

Residents' Forum Meeting 2 - Notes

St Peter's Church, 1 November

Meeting began with a brief review of and update on the process, including GC Secretary Karim's conversations with other garden chairmen. He said that he'd first reached out through the WhatsApp group of garden squares. Three chairmen had responded, saying they had decided to go ahead. They saw limited downside while gaining certainty of title ownership. Karim then reached out to the two Gardens that had been mentioned at the April resident's forum meeting as deciding not to register. Only one Chairman responded, mentioning that agreement on the matter seemed impossible during resident meetings. Karim subsequently heard that the second garden had apparently decided to register the title.

One resident expressed general doubts about proceeding at this time – uncertainty of a non-specific nature. They took the view that there was time before the Land Registry deadline, that we might wait to see what other gardens did, and we might regret having made choices now. In response, reference was made to material posted on the website earlier, to the protections provided in the declaration of trust, and to the information gathered by Karim from other gardens.

The more general view was that not pressing ahead now would result in a loss of momentum such that initiating the process could be delayed by several years. There was little to gain from a delay, certainly nothing that would result in a substantive change in the overall decision; and the protections ownership afforded, particularly against potential actions by public entities, were wholly beneficial.

Talk then turned in two directions:

1. The shape of the trust itself, and whether there should be individual trustees, or a corporate trustee. Conclusion was that while a corporate entity would make change of trustees much easier, the annual administration might be burdensome, given the small size and the impecuniousness of the GC trust.
2. Next steps in the process: There was a call for yet another round of notifications. This one specific to the AGM and to this process. It was to include the production of a simplified form outlining the basics of the matter for posting through letterboxes, to be posted in the garden and on the website, and to be handed out at the meeting itself.

Proposal itself to be simple: approval or not by residents of the claim to title being made on basis of adverse possession. Then, if "yes" a call for volunteers willing to serve as first lot of trustees, and delegation of authority to GC to pursue process with regular updating.

Follow-up: *The briefing paper with proposal at the top has subsequently been produced. It will be circulated along with the AGM agenda, as a flyer through letterboxes. It will also be posted on the website.*