

A NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FOR EGERTON

WORKING GROUP

Meeting 7.30 pm Thursday 22 March 2018 at the Sports Pavilion

Present: Jane Carr (Chair); Elaine Graham, Graham Howland, Richard King, Ian Mella, Claire Stevens, Lois Tilden (Secretary).

1. **Apologies:** Chris Burgess, Mel Rawlinson, Peter Rawlinson.
2. **The minutes of the meeting on 3 March** were approved.
3. **Matters arising from the minutes and other action points**
 - a. LT had sent the previous minutes to EPC's Clerk for website publication
 - b. R K reported back that he had studied the ABC document relating to housing/dwelling projections to 2030. Across the whole borough of Ashford the projection for 2030 was 64,200 which implied a 37% increase. If this were applied to Egerton it would amount to a rise from 455 households to 632 households. This was clearly disproportionately high for this village and it was understood that the higher proportion of new dwellings would be within the outskirts of Ashford town or in the larger villages such as Charing or Hamstreet. ABC's 2030 Plan (not yet approved) showed the site in New Road as being allocated for 15 new dwellings, and in addition there would be scope for 10 older peoples' bungalows on the Sunpatch site (with scope to mix and match property styles between the two sites). With additional "windfall" development, barn conversions and some small newly-identified development sites as part of the Neighbourhood Plan, Egerton was likely to be prepared for the future beyond 2030. The New Road/Sunpatch sites would necessarily include affordable housing for local people. The data in the ABC document would provide the evidence to support findings in the Plan. **Action: RK and LT to discuss and investigate the scope for a questionnaire to assess housing needs, with clarified distinctions between the Government's definition of affordable housing (social housing for those on the ABC housing register only) and private housing at lower rent than the average market rent for those not quite eligible for ABC's housing register and who wish to stay in the village. As demonstrated in the Parish Plan consultations, the latter category needed to be worked out carefully in consultation with ABC. Action: JC to arrange meeting with ABC.**
 - c. JC had tried unsuccessfully to contact Martin Chapman. GH said he would do this as he knew he lived next to the shop and would see him when taking their respective children to and from school. **Action: GH**
 - d. JC had contacted Jerry Crossley about preparing a one-page summary of the Parish Design statement. This was in hand. **Action: Jerry C**
 - e. GH had set up a Facebook page and would now add input to other media such as My Next Door and Instagram as well as costing a mobile-friendly web site. Images of vistas could be included. Others in the Group could add articles and photos. 270 people had reacted to

A NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FOR EGERTON

WORKING GROUP

Facebook in a matter of days, which was very good news. LT would issue information via the Neighbourhood watch network. **Action: GH to revive the Instagram site and to work on a designated Website, to link to Facebook; new material to be added regularly.**

4. Walks around village to identify Vistas

JC reported that Sarah Elworthy was not certain about taking this on, but the running Club members would be invited to consider this. She had contacted Malcolm Iles (Cricket Club) and Debbie Fooks, who have offered to help, as might the Bluebell Run via the School. There could be up to 30 families from whom ideas could be collected. GH would pursue these ideas. **Action: GH**

5. Workshops

Arrange 3 dates for workshops in late May/June Identify facilitators for these groups. **Action: EG** [Dates fixed : June 9th 10am to 1pm and June 20th 7pm to 10pm.] Seek funding. **Action: IM.** Beforehand, draft very careful letter to invite landowners to suggest land for sites – “toe in the water” approach, expectations to be managed. **Action: JC/LT; All to consider and put forward options for facilitators; . Action: All to think of ideas for engaging facilitators.**

Claire Stevens was working on converting economic development issues into a draft questionnaire for the workshop participants, to be circulated to the Group for comment. **Action: CS**

6. Budget

Ian Mella had produced headings to arrive at a total budget of approx. £12-15k. A Planning Adviser could cost about £3.5k. The cost of a survey might be significant. About £9k might be available in grants. It was understood that the Government was providing funds for local authorities to provide to NP groups according to the “Locality” website. Where there were complex issues, more might be forthcoming, although this was unlikely to apply in Egerton. ACRK would need to be engaged for advice and assistance, some of which would incur expenditure. More detailed budgeting would be needed after research into requirements. JC would investigate the scope for auditing our action to date. **Action: IM to work up budget in more detail and informally approach funding sources.** Applications for funding would need to be via Egerton Parish Council. This would need to be ring-fenced or under a separate account. **Action: JC would speak to ABC about grant funding; RK to speak to Clerk to EPC about accounting for funds .**

7. Parish Assembly Thursday 12 April

- A. LT/JC had provided speaking notes for Richard King, including the significance of a referendum; RK had adapted the notes to suit his style.
- B. JC had produced 1 page note on outcome of workshops, with different types of graph; it was decided that the bar charts were clearer than the ie charts. **Action: JC to ask Mel R to produce them even more clearly.**

A NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FOR EGERTON

WORKING GROUP

- C. EG had designed a poster for Mel Rawlinson to produce, signalling the opportunity the NP gives to everyone to help shape the village. Four would be used at the Assembly. Tables & easels to be positioned in the centre of the Hall, for best effect in enabling people to take part in looking at the map of the village and using coloured stickers provided by LT to denote "Potential for housing development", "Potential for commercial development" "No Development" "Sunpatch and New Road sites" and "key vistas". **Action: All** (except JC and LT who would be out of the country – all others would be present) ***GH would mark the sites in New Road/Sunpatch on the maps.***
- D. LT had produced a summary of the key points in the criteria for development – this still needed a bit more work before making it public at the Assembly and future workshops – RK offered to do this. Claire Stevens asked LT for a copy of the full version. **Action RK**
- E. ***Some of the photos used in the earlier workshops would be reused in the Hall. More name badges would be supplied by LT. Dates of workshops would need to be agreed so they could be publicised.***
- F. Copies of the Parish Design statement to be available at the Assembly. **Action: JC to ask Jerry C to write a 1 page summary of the Design statement. LT to ask Jerry C and/or EPC Clerk to provide more copies of the full version.**
- G. Forms to be devised for people to sign up to workshops in June to discuss criteria for development and sites/views to protect; economic development/business use. **[Action: None assigned, LT will do this]**
- H. Those expected to attend the Assembly : ***Richard King (Chairing the Assembly with a keynote speech) Chris Burgess, Elaine Graham, Graham Howland, Ian Mella, Mel and Peter Rawlinson, Claire Stevens.*** **Action: All: Arrival time 7pm to prepare tables, easels, maps, posters, forms, documents etc.**
- I. Mel had offered to produce a second NP Newsletter as well as an article about the Assembly for the Egerton Update magazine. **Action: JC/ MR**
8. **Next meetings :** Saturday 28 April, 10.30 am and Tuesday 22 May, 7.30pm at the Pavilion. **Action: EG to book the meeting rooms**

The meeting ended at 9.40pm