## Community Board Meeting - special meeting Monday 7 February 2022, 5.30 – 6.30 pm , Google Meet

Attendance: Community Board Members: 10 members plus Chair - meeting was quorate JV: 3			
1.	Apologies: 1 member		
2.	<ul> <li>Special Meeting <ul> <li>a. The Chair outlined the purpose of the meeting: to ask any final questions about the meanwhile community use provision for which officers were present to assist, and for members to give feedback for the LLP report</li> <li>b. The Chair confirmed that the actions from the last meeting had taken place and members had received confidential copies of the presentation and answers to their questions</li> </ul></li></ul>		
3.	<ul> <li>Questions:</li> <li>a. One member stated that minutes before the ballot do not mention QMH. The commitment to the meanwhile facility in the Landlord offer was repeated</li> <li>b. One member stated that it had been expected for QMH to be upgraded and it was confirmed that there are no plans for this as the HRA priority is on safe and warm homes</li> <li>c. Those previously managing the halls were concerned about demand for the hall versus availability. It was felt that should this occur priority should be given to hall users serving CRE residents and Cambridge Gardens and other services could be signposted to other local halls including Archway</li> <li>d. The cost of the portacabin option was discussed and the majority of members agreed that the investment should be on the permanent facility where this funding would have a greater impact in the long term</li> <li>e. The majority of members felt that QMH would provide a better quality meanwhile facility and that portacabins would be inferior and take up valuable outdoor spaces (green/play space) or parking which are known to be important to CRE residents. QMH was an option that did not have an impact on the whole CRE community and therefore had the least compromises for CRE residents. The compromise on the size of the hall was more acceptable. However there was no consensus</li> <li>f. One member felt that a lot of time had been given to this project rather than on the regeneration which was more important to residents</li> </ul>		
4.	Storage option at QMH		

	b.	A storage option of containers was presented to members. These come in different sizes, are easily assembled, can use heavy-duty locks for security, and could be accommodated to the rear of the hall. They would need planning permission but this should have limited impact on residents and neighbours and therefore not contentious' It was agreed that these would provide useful storage for items that are movable and the table tennis table etc. would need to be folded and kept within the hall or the internal storage. It was suggested that the CCTV to the rear would be helpful	
5.	Statement for LLP:		
	a.	Two members stood down from contributing to this statement	
	b.	It was confirmed that the One Norbiton survey would be referenced in the LLP report	
	C.	In response to a question about representing the board to the LLP, it was confirmed that the LLP report will contain feedback from the Community Board as views from residents. There haven't been third party attendees at LLP meetings	
	d.	It was agreed that the Chair would write the feedback from the Community Board for the LLP report, that this would be a concise summary, which will be sent to Community Board members for information	
	e.	It was confirmed that the kitchen would provide the agreed key elements outlined in the presentation and hall users can be involved in the detailed design of the kitchen	
	f.	<ul> <li>It was agreed that the summary should reflect <ol> <li>that there were mixed views</li> <li>that all options had compromises</li> <li>the request that the kitchen provides the same as Piper Hall (an improvement on QMH currently)</li> </ol> </li> <li>iv. Storage cabins outside would be an acceptable compromise and that should continue to be explored and provided</li> </ul>	