

Dulwich Society Executive 531st Meeting Monday 14th September 2020 at 7.30pm via Zoom videoconference

Attendees:

Ian McInnes – Chairman
Kenneth Wolfe – Vice-Chairman (part-time)
Sue Badman – Secretary
Russell Lloyd – Treasurer
Diana McInnes – Membership Secretary
Sub-Committee Chairs:
David Beamish – Trees
Patsy Bramble – Licensing
Bernard Nurse – Local History
Jeremy Prescott – Gardens
David Roberts – Planning and Architecture
Harry Winter – Travel and Environment
Angela Wilkes – Wildlife (part-time)

Brian Green – Journal Editor
Adrian Hill – Committee Member

Apologies: Colin Niven

Declarations of Interest

See Appendix 1. Harry Winter's details have been added.

Minutes of Previous Meeting: The Minutes were agreed and will be signed in due course.

Matters Arising not covered elsewhere:

1. Alastair's Blue Plaque - voting process delayed until January 2021 due to closure of libraries.
2. Our Healthy Streets and Covid Measures - HW has spoken to Laurie Johnston at Safe Routes. As far as we know the school coaches are operating normally via their assigned routes.
3. Meeting Attendance at SRS and other meetings – SB has emailed IMcI and HW about T&E meeting attendance. HW will attend SRS for the Society. The OHS Working Group is not meeting at present.
4. Licensing – Potential new pavement licences in Dulwich Village. PB is in touch with Peter Thickett of Aysgarth Road. The main concern is about disruption from “The Real Greek Restaurant”. PT and two neighbours have concerns about the restaurant not keeping to agreed conditions.
5. Defibrillators – At present nothing new is being done. Many existing and potential new locations are not open to the public at present. There are defibrillators at Bell House, Picture Gallery, Dulwich Park Café and the Village Dentist. We had a list of defibrillator locations on our noticeboard and we ought to consider putting it back. The matter needs further thought. Carry forward for further consideration.

Dulwich Estate – Future of the Scheme of Management Advisory Group

IMCl ran through the proposals for reforming the Dulwich Estate SOM Advisory Group which had emerged from discussions with the new Chair of Trustees, Andreas Köttering. AK is keen to widen representation and diversity of representatives of the AG. The DS itself has been rotating through Dulwich RAs for some time, but AK now wants to formalise this approach. In summary, a reformed AG would comprise 4 resident representatives, of whom two are appointed by the DS from its Executive Committee. IMCl and DR would stand down, at least for now, and two other Exec representatives would be appointed. AK will seek expressions of interest from other RAs across the Estate to fill the other two positions. Appointees should be invited to justify why they should be on the AG. Appointments would be for two years, and initially half the appointees would be for one year. There would continue to be 3 meetings a year.

Discussion:

- Technically the DS is the only consultee, and we should have a majority or at least 50% of the representation.
- Appointees should represent all areas of the Estate, not just the Village, and at least one should be from the modern 60s Estates, and we should ensure there is representation for areas such as Peckarmans Wood.
- For the two RA positions, we would not want to see direct selection of representatives by the Estate; it should be based on inviting applications from suitably qualified residents.
- A representative with financial skills would be sensible given the need to review the accounts at every meeting.
- It was felt that one of the four representatives should be a convenor (possibly one of the DS representatives) and the group should meet separately to discuss their approach, agenda and collation of questions for the meeting.
- The lack of trustees attending a recent AG was regrettable. AK had apologised and was keen to stress that a full complement of trustees would be attending future AGs and would be diverse representatives.

The Executive agreed to the proposals for reformation of the AG in principle subject to seeing how it works. IMCl will continue discussions with AK. IMCl will approach Executive Members individually to ascertain who would be interested in attending the new AG. AK wishes to take the proposals to his trustee group in October and then to the November AG.

Southwark Covid-19 Post Lockdown measures

There was a long discussion about Southwark's Council proposal to add further traffic measures in Dulwich Village, the response of the Dulwich Society, surveying the membership, practical matters relating to the AGM and motions put forward by the Travel & Environment Sub-Committee.

Phase 2 traffic measures and surveying members

Key points and decisions were as follows:

- The council plans to add timed cameras/bus gates on Dulwich Village, Turney, Burbage and Townley roads. There are also planned changes in Melbourne Grove and adjacent roads. The objective of the Village measures is to deter commuters travelling through the Village but with the consequence of restricting residents in affected roads using their cars during the prescribed times.
- The Society has supported Phase 1 of the measures because they were due to Covid-19, were temporary and would be subject to a full review in due course.
- The Society has had some correspondence both for and against from members, feedback in the street has also been varied about the Phase 1 measures. One Dulwich has asked the Society to support the case for a camera at the Dulwich Village junction.
- On Phase 2 BG has picked up that many residents in affected roads are unhappy especially because permits will not be provided. BG also reminded the Executive about an historical case which led to the formation of a rival organisation to the Society due to a poor decision which split the Society membership and felt support for the Phase 2 measures would be a mistake.
- There are risks attached to conducting a survey and it is not a panacea – the Society membership is itself probably not representative of the Dulwich area; we couldn't guarantee to capture views of some of the bordering streets such as Croxted Road, Half Moon Lane; any survey would be a poor relation compared to the wide survey conducted by Southwark Council for Our Healthy Streets; a low turnout would not reflect well on the Society, and we would need to be able to collate results by road to demonstrate capture of results from a wide geographical spread to counter the perception of views just from Dulwich Village.
- There is also a perception amongst some members that had the Society opposed Phase 1, it would not have gone ahead. This perception is false. The Council fully intended to pursue the junction closure regardless of any opposition and the Society's opposition would have made no difference.
- We wrote to the Council in February 2020 to say that wrt OHS we "would be guided by our members" but on reflection this was a meaningless statement and we need to use more precise language to set out our position even if we intend to "sit on the fence".
- There was a discussion about words such as "canvass" and "survey". We use the newsletter to "canvass" opinion, but it is not in anyway scientific. We also rely on our sub-committees to offer advice based on their expert opinions and soundings though the Executive is not always bound to follow the advice.
- There was also a view from AW that this should not be happening in a pandemic and there are other issues in the area which have been ignored by the council such as the S G Smith/Gilkes site which at some point will have an impact on traffic flows.
- Will the change of Cabinet Members have an influence on council traffic decisions? Unlikely.
- **Decisions:**
 - **The Society will not undertake a survey at this stage on the traffic measures.**
 - **We will neither support nor oppose the Phase 2 measures, and publish a statement making it clear that this is due to divided opinions of members.**

Proposal from Member about consulting the membership before making decisions (circulated by IMCI before the meeting)

Does the Dulwich Society agree that, whatever the views of its sub-committees, the Executive Committee should, before presenting an official Society position in public and to Southwark Council, canvass the views of its membership on important local issues that affect the daily lives of its members, particularly Emergency Traffic Orders that close roads?

There was a discussion about whether this was a question or a motion. We can take questions at the AGM and normally do. As we are holding the AGM on Zoom this year, we specifically asked for questions in advance. We are under no obligation to answer the question before the AGM. **Action: We should actively consider producing an FAQ for the AGM and have prepared answers to the most likely questions.**

POST-MEETING NOTE:

The Society rules are unclear about whether motions and resolutions can be put forward at an AGM and voted on. As a rule, motions would need to be notified to the Society in advance and then notified to the membership in good time before the meeting. It is unusual to accept motions, proposals or resolutions at an AGM to be put forward for a vote immediately. Any resolution involving a change to the Rules must be notified to the membership with the revision text “due notice [of the Resolution] shall be given in the Notice convening the meeting”. At best, any motion or proposal put forward at the AGM itself can be noted and recorded at the AGM for further discussion by the Executive.

T&E Proposal (see Appendix 2 of the Agenda)

This proposal related to support for writing to the MP and Council concerning u-18 fares and school buses. **Decision: The proposal was carried by the Executive. Action: HW**

T&E Proposal (circulated by Harry Winter).

This was a proposal from the T&E Sub-Committee to the Dulwich Society to request a statement in support of the temporary changes to the side-streets close to East Dulwich station. They include Melbourne Grove (North), Derwent Grove, Elsie Road and Tintagel Crescent.

Decision: We take note of the proposal but will take no action. It was agreed that the changes are currently in place and are now subject to an 18-month consultation phase. There is no requirement on the Society to add support at this stage – the changes remain in place for the foreseeable future.

DS Matters

- a) AGM arrangements – Will be on Zoom on 24 Sept; SB will host Zoom and mute participants. Agreed to discuss arrangements for voting offline (Action: IMcl and SB). SB will ask Andreas Köttering about his powerpoint slides and arrange a technical check (Action: SB). RL is chasing Sally-Anne Jeffries who will need to sign of accounts in good time to post them online before the AGM. (Action: RL). Arrangements are also needed to ensure Colin Niven can attend the meeting (Action: SB).

- b) Talks and Walks – no walks. There have been two online talks but attendance has been disappointing. They will be rearranged to take place shortly after the newsletter is published. It was agreed to also send a separate email to members with the talk link.
- c) Litter Picking – last event was successful with 8 bags collected in Gallery Road. A further litter pick may be scheduled.
- d) CGS and Neighbourhood Fund applications should be notified to IMCI ahead of the deadlines of 4 October and 12 October respectively.
- e) 2021 Dates – see end of agenda – approved. 18 January, 15 March, 10 May, 12 July, 13 September, 15 November 2021. All via Zoom at present. No venues have been booked. The AGM will take place on 26 April 2021 via Zoom if need be.

Treasurer’s Report and Grants

RL presented the latest budget statement and accounts (year to date) for FY2020.

- FY2019 accounts – draft complete and sent to the independent examiner, awaiting her signature.
- The bank summary shows £48k in our accounts including £8k in our Barclays account. RL asked that those depositing money into the account should provide identifying payment detail.
- Receipts are £18k YTD and payments £22k YTD (Gift Aid of £2374 received)
- RL reported there was no change to the Mary Boast balance.
- There are no new Society grant applications. See attached grant sheet for the current position.

Full details in RL’s Executive Report.

Licensing and events

PB reported there were two event proposals at Crystal Palace Park. These events are being mounted under the auspices of the Crystal Palace Park Trust. After discussion it was agreed to post an objection to the large events proposed over two July weekends with 50,000 attendees. There are concerns about the capacity of the terraces and the park and the ability of the event organisers to manage the travel arrangements which would impact Dulwich and neighbouring areas. It is not recommended to attempt to get the event licence reduced to one year. It would be better to seek a reduction in numbers. The Executive Committee agreed to submit an objection on the four licensing grounds and highlight the traffic concern and need for reduced numbers. **Action: PB**

A second set of events is planned to run for 5 years with a maximum attendance of 10,000. **Action: PB will review whether there is a case for a limited objection and report back.**

Full details in PB’s Executive report.

Consultations and Planning

Eastlands Crescent application – still under consideration. DR raised concerns that the Southwark planning register is not being kept up to date.

Alleyn’s Junior School and the **DHFC** applications have been approved.

There was a discussion about the **Streatham and Marlborough Cricket Club** application for a new pavilion and nursery which the P&A sub-committee have commented in favour of subject to travel access and constraints on hospitality events. There was a debate about Metropolitan Open Land and concerns that encroachment is now happening too frequently and the Society should take a stronger line on such applications. We have in the past highlighted our concerns about MOL and taken a neutral line on sports clubs especially where a case is being made to support future sustainability of the sports club. [Post-meeting note: The application has since been withdrawn].

PB thanked the P&A Sub-Committee for objecting to the **phone mast** on Dulwich Wood Park (The Dulwich Estate has also objected to the mast). PB also mentioned two controversial planning applications on **Fountain Drive** where neighbouring residents are taking or considering legal action.

T&E Sub-Committee

HW is still pursuing the results of Our Healthy Streets Phase 3. The current prediction is that the results will be published in October. The Sub-Committee are also working on procurement and installation of an air pollution monitor and visual display in Dulwich Village. Funding has been made available from CGS.

Other Dulwich Issues and Any Other Business

- a. McCulloch's – no progress. Still waiting the enforcement of the S215 Notice.
- b. Allyn's Statue – BG has requested SB contact the Foundry to arrange for the statue to have the patina reapplied and coated to preserve it. **Action: SB**
- c. The Smartwater also needs to be reapplied – SB has given the Smartwater to DR for action when the weather is warmer and after the treatment at b. above.
- d. Plaques – other assets requiring care and attention are the Stella Benwell plaque in the Picture Gallery grounds and the bomb plaques. BG will see to the bomb plaques and discuss repair works with London Signs. DB will arrange to clean/repair the Stella Benwell plaque.
- e. Architectural Awards – BG mentioned that Peckham had received several architectural awards that had been publicised and the DS should do the same with Dulwich awards. Only one such recent Dulwich award was noted but it is something we could consider in the future.

Date of next meeting – 9 November 2020 – Zoom meeting, details to be confirmed.

Sue Badman, Secretary – The Dulwich Society

2021 Meetings - 2021 Meeting Dates: 18 January, 15 March, 10 May, 12 July, 13 September, 15 November 2021 (on Zoom until further notice)

2021 AGM – Monday 26 April 2021 (no venue booked yet)

Appendix 1

Executive Committee - Declarations of Interest (September 2020)

Ian McInnes – Friends of Dulwich Picture Gallery (Chairman); Member of Dulwich Village and Dulwich Wood Ward Safer Neighbourhood Panels (Member + Deputy DV SNP); Son Tim McInnes is Chair of the Herne Hill Velodrome Trust.

Diana McInnes - Son Tim McInnes is Chair of the Herne Hill Velodrome Trust.

Sue Badman - Dulwich Events Partnership (DS rep); Safe Routes to School Group (Attendee).

David Roberts – Volunteer at the Village Orchard in Dulwich Village.

David Beamish – Parish of St Barnabas, Dulwich (Deputy Churchwarden); Dulwich Deanery Synod (Hon. Secretary); Southwark Diocesan Synod (Member); Friends of Dulwich Picture Gallery (Committee Member); Member of the Southwark Diocesan Council of Trustees and Vice-Chair of the Diocesan Board of Finance; Volunteer at Dulwich Picture Gallery; Dulwich & District U3A Committee Member; Volunteer at Dulwich Village Infants School.

Adrian Hill – Camberwell & District Allotment Society; Stradella and Springfield Residents' Association (Committee Member); Friends of Crystal Palace Subway (DS rep); Abbeyfield Dulwich Society Ltd (Trustee and Executive Committee Member).

Harry Winter – Vice-Chair, Herne Hill Forum; Member of “Mums for Lungs”