

## Minutes of

### William Morris Big Local - Partnership Meeting

William Morris Community Centre, 6-8 Greenleaf Road,  
Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> September 2016

#### Partnership members present

Adam Taylor (AT) – Vice Chair  
Gillian Jacob (GJ)  
Mohamed Khan (MK)  
Peter Stanton (PS)  
Chrys Christy (CC) - Chair  
Valerie Stapleton (VS)

#### Others present

Alison Caldwell (AC) – Co-optee  
Angela Rouse (AR) – Co-optee  
Daniel Stanley (DS) – Co-optee  
Lawrence Walker (LW) – Co-optee  
Gabriel Edwards (GE) – WMBL Development Worker (minutes)  
Mark Clack – Wood Street Walls

#### Apologies

Cassie White (CW)  
Grace Rollason (GR)  
Sian Penner (SP) – Local Trust Rep

	<b>Actions</b>
<p><b>1. Welcome and Introductions</b></p> <p>CC welcomed everyone to the meeting and welcomed new co-optee members AR, DS and LW and welcomed back returning co-optee member AC.</p> <p>CC explained that all the co-opted members would continue as co-optees until the next forum at which point they could put themselves forward formally to be a Partnership member if they wished to.</p> <p>Everyone introduced themselves round the table with an icebreaker.</p>	

## 2. Wood Street Walls Presentation

Mark Clack from Wood Street Walls presented feedback on the recent William Morris Mural. The key points were;

- Total of 1,100 pick your pattern votes
- 37% of votes from William Morris Ward
- Very close vote between *Willow Bough* and *Bourne* designs with just 3 votes deciding it
- 6 items of press coverage
- Total cost of £11k, slightly over budget due to custom made insulation for the wall. No extra money sought from WMBL

Mark will forward some of the free text comments relating to WMBL that were left by voters online.

**1<sup>st</sup> Action  
MC**

### Priory Court Urban Canvas Presentation

Mark Clack then presented a project proposal for large scale murals to be painted on various blocks on the Priory Court Estate with local community involvement.

The main points were;

- Project to bring together old and new residents of all ages, especially those with little knowledge of street art
- Priory Court has 8 blocks with a potential for 16 canvases (GJ corrected MC in that there were 12 blocks on the estate)
- World renowned street artists could be attracted to take part due to the scale of the project and lack of UK high rise mural opportunities.
- Residents would have full freedom to choose the artwork, the artist and be given lots of opportunity for input into the design through workshops.
- Wood Street Walls were seeking general support from the WMBL and also financial support for the 5yr programme.

Questions were then raised by the meeting to Mark

Question: *Are there facilities and training for artists locally?*

MC Answer: WSW has just agreed a lease for one in Wood Street which will have the facility for doing workshops.

Question: *What are the social benefits of the project?*

MC Answer: street art can make an area unique, using local artists, build stronger community cohesion and create more pride for an area.

Question: *What is your budget and how much would you be seeking from the WMBL?*

MC Answer: Cost would be between £5k-10k per mural, would seek £10k a year from WMBL for two murals per year.

It was explained by GE to the meeting that this was an expression of interest only at this stage and that no decision was being asked yet. He highlighted that consultation with Priory Court and the Ward as whole would be needed to see if there was an appetite for the project and for the Big Local funds to be spent in this way.

GE asked Mark Clack when Wood Street Walls would be hoping for a response. Mark responded that 2-3 months would be good.

\*\*\*\*The meeting thanked Mark and Mark left the meeting\*\*\*\*

GE asked the meeting for initial responses to the presentation and the project proposal and asked everyone to give a comment and a potential question that would need to be asked.

The comments, concerns and questions raised were as follows;

- Good project
- Query on the amount of money being sought (this comment was echoed by others at the meeting)
- Possibly consider other areas of the ward also as seems a large concentration of murals in one place.
- Social benefits through galvanising the community seem positive, and there is potential for the project to make a huge mark and leave a legacy.
- Consultation with Priory Court absolutely necessary, permission needed from residents (this comment was echoed by the majority of the meeting)
- William Morris mural had been a success because the design was to everyone's liking and celebrated a local icon. This project might be more difficult to appeal to the masses and would have to ensure no artwork is offensive.
- What would the artwork look like in 15-20 year's time? It might look tired and also look outdated.

- This was the sort of project that could really enhance the area and possibly link in with the development plans at Priory Court. (it was clarified that the development was not to the residential properties but rather the Council's community hub proposals)
- Piloting the project on one wall would seem sensible (this comment was echoed by the majority of the meeting and GJ suggested Capri House as a suitable site for a pilot as it was the most visible to all.
- Art pieces to reflect local identity
- Would there be potential for volunteers, apprentice artists to be involved?
- Concern about the murals being defaced, even high up, some kids would have a go at them
- Like the idea
- Upkeep concern and the cost of upkeep, who would that fall to?
- Priory Court consultation and a Ward response to the proposal needed.
- Loved the William Morris Mural, thought it worked really well.
- Process of choosing the artwork really important to ensure people don't feel it is being imposed on them.
- Confidence in Wood Street Walls as the quality of their work is very good and Mark is also coming at it from a community approach.

GE then asked the meeting how best to respond to Mark and how best to take things forward.

After round the table discussions it was decided that the following course of action would be suggested to Mark Clack;

- Consultation with Priory Court residents was the first priority. Without Priory Court Estate's consent the Partnership would not be able to take it further.
- WMBL happy to support the consultation, GJ could assist Mark Clack with the consultation process as she is the Chair of the Resident's Association.
- If following consultation it was clear that Priory Court Estate residents were happy with the project then the Partnership would present the idea at a future Forum to see if the wider ward was supportive of the idea and of the expenditure of Big Local money on it.
- Overall the Partnership thought the project proposal was good but that the above would need to be followed.

### 3. Minutes of Last Meeting & Matters Arising

The minutes from 16<sup>th</sup> August were agreed to be accurate and a copy was signed off by the Chair and Vice Chair.

The action points from the last meeting were then discussed

#### Third party grant administration

GE explained that Sian had had no success with finding a third party organisation willing to consider admin of WMBL grants.

GE stated that Sian had sent him a draft of a tender document that would be sent out once potential organisations had been identified.

#### **Action - SP to update at next meeting**

PS asked AH how St James Street BL administered their grants. AH replied that they were still setting up having only just launched their own small grants scheme but did not use a third party.

#### GE to look into leaflet distribution options

GE had not had a chance to look into this fully and suggested using Leaflet Distribution Company for street properties and GJ and CW for Priory Court as previously discussed to cover the next newsletter. This option was agreed by the meeting

PS suggested getting in touch with schools. GE replied that households without school children would still need to be delivered to.

#### GE to speak with Worth Unlimited

GE had spoken with Claire Gannon to clarify about the Youth Club's absent date in August. This had been due to a residential trip. GE also stated that Worth Unlimited were definitely delivering the Priory Court Youth Club until end of March 2017 despite some people having heard it would end in September 2016. The WMBL would also need to start thinking about options for when the funding of Worth Unlimited finishes.

#### GE/CC/SP to meet with youth organisation to offer settlement figure

GE explained that a letter to the organisation in question with the Partnership's offer had been sent last Monday by recorded delivery. The tracking information did not indicate whether the letter had been received yet.

#### Uses for the 20 skates belonging to WMBL

GE had asked people to email him ideas for this. CC reminded the meeting that the skates had been originally purchased to possibly launch a skate club, but that this had not taken off.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Action  
SP**

<p>Action – meeting to email GE ideas for the roller skates.</p> <p><u>GE to write article summarising the consultation results</u> This had not been done, but would be.</p> <p><u>Training Courses for Partnership members</u> Only two people had got back to GE with their course selections. Partnership to let GE know their top two choices</p> <p><u>Away day ideas</u> No-one had submitted any suggestions to GE</p> <p><u>Newsletter Articles</u> Just two suggestions had been put in to GE. GE explained that by and large the newsletter articles had chosen themselves with a good mix of stories and news for him to include, eg WSW, Gnome House, Community Chest, Forum.</p> <p>GE commented that there had been a number of items that he had emailed out to Partnership members that had required a response to which he had not received one and asked the meeting what this was down to and whether the email communication channel was ok.</p> <p>Reasons given had been down to the Summer holidays, numerous emails and busy lives.</p> <p>GE suggested that he could use an online forum for people to upload their ideas, or send round a monthly internal newsletter. AR mentioned that a piece of software called “Slack” was very good that she used and that it had cut down the amount of emails needed.</p> <p>It was agreed that for the time being GE email with a subject heading “response needed by” followed by the date, for emails requiring a response.</p>	<p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> Action Partnership</b></p> <p><b>4<sup>th</sup> Action GE</b></p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup> Action Partnership</b></p>
<p><b>4. Local Economy</b></p> <p>AT introduced the agenda item on local economy. He had looked at the information that SP had sent him and he outlined his initial thoughts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Difficult priority to define, need to drill down what it means for WMBL</li> <li>- Opportunities for WMBL to imbed local economy action in the area such as; local employment, work placements, business networks, local</li> </ul>	

<p>shop schemes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to speak to community minded projects and organisations involved in local economy work</li> </ul> <p>AR pointed out the Central Parade space on Hoe Street that supported start up groups.</p> <p>GE asked whether she knew much about the Brixton pound scheme from her time in Brixton. AR said she had not been directly involved but had seen it. AR also mentioned the 'Walthamstow Penny'.</p> <p>AH said that St James St Big Local had facilitated a business support programme.</p> <p>GE said that the Council also had a forum for start up businesses.</p> <p>After some further discussion the following action was agreed for the next steps on Local Economy;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Partnership members interested in supporting AT with Local Economy to contact him or GE. LW put himself forward at the meeting, and AR said she would be interested in being kept in the loop.</li> <li>- GE to contact LBWF for list of trainers and providers of NEETS services.</li> <li>- GE to map current Local Economy related services and organisations, and Council's local economy priorities.</li> </ul> <p>VS suggested contacting Althea Bart and gave GE her email address.</p>	<p><b>6<sup>th</sup> Action GE</b></p>
<p><b>5. Community Chest</b></p> <p>GE re-introduced the WMBL Community Chest grant to the meeting and explained he had written up the draft paperwork for it and emailed out key questions and the documents to partnership members.</p> <p>GE explained that some consultation had been done at the Garden Party and July Forum to see what types of projects local people had an appetite for and that 81% of people had said that it was important for the Community Chest to be used for Community Cohesion and Intergenerational projects.</p> <p>GJ said that the Community Chest outline had already been established in the WMBL Plan and should not be changed.</p> <p>GE replied that the core aim of the Community Chest as defined in the Plan was still the same, namely that it was a small grants scheme for grassroots organisations and community groups and that consultation had been carried</p>	

to further define the types of project, eg. Street parties, one off events for community groups.

GE explained that the WMBL Plan had outlined that the Community Chest could only be used in Community Spaces and that this seemed overly restrictive and would rule out many good potential projects. GE asked whether the meeting would vote on a resolution to amend this and widen the scope of the Community Chest.

Resolution to widen the scope of the Community Chest to public places in the WM Ward. – Agreed 6 votes to 1.

GE asked whether the Partnership considered the funding of trips to be appropriate. GE further explained that this meant the funding of trips for existing community projects, such as a youth club trip to a football stadium, and not a private group of individuals going to a theme park.

The meeting discussed this and debated the merits and importance of trips inside and outside of the ward and whether the Community Chest should be used for this and a vote was carried out.

*Resolution* - trips outside of the Ward will not be funded on this round of the Community Chest, and will be reviewed for the next round, agreed 6 votes to 1.

GE outlined the timescales for the grant process;

- 4 week funding window for applications
- 3 week administration process to include, paperwork and eligibility checks by GE and a funding panel made up of some or all of the Partnership members with a minimum of 4.

GJ and PS expressed an interest in being on the funding panel. GE asked the rest of the meeting to contact him if they were interested in being on the panel.

GE handed out a copy of the draft application form and guidelines that once finished will be sent to interested applicants.

Due to the meeting running over time it was decided that GE would email out the remaining key questions for the Partnership and Co-optees to respond to.

**7<sup>th</sup> Action  
GE**

<p><b>6. Autumn Newsletter &amp; 7. Away Day</b></p> <p><b>GE gave a quick update on the two remaining agenda items;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Autumn Newsletter; will be similar in layout and content to the Summer one with reporting back on successful WSW project, Forum advertising, new project announcements.</li> <li>- Get togethers and away days; GE is organising the away day as he sees fit as he got no input from Partnership members. The day will involve half a day of workshops mainly focusing on the WMBL plan for 2017-18 and half a day of 'team building' and getting to know each other better. This will take place in November.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>8. Any other business</b></p> <p>It was asked if meetings could be moved from Tuesdays to another day in the week as CW had begun College which took place on Tuesday evenings.</p> <p>The meeting discussed whether Mondays or Wednesdays would be best and a show of hands was given for each.</p> <p>The majority of the members showed availability for either day and it was decided that alternating between Monday and Wednesdays would be a good way forward.</p>	
<p><b>Next Meeting</b> To be confirmed</p>	

<b>Summary of Action Points arising from meeting</b>	<b>Person/s responsible for Action</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
1. Mark will forward some of the free text comments relating to WMBL that were left by voters online.	<b>MC</b>	<i>None given</i>
2. SP to update Partnership on third party admin of WMBL grants	<b>SP</b>	<i>Next meeting</i>
3. Partnership to email GE ideas about how to use the WMBL 20 pairs of skates.	<b>Partnership</b>	<i>Next meeting</i>
4. GE to write article for website on Consultation results	<b>GE</b>	<i>No timescale given</i>
5. Partnership to forward training selections to GE	<b>Partnership</b>	<i>Asap</i>
6. GE to map existing local economy related services and NEETS projects as starting point for AT & LW to work on.	<b>GE</b>	<i>No timescale given</i>
7. GE to email out key questions about the Community Chest to Partnership	<b>GE</b>	<i>Asap urgent</i>