Transcript of Conservative Group (London Borough of Havering) meeting held at Havering Town Hall on 03 February 2020

Speakers (in order of first speaking) - All Conservative councillors

Cllr Damian White	**(DW)**
Cllr Joshua Chapman	**(JC)**
Cllr Robert Benham	**(RobB)**
Cllr Bob Perry	**(BP)**
Cllr Timothy Ryan	**(TR)**
Cllr Roger Ramsey	**(RR)**
Cllr Ray Best	**(RayB)**
Cllr Christine Vickery	**(CV)**

Other persons mentioned in audio (in order of first mention)

Andrew Blake-Herbert (Chief Executive, London Borough of Havering)	**(AB-H)**
Andrew Rosindell MP (Conservative MP for Romford)	**(AR)**
Cllr Darren Wise (North Havering Residents Group)	**(DWise)**
Cllr Brian Eagling (North Havering Residents Group)	**(BE)**
Julia Lopez MP (Conservative MP for Hornchurch and Upminster)	**(JL)**
Andrew Boff (Conservative Party - London Assembly Assembly Member)	**(ABoff)**

Time on audio (mm:ss)

(Paragraph breaks in text are for easier reading purposes only)

Audio starts.

00:00 - 02:53 DW - "One is with the 52 councillors....***(00:03 - 00:05 Inaudible)*** .....basically the parameters that we need. And all need to be different aspects of the Boundary Commission's technical guidance. Instead of submitting those four to the Full Council when we decide which ones we want subject, er, us doing the amendments, Andrew ***(AB-H)*** has now agreed that we can have a Governance Committee meeting to, um, discuss the four options, pick which one we like, make any amend, recommendations and changes to it and that then goes on to Full Council as an administration amendment or a motion, so the previous one gives the officers..... (**00:39 - 00:47 m*ostly inaudible)*** .....the option of going forward.

The reason why that is so important is because had, er, Andrew's ***(AB-H)*** approach, we followed Andrew's ***(AB-H)*** approach, all four would go to Full Council. We'd pick one, we'd make amendments on the night and submit it. 'A' we would have no, em, certainty that the amendments that we would be putting forward with the movable boundaries, would meet the requirements to be plus or minus their five percent of the population in five years time. And also there would be, em. What we need is the ward boundaries, er, justification for each ward and why those boundaries are being proposed.

That wouldn't meet those requirement but when it comes to the Boundary Commission, they would look at the submission the council has picked, but they then would then look at the other options that were available to us at the time. So in a way there's a little bit, erm, though you can see why those four options being a disaster, er, being considered by the Boundary Commission. By changing it and having Governance Committee's filter we can argue that there's, er, there's cross party involvement in the boundary proposals we have brought forward.

Officers will make sure that what we are proposing meets the technical elements of the requirements. So the plus or minus within ten percent, mostly to, erm, I think about five percent and the ward names blah de blah de blah. Then when the one recommendation goes to Full Council, when the boundaries can then go along to the Boundary Commission, when they look at it apparently they only look at what was discussed and debated at a Full Council meeting. So there will only be one option from the council. There won't be, instead of four there will be one and that one.

So they won't have any others to compare and they'll won't look at the locally dis, options that went to the Governance Committee. Apparently they could do if they want but they only have five members of staff and highly unlikely they'll put the effort in to do that. They just want the debate that is held at the end of the Full Council meeting. So tomorrow at, erm, five o'clock er."

02:54 - 02:57 ***(Inaudible speaking from another person, possibly Cllr Roger Ramsey)***

02:57 - 02:59 DW - "So the opposition will go.... ***(several inaudible words)***."

02:59 - 03:01 ***(Question from another person, possibly Cllr Roger Ramsey)*** **-** "So can they put in any amendments as well?"

03:01 - 06:14 DW - "So what is going to happen is that, erm, there is going to be an extensive discussion.... ***(03:06 - 03:10 inaudible due to coughing)*** ....twentieth of February, at, er, twentieth of February, at seven, seven thirty, we'll have a special Governance Meeting. That means the paperwork needs to be published on the twelfth of this month, giving the required time. So tomorrow, um, the op, the Opposition, all group leaders have been invited to meet Andrew Blake-Herbert to look at the four options we have come up with, um. He'd. For, for, um, these four walls, I've been able to, only recently he has agreed for some reason to allow me to influence the proposals and, erm, I've been able to.

Andrew Rosindell has come in and looked at them and then checked them and out of the four options, if I'm honest, what they were proposing, some of them were disastrous. Erm, if we, they would be included, we would never ever win ever again. Um, they will just. Some, I mean for instance, one of them, one for Romford Town, Squirrels Heath, um, what, you know, large chunks of Harold Hill into Pettits. I mean they would just. Some of them we'd just lose but, um, but we've come up with, umm we've, we've come up with a set of proposals that I think are really politically advantageous for us.

They are based on 56 councillors. Um. The Boundary Commission, so they've accepted that there'll be 54 councillors for Havering. They're willing to allow, unofficially, Andrew Blake-Herbert said to them, to go up by two councillors. Er. They will not, they will not accept anything above 56. So what we have got to accept 54. We have come up with proposals that are pretty advantageous of 56. Um. And what so I hope effectively works

on, um, Andrew's ***(AR)*** constituency and then we'll be maximising our councillors in the areas we can win, um.

So within the confines of Andrew's ***(AR)*** constituency we go from 21 to 24 seats, um. And there's, er, effectively of the town come Squirrels Heath wards erm, there's a new ward, new ward, two new wards created. A Rush Green Ward and a, erm, Hylands is split into two, um. And you get, end up like with like an Albany ward. And then you get, erm, from Romford Town going, Hylands going right into Romford Town, um, then some of that development. Cos the main aim is to make sure all that development that is coming forward to Romford cown centre is split in different wards. The last thing we want is to have, er, Romford Town ward which has all, all one ward has all of the development, because that would become very difficult for us to sustain.

So Andrew ***(AB-H)*** has kindly agreed. Funnily enough the one officer that is able to use the computer program is, um, Joshua's ***(JC)*** cousin, erm. He's the ***(laughter in background)***, he's the chap who's been able to govern the boundaries and what not. And Andrew ***(AB-H)*** is very worried to let him sit in a room with, um, us, because of course he knows his political leanings. But I think it is fair to say your cousin's um."

06:15 - 06:23 JC - "Clearly. I don't know, I just want to put it out there and for the record he's, he's a very professional young man and he's, he's very neutral..... ***(Ends with several inaudible words, as talked over by next speaker)***"

06:21 - 06:23 (Unknown speaker) - "Quite right. Quite right. Quite right."

06:23 - 06:44 DW - "I think the issue, the concern was, um. That the big concern was that um, by sh-sharing these things with me, that we might have officers do things that are not.... ***(06:34 sentence ends with single inaudible word)***. Ex-party member obviously, so that we can share.... ***(06:37 - several inaudible words)***. I don't think that's going to happen.... ***(06:37 - 06:40 several inaudible words)*** ....be very fair minded, which is important. So effectively you get."

06:44 - 06:56 RobB - " ***(Starts with several inaudible words) ....***the opposition parties get one look into it...."

06:56 - 06:58 - (Unknown speaker) "I think the key generally is just, you know, don't talk about it."

06:59 - (Unknown speaker) "Yeah."

07:00 - 07:01 (Unknown speaker) "You know, um."

07:02 - 07:34 DW - "Not an issue..... ***(07:03 - 07:05 several inaudible words)*** ....Basically we get a situation where, um, we have 24 councillors in Romford. Um, I think that is the best situation we can, best resolution we can get. Um, we've tried to break up, er, the south, er, the south of the borough into smaller, two member wards where possible, so that we can then pick the best bits and target them. ***(07:25 - 07:27 several inaudible words)*** .....two member wards but a big chunk of it gets carved off and goes into the new South Hornchurch ward. South Hornchurch and Airfield's estate."

07:34 - 08:06 DW - ***(Mostly inaudible due to background noise)***

08:06 - 12:13 DW - "....one and two member wards and we can then say, we can make gains in those areas because erm, because we, we can do a monthly newsletter. We can do fifteen hundred or seventeen hundred houses rather than five and a half thousand to have to deliver and to get each. You see if we have to deliver them all just to get one councilor elected. So I really think these are a good set of proposals and they all meet the threshold of requirements.

They are going to be published tomorrow. Andrew ***(AB-H)*** won't let me have a copy of them until they are published. So I suggest, um, we do need to meet once they are out to send, send them to all members straight away. Um, what I was going to suggest maybe, um, we can have a meeting at some point, at the end of the day we can go through it all or prepare a sub committee of the whole group to go through what's being proposed and make final recommendations. Connect what's being proposed and then we can, um, then we can take everything, um, submit those recommendations to the Governance Committee and have that amended. All support the Conservative, er, amendments that can on the Full Council and then, um, on to the local Boundary Commission.

I met with the North Havering Residents' Association. We will need their support. Um. They've change their view a bit, a little bit. They, they wanted to have the Harold Hill bit removed from Harold Wood. Um, down in the, er, the Emerson Park bit of Harold Wood which that's what most of these options been built, made up on. But now subsequently they've changed their view. They want the Harold Wood bit of, at the Emerson Park bit of Harold Wood. And they don't want the Harold Hill bit but they want Darren ***(DWise)*** want, the house where Darren Wise lives that's in Harold Hill, just over the road, the A12 in, um, in Harold Wood. Um. ***(09:58 - 10:02 laughter in background)***.

Brian ***(BE)*** has spoken to me. You know, it's difficult to do, um,.... ***(10:04 - 10:10 More laughter and other voices in background as DW continues to speak)*** ....It's a difficult decision but um, um, I think they're comfortable or they will implement... ***(10:14 single inaudible word)*** ....if we go through it again. I think they'll be comfortable with what we propose, which basically keeps Harold Wood hemmed in by the A12 and the A127, so there'll be a chunk, um.

The trouble, that makes Harold Hill make. What I've tried to do is make sure all Conservative wards are slightly below the average but all non, current non-Conservative wards are over the average. So what they do is in five years time the population X, the number of councillors Y, we come to an average of voters per councillor. What I've tried to do is make sure those seats that are unlikely to vote Conservative have more than the average. So, for instance, Gooshays by five or ten percent over. Whereas Squirrels Heath will have five to ten under. The reason being if we.... ***(10:57 - 10:58 several inaudible words)*** ....turn them around, the boundaries we want to keep, you know, grouped together.

I've taken advice from central office on some of the proposals and their advice is to have a greater number of smaller wards in areas we are never going to win, so with one or two members. It's difficult to have one member wards. I've gone through all the, um, the boundaries, um, the reports for all of London where they've done them and there's only a handful of single member wards that have been created across London. There have been some but very few. So it seems.... ***(11:29 single inaudible word)*** ....easier to justify two member wards than it is single member wards.

So we tried to adopt for, go for two member wards in areas where it's unlike, um, Upminster for instance, and Rainham and South Hornchurch, rather than three members because we need less of a resource for us to market. Um. So what I will do is I will try and bring a few of us together and go through them, to go through the proposals once they've been published tomorrow and try to connect it and check it. Send it to associations and to, um, to any other interested parties, then when we have our, our next group meeting we can then look at the amendments and see what they are and I will send you all regular updates from, um, the proposals for update."

12:14 - 12:16 - ***(Unknown speaker - Inaudible)***

12:16 - 12:27 BP - "Thank you. Um. Excuse my ignorance of this cos I don't understand how it all this works. Um, but the reason it would go to associations. So, associations. So Julia ***(JL)*** would have to be in agreement with these proposals?"

12:27 - 14:12 DW - "No. So what, so what we, we have got in the Conservative, um, the Conservative council's proposals. So it will be the Conservative group. So our separate proposal we will need to vote from a.... ***(12:40 single inaudible word)*** ....group. Council have to make a sub, well they don't have to. Um. Councils very strongly advised to make a submission to Local Government Boundary Commission. And those submission, that submission usually be followed thereabouts, um. But so what we need to do is put four options. Gonna try and come up with and refine one of them, um, to make it reasonably advantageous. So in the next week us, the ones we've put has been published and I can send it to everyone and members of the group and try and get comments from people to what amendments they might like to make and what's feasible.

Trouble is, I sat there for a couple of hours earlier today and those of you who would want one road from one ward to another, changes the balance in between those two wards. It also changes the balancing ratios of all other wards as well. So just, you know, for instance Gooshays massively over and Heaton was massively under. So you would assume the logical thing was to cut a bit of Gooshays and put it into Heaton. Though you cut a bit of Gooshays and put it into Heaton, one goes down, one goes up but then the average number of voters per councillor changes and it has an impact in all of the rest of the borough. So certain things which may look sensible, they, em, they are not really doable. What I will do is I will get those up to date proposals published, once they've been published and sent to everyone and ask for comments and I will create a smaller working party of us to go through them and make a final set recommendations that, um, have probably the best, most easily advantageous to the group."

14:12 - 14:18 BP - "But surely if there's an impact on say Emerson Park or Hornchurch and Upminster, surely we've got some kind of say in this?"

14:18 - 14:34 DW - "You do. So your, em, so you, your, your association certainly can put, anyone can put in amendments to the, um, Boundary Commission. Um. Your here, so you can certainly make your voice known, um, as to what you want to see. I mean on the."

14:34 - 14:36 BP - "Well I haven't seen the proposals yet. So."

14:36 - 14:49 DW - "Um, I mean the proposals have gone. The proposals.... ***(14:38 - Unknown person speaks several words at same time as DW "There is more... (ends with one or two inaudible words)") ....***is, um, is to actually for Emerson Park to go down

by two. To go to two councillors than three. Um. And that's one of them. That's one of the proposals. So there are differences."

14:49 - 14:50 BP - "Can I ask why on that?"

14:50 - 16:06 DW - "It's because of population growth. Um. And the question becomes. What we've tried to do as much as possible is respect the current constituency boundary. So tried to avoid, um, situation where, you know, a big chunk of Romford and constituency.... ***(15:06 single inaudible word)*** ....Hornchurch and Upminster and vice versa. So that severely restricts how, um. Squirrels Heath over, er, Emerson Park under. You then get this, well why, erm? It becomes really difficult if you're trying to respect those boundaries. We're not trying to respect those boundaries just because, um, we didn't just want to mix them up. The reason why we prefer to be separate is there are natural boundaries that tick what, what is proposed between the two. So for instance, like, postcodes or rivers or so and so forth. So the reason why those constituency boundaries are tried to be, er, try, sought to be respected is because they fit in the guidance that the Local Government Boundary Commission have issued. And going over them will undermine, weaken the submission. Cos for instance, um, so, um, one of the suggestions that the officers came up with is to put a big chunk of Heaton in with Pettits. So you end up with a Rise Park and, um, Heaton Grange wards? Is it called Heaton Grange?"

16:06 - *Unknown speaker -* *"Yes."*

16:07 - 17:15 DW - "Rise Park, Heaton Grange. Well the Boundary Commission. You may think that makes sense.... ***(16:11 Single inaudible word due to someone coughing)*** ....better, when you look at the map. Well the, the, you know, they are.... ***(16:15 single inaudible word)*** ....next to each other and, er, golf course in the middle. You may think that might make sense. But on the, if you look, cross reference it to the technical, um, guidance from the Boundary Commission, they think that, erm, are now putting a lot of emphasis on community identity and Heaton doesn't have anything to do with, er, Rise Park. So they wouldn't accept that for the simple reason if you, there would probably be a lot of people in Rise Park that would object and a lot of people in Heaton would object. And that's the one thing they do not want is lots of objections from local people. They want the blandest set of proposals that meet the technical criteria. Um. So that's why the advice is to do it like that.

So the alternative is you could, you can.... ***(16:57 single unclear word sounding like 'watch')*** ....you can.... ***(16:58 single unclear word sounding like 'whack')*** ....Emerson Park up. But the only way you can do it is by putting a big chunk of either Upminster or Cranham into it. And the question becomes - Is that politically advantageous to maintain three councillors when you're taking a massive chunk of an RA ward and putting it into Emerson Park? And that, that then becomes the, the difficulty."

17:15 - 17:18 BP - "Yeah. So when do we see the proposals? Tomorrow are they out?"

17:18 - 17:32 DW - "Published tomorrow at six o'clock. So once the meeting finishes I will e-mail everyone and let the group know what they are. Ask for comments. Refer it to the sub-committee, um. Then we can take it from there and have a group meeting as soon as we can finalise our position."

17:32 - 17:34 (TR) - "Do we get a plan, so we can look at?"

17:34 - 17:46 DW - "Yeah. So what I'll do is um.... ***(17:35 - 17:40 several inaudible words due to coughing)*** ....And then what we've got is a technical group, sub-committee and go through it and have, um, advice."

17:46 - 17:49 Unknown speaker - "Is there going to be one big map showing all of the wards or will it be.... ***(ends with several inaudible words)***?"

17:49 - 17:54 DW - "So it's four different maps. Four different maps. Each map means a different boundary commission scenario."

17:55 - 18:01 Unknown speaker - "Er, OK. ***(Followed by several seconds of inaudible speaking in the background)***"

18:01 - 18:02 DW - "For the local gov."

18:02 - 18:04 Unknown speaker, possibly RR - "For the Local Government Association."

18:04 - 18:06 DW - "Erm. The, the councils?"

18:06 - 18:08 Unknown speaker, possibly RR - "No, cos when the Boundary Commission."

18:08 - 18:11 DW - "No, no. So what happens, they don't have a, a public enquiry."

18:11 - 18:13 Unknown speaker, possibly RR - "They're constantly ***(18:12 single inaudible word)*** ....in?"

18:13 - 18:14 DW - "They do. They do not have."

18:14 - 18:16 (Unknown speaker - Inaudible)

18:16 - 19:29 DW - "So they do not have, um, er. There's no. So when the parliamentary boundaries, we have a current set of proposals you have a public enquiry. It was here funnily enough for Havering. Actually I think... ***(18:26 - 18:28 Several inaudible words)*** .... London was here. Um, um. You don't have that Boundary Commission. What happens is the council submits its recommendations. All members of the public have until the second of March to submit their recommendations. The council have got special dispensation. So we can submit ours by the ninth of March. We submit ours. The Boundary Commission will look at what's been submitted and then look at all of the alternatives. So look at the council's, look at the alternatives. Unlikely that anyone will, apart from the council, will have a full submission that's within the technical guidance.

So that's the, that's the council's has to be in the technical guidance and that becomes the baseline then that they measure everything. Anyone else can make suggestions but they don't have to be in the guidance. You may say, um. Just say we've adopted, you know, Emerson Park as two member. You might want to say *'Well I don't agree with that. I think Emerson Park should be three members'*, and put that representation in. And what if.... ***(19:21 Two inaudible words)*** ....say '*Right, I'm going to take this big chunk of Cranham to go with Emerson Park to subsidise it.'* Or *'I'm going to take all of Heath Park and put it into Emerson Park.'"*

19:29 - 19:30 (Unknown speaker - First few words inaudible) "....of those two options."

19:30 - 21:47 DW - "They will then. You don't have to do the numbers, um, to put that submission in. The Boundary Commission will look at it and say 'Does that meet with the requirements, yes or no?' Um. Is that something that's sensible, sensible community boundary? Um. Does it support the effective discharge of councillors duties? Um. Yes or no? And then they will make the decision. Apparently what they do is they come out and they drive. So they will have like 20 recommendations from the public, basically from the baseline and they will go out and they will just for one day, they drive around and they come to a conclusion themselves.

They'll say *'Oh this bit of Heath Park. Oh, I think this is close enough to Emerson Park station. I support it going into Emerson Park ward.'* Or they may say *'This is, this is clearly nothing to do with Emerson Park. This stays into Squirrels'* or Romford Town or wherever it may be. So that, that's how they do it. There's no public enquiry. What there is, is once they, we have put in our submission, say that's one accepted and they then consult on that, there will be an opportunity for people across the borough to put in supporting statements on that. So that is the next stage.

If our council's are the, prime one becomes the council's submission, the coun, the Boundary Commission consult on it, we'll need to make sure we put in a lot of supporting evidence in these wards, for people to say to people *'This is a good. I support this bit of this change to Rainham. I live in Rainham and I think it's a good idea.' 'I live in Gidea Park and I support this.' 'And I live in Havering Park or Collier Row and I think that's a good thing and I.'*

And all they need then is the public viewpoint in each ward to say good things on what the council is proposing, for them to be able to say that any other submission that comes in, and one of them will be from the Labour party to say Harold Hill should have seven ward councillors rather than six or Harold Hill should be, you know, bigger. We, we're trying to, we're trying to.... ***(21:28 single inaudible word)*** ....push down and.... ***(21:29 single inaudible word)*** ....from push out. So as long as there's justification, the Boundary Commission will say, oh, we've, we've, the Labour party have put in their submission but we've got a counter to it which makes sense and the technical guidance, so there, so that's what we need to do, have a co, coherent, um, approach, to be able to support it once it's been published."

21:47 - 21:49 (Silence)

21:49 - 22:17 (Speaker - Believed to be RayB) "Have they ever had a situation whereby when the council put in their recommendation. Obviously you're gonna got to put the recommendation in which is the most suitable for the Conservative Party. Have they ever had to, erm, the Boundary Commission ever modified it with the residents, erm, submissions which has overruled and taken, er, the place of some of the of the, the recommendations by the council?"

22:17 - 23:18 DW - "Yes. So, um."

22:18 - 22:19 (Speaker - Believed to be RayB) "So it can happen?"

22:19 - 22:21 DW - "It happens all the time."

22:21 (Speaker - Believed to be RayB) "Does it?"

22:21 - 23:11 DW - "Now, the first thing they have to say is do not try to come up with ward boundaries that are going to be political, um, a politically advantageous, er sort of advantage. Because all that would happen, because the reason why they say that is cos when you, cos if we were to design the boundaries and try and say what's good for us, you'd create wards that don't come from communities and they look odd. And they say they can spot them a mile away and that's not what they want. They want boundaries that reflect proper communities and are not all higgledy-piggledy and then cause them the least amount of work.

Some council's, um, they have sub, sub, like Newham have put forward a set of proposals and the Boundary Commission completely re wrote them. Um, er, Andrew Boff ***(ABoff)***, who apparently advised.... ***(23:04 single inaudible word)*** ....to have a look this. They would do, they would do the same for Hackney. So it does happen across, erm. You put your hand up as well?"

23:11 - 23:13 (Unknown speaker) - "No, no, no, no, no."

23:13 - 24:39 DW - "But there to be fair it does happen. That's why we need to make sure that that set of proposals that we have that are politically advantageous to the Conservatives are within the technical guidance, so, and there's strong justification for each ward. So, for instance, if we were to create, um.... ***(23:30 - 23:31 Several inaudible words)*** ....create a, an Oldchurch ward or a Rush Green ward, whatever you call it, um, there's a strong reason why we're doing that, along Rush Green Road going across into Romford, taking one of the developments. Um. You've got like.... ***(23:44 single inaudible word)*** ....ward that goes.

You've got strong routes saying this is a proper community and it meets the numbers, and it's, er, you know, it's identifiable. Um, you don't end up with um. One suggestion Andrew Rosindell ***(AR)*** put forward which, you know, erm, might undermine it is that Havering Park takes, takes, Havering Park takes all of the, um, you know the Noak Hill Road? They take all of the bit above Noak Hill Road. So taking all of the farmland for instance. And Andrew ***(AR)*** said that... ***(24:12 single inaudible word)*** ....like that. That creates a ward that's about, you know, fifteen percent of the size of the borough, um, but for no benefits. Cos no-one lives in that area.

So the officers have strongly said *'Don't do that.'* Because if you do that it suddenly becomes quite easy for the Boundary Commission to.... ***(24:29 - 24:30 Several inaudible words)*** ....that looks strange and then it undermine, then they look at it again and change it. So the proposals won't then be very political, they need to be deliverable as well."

24:39 - 24:40 (Unknown speaker) - "And justifiable."

24:40 - 24:41 DW - "And justifiable."

24:41 - 24:42 (Unknown speaker) - "As opposed to.... ***(Ends with several inaudible words)***"

24:43 - 24:44 (Inaudible speaking in background)

24:44 - 24:53 CV - "Can you just tell me what's happening on. I know where they're all sort of going and things but I couldn't quite understand about Squirrels ward? I'm only asking because I live there you see, round... ***(Ends with two inaudible words)***"

24:53 - 25:05 DW - "So one of the proposals is to um, with Squirrels Heath. I mean, nobody can tell. It's just one of the options you will, um. It's probably easier to wait till tomorrow when I send it out and you will see on the map."

25:05 - 25:12 CV - "I just wanted to know. Cos it just sounds like part of Romford Town's going into Squirrels and then, just that I didn't know where it was going?"

25:12 - 25:49 DW - "So, so the aim is to take a chunk of Squirrels Heath and put into Romford Town, to, to, to, um a chunk into, um Hylands and I think a chunk into Pettits to try and bolster it all up. So it's trying to, you know, erm, carve it up in that way to support some of these smaller. Because if anything Romford town has got a huge amount of development to come forward in Brooklands, You know like 20,000 people live there. And we need to make sure they live in areas that are, like Romford Town does at the moment. If.... ***(25:40 single inaudible word)*** ....Gidea Park in effect subsidising the.... ***(25:43 single inaudible word)*** ....bits and other bits of Romford. But I'll send everything down tomorrow....***(Last few words inaudible)***."

25:49 - 25:55 (Unknown speaker) - "Sorry, just for clarity, clarity Damian are you saying that there won't be a Squirrels Heath ward after this?".

25:55 - 25:58 DW - "No, I think there will be. There will be more wards. They'll just be in different shapes."

25:59 - 26:00 (Unknown speaker) - "OK, thank you. Thank you"

26:01 - 26:08 ***(Inaudible talking in background)***

26:08 - 26:10 (Unknown speaker) - "You say within the next ten days but."

26:10 - 26:24 DW - "What I will do is I will set up, so I will set up a, um, a working party for us to go through it all and for us to consult people who have got.... ***(26:18 single inaudible word)*** ....interested. Andrew. And then we'll probably from, need to send out the e-mails and you can reply."

26:25 - Meeting ends.

26:25 - 32:02 (Post meeting conversations between various people. Not transcribed as not of relevance.)