

**MINUTES OF HASLEMERE VISION STEERING GROUP MEETING
HELD AT HASLEMERE TOWN HALL ON WEDNESDAY 17 February 2016**

1. Members: Stewart Brown (Chairman)*, Crawford Christie *, David Simmons*, Cyndy Lancaster*, Liz Burton*, Jonny Fry*, John Moxon*, Lesley Banfield , Stephen Mulliner , Simon Drake , Ged Hall*, Simona Teresi*, Robert Silk (A), Peter Isherwood (A), Vicki Purewal (A) Diana Vartan(A), Matthew Bowcock (A).

*=Present (A) = Apologies

In attendance: Malcolm Carter

2. Introductory remarks: The Chairman welcomed Ged Hall and Simon Drake to the group as nominated representative of HTC. He also welcomed Malcolm Carter, Councillor for Hindhead Ward who was attending with respect to Hindhead & Beacon Hill issues (item 8 below).

3. The Minutes of the Meeting held on 20 January 2016 were approved.

4. Matters Arising:

- PLG discussion/ agreement re. addressing the infrastructure implications of the policy proposals and approaches to Sue Stathers on Schooling, Rose Parry on Medical facilities and Ken Griffith or one of his Culture Group on Leisure facilities: this item was carried forward to the next meeting. - SB reported Haslemere Society's proposal for a member of HVSG to join their Committee had been shelved pending clarification/reconsideration on their part re. - all other matters were acted on and/or reported on below.

5. Report back from Policy Writing Meeting of 9/02/2016 & Next steps:

CC reported the wording and format of the drafts were still a long way from being adequate so the 14 February deadline for circulation had been missed. The Environment and Business groups had come closest to producing properly worded policy and their drafts could now be circulated more widely to HTC for feedback. The Community group was unlikely to produce any policies as such, the only issue here being whether there was any interest in forming some kind of Community Land Trust for Haslemere, in which case there should be a separately constituted group to take this forward, HV being only the initiators. **Action: CC & LBU** to review Transport policies before the next Policy Writing meeting scheduled for Wed 24 February and aim to get policies drafted to a point where they are acceptable as formal policies in the right format that can be circulated to nominated members of HTC by the end of the week ending 28 Feb. **SB, CC and LB** to review the policies for all groups during week commencing February 29th and then circulate to Steering Group, Work Groups and the HTC working party.

6. Evidence Base Progress:

- SB reported this was progressing well with Diane Moses & Adam Brown having done considerable work on the verification trail and CL & SusannahB using a template from another NP (Roseland Peninsula) to make progress on the engagement process and governance record.

7. Environment/ Sustainability Progress:

- CC reported the Sustainability Appraisal was finished: **Action: LBU** to ask Adam Brown to circulate.
- Still awaiting WBC's response re. the SEA, which would probably take 2 months and was not critical at this stage.

8. Hindhead & Beacon Hill Issues:

(a) Consultation Update:

LBu & MC reported that, following contributions from PI and MC, the document was now ready to go and distribution was already in place covering most of the Hindhead area, with various retailers having agreed to help. A print run of some 4000 (??) was deemed most cost effective. Review of the questions by CC to ensure the usefulness of data collected was still needed. **Action: CC** to review as soon as possible.

MC reported that a general feedback meeting with local businesses & general public addressing "Hindhead after the Tunnel" was scheduled for March 14 and, ideally, the document would go out at least the week before for people to have a chance to consider the questions. This would then allow for a minimum of 6 weeks consultation period.

(b) Pros & Cons of applying to list the Punchbowl Hotel as an Asset of Community Value:

Pros: - There is no other indoor public space for the local community to hold events.

- The hotel has local historical value as a staging post on the old London to Portsmouth coach road.

- Hindhead is a tourism area that needs a high quality hotel.

Cons: - Would the community be able to raise the funds? LB suggested this was unlikely and a better course of action for the community would be to apply for section 106 money to create a village hall as part of planning policy.

- SD, with considerable experience in the hotel industry, stressed that the sums of money involved would be vast.

- Listing the building risked the possibility of deterring potential future onward sale to purchasers seeking to invest in the property for continued use as a hotel.

Conclusion: Following discussion it was agreed that listing as ACV was unrealistic but that the local community should be encouraged to show their support for keeping the site as a hotel and MC would speak to the owners to gain further insight in the matter.

9. Proposal from HTC to update the Memorandum of Understanding with HVLtd:

- SB reported the memorandum update had been circulated to SG members before the meeting for comments. After discussion it was agreed that, apart from some minor editorial points the only serious concern related to the Media Clause 9 requiring any HV media contact on the NP or future projects undertaken on behalf of HTC to be first approved in writing with the Town Clerk and the link councillors. It was recognised that it was very important, particularly as the drafting of the plan proceeds, to make sure that HTC and HV were in agreement over any future press releases regarding the content or possible content of the plan but there was general agreement that Clause 9, as drafted, put in question the independence of HV and was potentially unworkable given that press deadlines were often short.

- GH explained the large number of new councillors on HTC following the elections in May 2015 had prompted the update, and emphasized the Media clause solely concerned the main focus of the NP as far as HTC was concerned, namely Housing and Land Use. These were sensitive issues that had the potential to generate a lot of residents' concerns that were then being addressed to HTC, as had happened after a recent article in the local press that HTC only became aware of after being bombarded by such complaints and queries.

- The point was made that the press article in question had in fact not originated from an HV press release but had followed the presentation of the Housing Consultation results which had been attended by several councillors, but it was agreed that this highlighted the need to work closely together. After discussion it was agreed that HV should propose alternative wording for Clause 9. **Action: SB** to review and agree an alternative wording of clause 9 acceptable to all SG members and put it to GH as soon as possible.

10. Discussion of the pros and cons of applying to deregister the Fairground Site as common land:

SM summarised the situation as follows: In 2013 WBC had agreed to defer their application re. any plans for the site until HV had conducted its consultation with local residents. Now that the

consultation had been completed and there was a clear outcome of a general wish to keep the car park in some shape or form (90% support) there could be a case for proceeding with an application to deregister. This was because no development or upgrade to the car park could proceed in view of a 1968 by-law whereby the site became an Urban Common, and therefore could not by law be driven over. De-registering the site as common land would involve the need to offer some other land in exchange. After some discussion it was concluded that until a clearer plan for the future development of the site had been developed it did not make sense to apply and, in any case, it will be up to HTC not HV to initiate an application when the time is right. Members thanked SM for the clarification of this issue and agreed that no action should be taken at present.

11. HVLtd/ Governance:

As this item was not urgent and time was running short, it was deferred to the next meeting.

12. AOB:

DS proposed that the use of Drop Box should be discussed at the next meeting and this was agreed.

LBan suggested that the Steering Group should consider applying to list the Wey Centre as an asset of community value. It was agreed that this would be considered at the next meeting.

13. Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday 16 March at 8.00pm

Action: SB to circulate the dates of the next 6 months' meetings as soon as possible.

Meeting ended at 10 pm