Council would expect representation of the MHRA, MHPS and NW7Hub amongst others in a Neighbourhood Forum for Mill Hill.</p> <p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution.</p>

	<p>they have not even approached any of these associations. So, for example, I have attended the MHRA meetings for over 9 months already and they have not received any official approach from the new Forum to join them or even to be part of them in any manner or even to endorse the new Forum in any way. Total silence from the Forum. Why have they never officially approached us? I suspect the same is the case for most if not all of the other local associations.</p> <p>Why has this kind of unity and inclusiveness NOT BEEN ACHIEVED YET AFTER 5 YEARS? If these people on the committee could not bring the community properly together by now, WHY ARE THE SAME FAILED COMMITTEE MEMBERS STILL SO INVOLVED WITH THE NEW FORUM? Who actually selects committee members who have voting rights? Who decides if they actually speak for the community? Is the Forum merely a PRIVATE CLUB with the autocratic power to make decisions for us and dispense with our money just as they wish and with no reporting and no scrutiny from outside local sources? I can't believe the Council will agree to something like this. I really feel that these and more questions need to be PROPERLY answered and addressed before the new Forum or any other body is deemed to be credible. From what I understand, there is no legal requirement for a neighbourhood plan right now so best to wait until a better group puts itself forwards – one that demonstrates that it can deliver on even the most basic governance, basic transparency and has the ability (or even makes the effort) to bring different parts of our community together.</p> <p>In the short and medium term, the planning and financial interests of our community can carry on quite well with LBB and our local Councillors representing the ward in the meantime. So no rush. It went wrong last time so this time, let's get it right this time.</p>	
Sury Khatri	<p>I am writing to inform you that I strongly Object to this application for (re-)Designation of this neighbourhood Group which should be refused. Hopefully You will have received submissions from residents / groups etc so I will keep my submission brief. As the then Mill Hill Ward Councillor I was one of the two original sponsors of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood some 7 - 8 years ago. I was then and still am very much in favour of having a Neighbourhood Plan for Mill Hill. In light of all the numerous developments that were springing up in Mill Hill, I truly then believed in the aim to have a code of guidelines for development for Mill Hill (similar to the Millbrook Code for the development of Mill Hill Barracks site). But regretfully because the manner in which the Chairman conducted himself and proceedings and subsequent actions, having lost its primary focus which should have been solely on preparing a Neighbourhood Plan instead of wasting time on focussing on other community matters, I reluctantly had to resign some 5 years or so ago. This was borne out clearly and succinctly in the report to the Planning Committee for its meeting in July 2019 wherein the Committee unanimously supported the Planning Officers recommendation (and with which I wholeheartedly agreed with) to refuse the re-designation of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum. As the re-designation was refused and is legally not existent, why are Officers allowing this group to still be called 'Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum? What is surprising that Planning Officers so soon after this are now entertaining another application from the same group which has been discredited in its operations spanning over 5 years. Because of the manner and conduct of the Chair the group lost its direction and let governance issues go out of the window. Moreover, the same people in the group allowed the issues to continue without any challenge of the Chair. How will this now change? The new application clearly is continuation of the same. They also have lost all credibility with the residents of Mill Hill in whose Name the group supposedly operates.</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity and the Constitution.</p> <p>The absence of elected representatives for Mill Hill and Hale from the Forum is a significant concern for the Council</p>

	<p>What you have been presented with is simply window dressing / a front man with a group largely made of the same members bar a few unrepresentative additions to the list (just to make up the numbers). The previous chair is now a 'consultant' but he is still leading and pulling all the strings behind the scenes - monkey and organ grinder comes to mind. So, with all the issues of the past, how is this meant to show the group in a new light. Does this inspire trust? There is no evidence to suggest that this will change.</p> <p>Isn't it telling that none of the Ward Councillors are included? I understand that they are not supportive of this application. Should not that in itself carry weight?</p> <p>In Appendix 4 to the July 2019 Committee paper it clearly set out the negative comments of how the group conducted itself over some 5 years - I from personal experience as well as the former Ward Councillor and resident wholly endorsed these and would strongly urge you to give much weight to these in your current deliberations on this application as the current application fails on all these issues.</p> <p>The application fails as follows: The Group does not represent and speak for residents of Mill Hill. There has been no attempt made to be inclusive of voluntary bodies / groups and association and, simply put, there needs to be wholesale changes in Committee membership so as to be more representatives of Mill Hill residents. The application and supporting documentation and constitution show that the group is a 'closed shop', not a fully democratic organisation nor will operate in an open and transparent manner, e.g. in the constitution it states that the local groups that truly represent Mill Hill residents can only be affiliate members and would not have a vote on any matters. Why? Is this democracy? It already lacked previously and will now be even less so. Instead of learning and building on the issues (e.g. good governance etc.) raised at the Planning Committee meeting, the application from the group and as constituted has gone in the reverse direction - making it wholly unrepresentative of Mill Hill residents. It has put the shutters down on any representations or say from any other groups who are truly representative of Mill Hill residents. The object of a Neighbourhood Plan is to bring the Community together and be inclusive but instead its constitution as set out deliberately to exclude the community representatives and will not broach any input nor involvement of any truly representative groups. Isn't it telling why none of these groups have been approached nor invited to participate? The new forum states that it has reached out to groups but this a patent / blatant lie – no such thing has happened. Members of the proposed group are individuals (largely as before and unrepresentative) and have no credibility and as far as I am aware none of them reflect views of the Mill Hill residents. Moreover, to the contrary it is now going to be actually less democratic, less open and less transparent. When the group was formed some 7 years ago, this was only as a result of the endorsement of the group and election of Officers at a public meeting of Mill Hill residents; who are and will always remain sovereign. Any such group is and should remain at all times and fully subservient and accountable to the Mill Hill residents which it purports to represent. As time went by this fell by the wayside and deliberately side-stepped and became more of a personal fiefdom. There has been no such public meeting of the 'new group' – it has no legitimacy with the Mill Hill residents. As now proposed to be constituted such decisions will be carried out by the 'Committee'.! While I am very supportive of the Neighbourhood Plan and of an organisation that will move this forwards for the residents of Mill Hill, I personally feel that this 'new group' in its current form and with its current committee, its current lack of representation of the residents it claims to want to serve, and its current constitution</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>is simply not yet ready to take on such an important task and has not demonstrated that it has the capability to be the voice of the residents of Mill Hill or the ability to manage the Plan or public monies in a way that represents the community, builds trust and unites our community here in Mill Hill.</p> <p>It is not clear what is the rush to proceed with this. It is not a life and death matter if it is delayed. As I have pointed out to Planning Officers after the July meeting that I have been working with another group to resuscitate the forum, devoid of involvement of the existing persons, and submit our application to take on the work of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and moreover which will be representative of the many residents groups who speak on behalf of Mill Hill residents and be accountable to them.</p> <p>The Officers should not allow this application to proceed and reject this application. This group does not deserve to be given a mandate again having already failed so dismally. It does not give nor lends to give any say to many voluntary groups and associations any say in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan. Instead, Planning Officers should encourage and allow and assist in a new competitive application to be submitted by an alternative group.</p>	
<p>Local Resident 41</p>	<p>I wish the following comments be taken in to consideration.</p> <p>Diversity within the Committee I challenge the Committee's claim that they represent the community at large: "The Committee is independent and representative of the Community at large, since it includes, young, middle & older age groups, of both genders, from different ethnic backgrounds and faiths." This extract is possibly the biggest indicator that the Committee has no claim that they represent the people who live, work, visit, worship or invest in Mill Hill. It would have been helpful if the age range was submitted in clear terms. However, the number of retired members may be able to assist in either the "of an age" group, or those fortunate enough to be able to live independently on a salary index-linked pension. This does not represent the graduates from schools, university or further education college; in other words the over 18's who would want to possibly work, access training, rent or buy in the area. I doubt that any of the people listed are on zero hours contracts. At least one is retired, yet to all intents reads as currently working in the retail sector. They are not the future. It is not enough to counter this by adding that some members have adult children living at home or that both he and his wife are blue badge holders. It is the following voices that need to be heard:</p> <p>Those who moved to London to pursue their career and are wanting to remain in the area where they have established themselves in the community.</p> <p>Those who have lived at home for longer than the average in order to save up to join the housing market, yet cannot quite afford to stay in the area where their parents are.</p> <p>Those who are chasing the limited number of shared ownership and affordable homes, then finding themselves in a situation where it is uneconomical to return to work as childcare isn't affordable on top of their mortgages; and they don't live close enough to be practical for parents to assist with childcare.</p> <p>These are just a few of the voices in the younger age category which Mill Hill needs. The world has changed even before the pandemic and the Committee needs to reflect the future home makers and contributors to the economy.</p> <p>"both genders"</p>	<p>The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity, safeguarding and the Constitution.</p> <p>The requirement for equalities impact assessment needs to be considered on a case by case basis as further proposals for Neighbourhood Development Plans come forward.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans need to support community cohesion. Concerns about threats on social media should be reported to the Metropolitan Police.</p> <p>The express purpose of the Forum is to produce a Neighbourhood Plan and engage with the local community to contribute to the production of a Plan. Involvement in non-planning matters such as organising festivals and markets is a role that can be performed by other groups in Mill Hill</p>

<p>This constitution was circulated to all members for approval, I assume. To submit a document in 2020 that does not even mention sexual orientation preferences or gender identification (LGBT), let alone consider it, must be grounds for the Planning Officer to recommend refusal. It is outrageous and breaches the Equality Act 2010, especially but not limited to, Section 149, and fostering good relations. This replicates the Discrimination Act 2005.</p> <p>As there are no "elderly residents" represented, can this be a safe forum to understand the difficulties which the elderly and indeed isolated residents may have? In fact this single matter triggers the Birmingham City Judgement whereby any decision made by a Local Authority which may impact on the Elderly or Disabled has to take priority, and that priority is high. In the case of the application, it is noted that disability doesn't even feature in the documents submitted for consideration. I cannot even begin to tell you, as a full time carer of an Adult with Learning difficulties, how worrying this is.</p> <p>Nobody from the unemployed sector. And so on.</p> <p>New or Original: Which is it? In 2013/14 the MHNH held statutory public meetings in and around an area which the then un-elected committee proposed to cover. These were held at golf clubs, in halls and other locations. Setting aside the current COVID-19, no such consultation has taken place prior to the pandemic, even though committee meetings have been taking place over the summer/autumn of 2019. So, in reality, relying on a five year old consultation as a remit is demonstration that the New Forum application is, in fact, a re-designation application of one that has already failed. You cannot claim you have consulted when you have not. Same name, same accounts, same email. Again, rather than address this issue using their own platform, the Forum chose to advertise this (Engage Barnet) consultation just one day before the original closing date. This shows that they were not exactly looking for people to engage, and demonstrating that they are open to comments. They have chosen to do the minimum required to promote the Engage Barnet process. How strange, when the whole idea of a forum is to ask the community what they would like to happen to improve day-to-day life in Mill Hill. Fortunately, Barnet had extended the deadline. A key indicator of how the current application and Forum committee is influenced by the former Forum of that same name is this: 30 residents signed a letter formally requesting an Emergency General Meeting, and calling into question the credibility of the then Chair: in other words a vote of no confidence. At least 50% of the current committee failed to respond to the request, which was an important part of the accountability. That same 50%, one would assume, have agreed a new constitution which has eliminated any kind of accountability. Had the EGM been called and the matter resolved, the outcome of the re-designation application might have been very different. In any event they decided to await the outcome of the (Planning Application re-designation) hearing, if post failure minutes are to be believed. Barnet Planning would never accept a report for a planning application that was five years out of date, nor should they now. If this is a new application then the statutory public meetings should have been held. Why weren't they?</p> <p>Finance It is a matter of record that the former Chair, now consultant, claimed at a licensing hearing, that the MHNH published accounts. This was in reply to a question asked by a member</p>	
--	--

of the licensing panel. This is absolutely not the case. To date, no such accounts have ever been published. It is a worry that applications for grants and public money will be made with a proposed constitution that actually makes sure that they have no obligation for accountability. Utterly disgraceful. Who knows what claims could be made? £274k is a lot of money to claim, without any clue as to from what sources it has arrived. The Constitution needs to be able to reassure the public that funding accrued has been applied for via a democratic process.

Governance and accountability The new proposed constitution enables a quorum to add in or remove members as they wish, especially on the 3 in a row attendance rule. What worries me about this, is that they state that they will comment on planning applications. Yet, in as early as February this year, they already commented on at least one such application, without any official remit. They may only meet 4 times a year. Effectively, the committee will not be given the opportunity to discuss, agree, or vote on proposed planning applications or give considered comments, because many applications will fall between the quarterly meetings. This has been cause for concern in the past. The "missing three (meetings) in a row" rule means that actually a member of the committee may only attend once a year; and even then removal is discretionary. The quorum can actually be made up from 4 households as there are 3 married members and one married to the consultant. I am not assuming that spouses have the same view, but in a hurry to get a quorum, the wider committee is obviously at risk of being surplus at times. Another point about which I am unclear is the status of the consultant. It does not appear to be clear within the Constitution, if this consultant is attending meetings (let alone directing them), as there seems to be no allowance for an ex officio to attend. In any event, the privacy clause is only expected from the committee, and a consultant is not a member. Certainly attending and running the meetings does not appear to facilitate this; and minutes posted on the website express the need for the consultant position to have a limited time, yet neglect to discuss how long that term should be.

The forum claims to hold a database that comprises circa 600 people. How is this? The former Forum wrongly sent out an "opt out" email during the GDPR window. Even that was incorrect, as they never held a database which they personally gathered; and/or held records of members who had signed up for email updates. In any event once the Forum closed, the database held should have been destroyed in accordance with the General Database Protection Regulations. Some of the addresses on the database were obtained by copying an accidentally open cc'd email from another group prior to GDPR.

Licensing, events safeguarding With the planning report, it was raised that hanging baskets, markets and bins are all very well, but that wasn't what the job of the forum was. I attended both the licensing meeting and the re-designation planning hearing. What I walked away with from both meetings is how little support in reality this forum has, as it stands. For such a momentous an event as a re-designation to have not one member of the then committee, and just one spouse and one member of public attend, with the Chair, was a true reflection of the actual support the Forum had. Is this any different? This weekend saw an abhorrent retort to a post from a concerned resident. It wasn't by way of reply. It was posted on a censored page, and allowed known fake ID accounts to comment, whilst the person they were attacking was muted along with anyone else who dared to argue for a fair debate. Even if the current chair has no plans to run

markets and festivals, that doesn't mean that the Forum wont take it upon themselves to register the town square and bid to run it . In this event, the use and lease of the square would be at the mercy of the forum and not the discretion of the Local Authority. It also does not stop the MHNF from getting a third party to run them either. Plays on words can often lead to misleading comments . For instance: nowhere within the bundle, is there an official endorsement from any other established organisation; one that holds a constitution. The misleading post on Facebook would have you believe that cross-overs of committees and members of societies mean that they are speaking for or representing that organisation . That is not something that sits comfortably with me and may, at times have the reverse effect of a conflict of interest .

Below are comments from the public including my personal post.

25 April .

I am posting this on Inside Mill Hill as I am one of many people who are unable to comment on the official Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum page. A fellow Mill Hillian posted her objection to the MHNF and felt so passionately that due to COVID 19 many people may have missed the Engage Barnet notice in the local paper inviting us to review and comment on the MHNF application. I too have been looking at this and have very grave concerns that the application, if successful, will have a fundamental influence on everything to do with plans and how the future is shaped in Mill Hill. Wendy Kravetz has had her comments removed and is unable to reply , however the Chair of the proposed Forum has taken it upon himself to respond. With this kind of censorship and lack of right to reply would you honestly want these people deciding on what is best for our area? His right of reply is at the planning meeting to convince the members of the Planning committee that he can lead a fair and open forum. He hasn't exactly publicised the consultation save 1 post . Maybe he doesn't want our opinion. He may argue that at the end of the process everyone can vote to adopt the plan. You will not be able to alter or amend so what they write is what is on offer. The trouble is what Mill Hill needs is a team who will listen. Historically this has not been the case . I have no idea who Tracy is but she made a fair point . My views are my views and no threat from the chair or the traders association who will stop me. We have freedom of speech . If Wendy asks me to take the post down I will . Life is tough enough these days. Of course if you are retired on a pension are you likely to understand the pressures on the rest of the community? Remember you are commenting on the plan submitted not on promises or offers .

Local Resident 42	<p>I write to express my concerns at the application from Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum for designation. My concerns are largely around the negative social media presence of the Forum which calls into question its integrity, professionalism and ability to represent a diverse and deserving community, such is Mill Hill. The disturbing way the Forum is publicised and supported by what appears to be a person (or persons) who is threatening and abusive towards anyone who may have an opposing view, or who may ask for clarification around the Forum's intentions is breathtaking. I was recently, unwittingly, drawn into a nasty social media dispute when I questioned the unprofessional and slanderous nature of a Facebook post by the Forum, where local residents were publicly named and slandered (with such naming and threats being allowed to continue in the post's comments). What concerned me just as much as the actual Facebook post (which was eventually removed after numerous complaints) was the total failure of the Forum to distance itself from such egregious behaviour. In their silence they have condoned the behaviour and I do not believe such a group of people should be given any responsibility for representing the interests of the people of Mill Hill. I have not engaged with the Forum since my unpleasant experience, but I have seen that they continue to be publicised in this unpleasant way, and threats continue to be made publicly. I would be desperately disappointed if the Council felt it could trust such a group to do such an important job and sincerely hope that the council does extensive research to convince themselves of the Forum's worthiness before granting designation.</p>	Neighbourhood Plans need to support community cohesion. Concerns about threats on social media should be reported to the Metropolitan Police over social media is a matter for the police.
Local Resident 43	<p>I write to state my objection to the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Area Forum Designation for a number of reasons, listed below.</p> <p>1) Lack of transparency The Forum have not been open about their intention to go again for designation. There have been no open offers for people of interest to join. In fact, they only publicised the fact they were going for designation the day that the original consultation should have closed. The core group of committee members appears to be similar to the previous forum. This does not fill me with confidence bearing in mind the much documented problems associated with the previous forum.</p> <p>2) Lack of financial controls/ management The treasurer of the new forum is the same as the previous forum. Despite numerous requests, the previous forum refused to produce any financial records. Records only appeared once they were going for the renewal of designation last time. Bearing in mind the potential sums of money that may be available to the forum, should it be designated, this is a serious issue for the Mill Hill community.</p> <p>3) Lack of representation The forum certainly does not represent the wider community. At the core sits the old guard from the previous forum, bolstered by their partners and wives. This also seems to be a clear lack of democracy in play here.</p> <p>I am a Mill Hill resident and I object to this application.</p>	The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity, safeguarding and the Constitution.
Local Resident 44	<p>Please note I am writing to advise my objection to the current application of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Area Forum Designation for the following reasons:</p> <p>Committee Members There appears to be a group of people from the last forum who form the epicentre of the new proposed forum. However their partners are now also committee members. This appears very odd to say the least. I have to ask why. If the key players are the same as previous then I have to question why Barnet Council would grant a designation for a further five years after the group failed to produce a neighbourhood plan in the previous five years. If it takes 8-10 years to produce a neighbourhood plan then I have serious reservations about the</p>	The Council refers to our previous responses on the application for the new Forum with regard to public money, inclusivity, safeguarding and the Constitution.

	<p>competence of the entire proposed forum.</p> <p>Financial Responsibility I understand that should the neighbourhood plan actually be passed then huge sums of money will be paid into the forum. The key players including the treasurer remain the same as previous and it is a matter of public record that the previous forum displayed a clear lack of financial competence. The recipe for misuse of public funds exists and I have grave concerns that this will be the case again.</p> <p>Openness, Transparency and Democracy There has been no open call for local people of interest to join the forum. There has been no promotion of the potential re-designation of the forum. It has all been underhand and is not the proper way a committee claiming to represent the local community would act.</p> <p>The fact that the key committee members are all committee members of the previous forum and are now supported on the committee by their partners/ wives/ husbands etc. This effectively means that a small group of friends hold the balance of votes in any vote that takes place within the forum. This is absolutely UNDEMOCRATIC. No-one has been elected by the local population yet they potentially have the opportunity to manage hundreds of thousands of pounds of public funds. Frankly it's frightening.</p> <p>Representation For the reasons listed above I certainly don't believe this forum is representative of the people within the Mill Hill Community. I confirm that I am writing to advise my objection to the current application of the Mill Hill Neighbourhood Area Forum Designation.</p>	
Local Resident 45	<p>I am writing to oppose the application made by the Neighbourhood forum in Mill Hill. If the past five years is a representation of their work then I certainly don't want a repeat of this as life has become unbearable recently. I have lived in Mill Hill for 20 years and have never seen so much change in a short period of time. The forum don't speak for me and quite frankly can't as they seem to be mainly men as well with financial motivation. I am opposing this application.</p>	<p>Development that has come forward in Mill Hill has been approved by the Council on the basis of Barnet's Local Plan. The application for a Neighbourhood Forum and Area is the first step in producing a Neighbourhood Plan for Mill Hill</p>