WORKING GROUP

Minutes of the 14th meeting on Wednesday 29th November 2017 held in the meeting room, Egerton Sports Pavilion

Present: Lois Tilden - in the Chair (on behalf of Peter Rawlinson), Chris Burgess, Jane Carr (note-taker), Elaine Graham, Graham Howland, Ian Mella, Mel Rawlinson, Claire Stevens, Lois Tilden. Apologies: Sarah Elworthy, Richard King (EPC Chairman), Peter Rawlinson.

By invitation: Jerry Crossley, Hazel Harper.

LT explained that she had been asked to chair the meeting in Peter Rawlinson's absence. The minutes of the 13th meeting on 8th November were approved, with an amendment to Item 3 to include the work of EG and SE on the analysis of workshop comments. .MR undertook to amend the minutes and to forward them to Heather James for EPC.

Matters arising from previous minutes:

1. Boosting interest and broadening consultation

GH explained that the draft consultation strategy (Community Engagement Action Plan) circulated in advance of the meeting had primarily been prepared by Hazel Harper (HH) and Fiona/Fraser Bolton (FB). LT invited HH to present the draft. HH explained that, although the priority group had been identified as 'older young adults', the sub-group had felt that a full communications strategy needs to cover engagement with all age groups. She also noted that more resources would be needed to deliver the outcomes. JC asked whether the full range of consultation would be necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan given the scale of communication which had resulted in the Parish Plan. LT also expressed concern that there might be overlap with work already undertaken by the Parish Plan committee, and that too broad brush an approach could raise expectations that cannot be met by a Neighbourhood Plan which deals only with land use and housing development.

In discussion on the proposed approach to each of the age groups, CB asked whether the level of activity for **schoolchildren under 12** was appropriate. Both GH and HH suggested that primary school children can influence their parents, who form part of the priority target group. It was agreed that a light touch would be needed with this age group.

HH felt that the **schoolchildren 12-15** and the **young adults 16-24** age groups are essential, but communication with them will take time. GH suggested that community champions would be needed for these age groups, and possibly one to one discussion. It was agreed that some could be reached through sports and other clubs but this would not substitute for personal approaches. CS offered to do door to door visits to those she knew; but it was agreed that more work would be needed on the required content of the consultation as well as the approach.

It was agreed that the general public age groups had already -been reasonably well-represented at the three open workshop/meetings.

HH offered to draft a questionnaire, using the information that had already been prepared for the three open meetings. JC suggested that there should be a core set of questions for all age groups, supplemented by additional questions specific to particular age groups. MR agreed that a core of questions was essential to avoid any sense of particular groups being left out.

WORKING GROUP

JC and JR suggested that a Ffacebook page could be set up, but any questionnaire needs to be available for completion online. It was agreed that a satellite to the Egerton village site would be the best short term solution, as long as it is mobile compatible.

HH estimated that the process could take a year to complete. In view of the NP timetable, JC suggested a focus on the priority age groups and that HH could produce a revised time line to deal with these.

IN conclusion LT thanked the sub-group, on behalf of the committee, for all the work that had been undertaken to produce the strategy as this helped to provide the evidence base needed to underpin a Neighbourhood Plan. However, to reflect the feelings of the Group as a whole, it was important to acknowledge that the focus on gauging the views of younger people in the village should not detract from the process of, and timetable for, seeking and assessing the views of everyone else.

Actions:

- HH to draft a questionnaire for circulation to the NP committee
- GH, LT and/or JC and MR to provide HH with details of the workshop content and analysis (hazel.harper05@gmail.com)
- HH and the sub-group to prepare a 2nd draft of the strategy/Gantt chart focusing on the priority age groups.
- GH and the sub-committee to assess the resources which might be required for the revised strategy, including new people to assist
- LT to approach Malcolm and Sandra Laws about setting up a satellite web site

2. Timetable

LT reported that she had spoken to ABC and established that the 2030 Plan will go to the inspector at the end of this year (2017) with the expectation that it will be returned with commentary in mid 2018. JCo noted that publication might be later than the summer as some amendment is likely. The fact that Egerton is producing a Neighbourhood Plan has been noted in the 2030 Plan but the only site in Egerton included in the 2016 draft was the site on New Road. RK and LT have therefore asked ABC to include both the Sunpatch development and access to it via the New Road site, and have received verbal confirmation that these will be added but have not yet received confirmation in writing. LT will chase written confirmation but noted that, if the Sunpatch site and access via New Road are not included, then the timetable for the Neighbourhood Plan may need to be accelerated.

GH noted that Hothfield have decided to wait until the ABC 2030 plan is finalised before producing their Neighbourhood Plan, and asked whether it was crucial for Egerton to aim for a referendum by September 2018. It was generally agreed that completion of the Plan to the September timetable gives Egerton some control, in line with government policy and in relation to ABC's -government policy Plan-

WORKING GROUP

CB expressed concern that the re-visiting of issues already covered in the Parish Plan (and that had been referred to the Parish Council for action) was delaying work on the NP, and that more focus was now needed of ensuring the timetable is to would be met.

It was agreed that the existing timetable should be -maintained, and that further consultation should run alongside- preparation of draft text.

3. Workshop outcomes

Maintaining the rural environment

Action

- It was agreed that the views and vistas should be established by the group, with the map, at the next meeting.

Housing development - Following a discussion between RK, LT and EG, RK has drafted a document on land use and housing need. LT has also asked ABC for guidance on how best to develop a housing needs survey. She also undertook to follow up with ABC on grant funding.

Action

- RK, LT or EG to circulate the revised draft to the full committee in advance of the next meeting for full discussion at that meeting.
- LT to circulate to the committee any ABC advice on developing a housing needs survey
- LT #to check on available grant funding with ABC

Economic development

JC reported briefly on the work that the group has undertaken to identify current business activity, to consider what constitutes sustainability and to prepare a first draft of a questionnaire (now attached for comment).

Community_Well-being

Action

MR to circulate SE's notes to the full committee.

4. Any other business

Christmas Fair. LT reported that she had been able to secure a tent -on the Glebe. GH-GH was already engaged in the overall set-up for the event and would offer more specific help too. and IM offered to assist LT and GH on a stall. help. LT would provide prizes and "Egerton" hessian bags with Christmas decorations, with profits of any sales to the Group. –MR agreed to provide laminated material from the workshops and a laminated map for the quiz.

WORKING GROUP

5. Next meetings

The next meetings will be on:

Wednesday 10th January 2018, 7.30pm, Sports Pavilion (now cancelled)

Thursday 1st February, 7.30pm, Sports Pavilion

The meeting closed at 9.45pm.