

**Minutes of Meeting of the Steering Group of Haslemere Vision  
held at the Town Hall on Tuesday, February 18 2014 at 8 pm**

**Present** Stewart Brown, Lesley Banfield, Matthew Bowcock, Cyndy Lancaster, John Moxon, Libby Piper, David Round, Robert Silk, David Simmons, Richard Oldham. Robert Serman was in attendance. Susanna Brown took the minutes.

**1 APOLOGIES/ABSENCE** Andy Braithwaite, Ken Griffiths, Vicki Purewal, Peter Isherwood, John Robini, Diana Vartan

**2 MINUTES OF LAST MEETING** held 22 January 2014 were approved with the correction of 'decline' to 'deadline' in paragraph 6.

**3 CHAIRMAN'S POSITION**

**3.1** S B opened discussion by saying that when he took on the chairman's role it was to have been for one year, and specifically that he had agreed only to be chairman, not chief executive. Now, 18 months on, he has been carrying both roles. This conflicts with his other responsibilities and is not good for Haslemere Vision, concentrating too much operational responsibility in one person. In short, it is no longer a viable arrangement. He had been discussing a possible restructuring of his role with other members of the Steering Group and asked MB to outline a proposed reallocation of responsibilities.

**3.2** MB began what became an extensive discussion, saying that probably all those involved were aware of the 'stupendous' amount of work that SB had taken on. MB felt that few people would step forward to take on the role as presently structured and that, if SB stepped down as chairman of HV at this juncture, credibility would be lost and SB would lose the satisfaction of seeing it through.

**3.3** MB suggested that the workload of the chair should be reduced, with SB continuing as chairman of both Haslemere Vision Ltd and the Steering Group and retaining responsibility for external relations with the Town Council, the inspectorate, WBC, etc. SB confirmed that he agreed with this proposal.

**3.4 *Process Leadership Group*** MB's proposal, which he had already discussed with several members of the SG, was that SB should step back from day to day operations and step down from the chair of the Process Leadership Group. Management of operations would become the responsibility of the Process Leadership Group. As it is unlikely that any one person would take on total leadership of that group, MB was proposing after recent discussions that, if two or three people were to share the PLG duties, chairing would not be so onerous, or possibly the chairmanship could be rotated. The candidates for this were RS, JM and Crawford Christie (not present). MB regretted that he personally is over-committed elsewhere until July or August, but hoped to contribute an on-going objective perspective.

**3.5** RS responded that he and JM were available and worked well together but noted that neither he, JM or MB had yet spoken to Crawford. There was widespread support for the proposal and for the three candidates but there was general agreement that, for the triumvirate to work, one of the three should act as chair.

**ACTION** RS and JM to talk to Crawford Christie and, having established his willingness to share the task, they should agree amongst themselves who would take on the role of chairman and advise the Steering Group accordingly.

**3.6 AGREED** in principle to relieving SB of the chief executive burden which will require a more general sharing of responsibilities for performing to timetable in future.

**4 UPDATE ON FORMAL TIMETABLE AND PROCESS**

- \* See HV: Update on future timetable and organisation as at 17/02/14
- \* See HV: Stage Summary as at 17/02/14

SB spoke by reference to these papers which he had circulated by email and distributed at the meeting and noted the following key points:

**4.1 Organisation** The PLG recommended that the four work groups continue, that a Policy Writing Team comprising one or two writers from each working group be formed. They will write policies and liaise with each other and with the members of their work group, under guidance of a Policy Editorial Group drawn from the PLG.

**AGREED: To adopt Organisation paragraph of paper referenced above (to be attached to and made part of the minutes).**

**ACTION: LB to recirculate the Plan the Plan “policy” paper prepared before the launch.**

**4.2 Timetable** Discussion of whether HV should have a stand at Charter Fair in May. It was agreed that a stand should be booked. It would be decided later whether this would be used as part of the main consultation scheduled for June or instead to raise awareness of the forthcoming consultation. It was agreed that the need for a November consultation would be reviewed once the June consultation had been completed.

**AGREED: To adopt timetable as set out in the Stage Summary referenced above (to be attached to and made part of the minutes), subject to the above provisos and with the addition of an action to obtain HTC approval of finalised plan in November/December.**

**4.3 Major Themes** The “provisional titles” for the major themes around which the NP would be written were discussed. These were:  
Meeting the housing needs of the community  
Making traffic less intrusive  
Strengthening the local economy  
Enhancing the built environment  
Protecting the natural environment  
Encouraging a cohesive community, constructively engaged in its own future

It was agreed that these titles did not quite capture the intent of the major themes.

**ACTION Suggestions invited from all for rewording of major themes, to SB**

## **5 RESOURCES**

Discussion of email circulated 18/02/14 by SB regarding the need to recruit further volunteers for key roles was deferred to next meeting.

**ACTION: SB and PLG to actively seek to fill those roles in the meantime and report back.**

## **6 WEY HILL FAIRGROUND SITE**

**6.1 Local Ballot** DG reported a heartening response to the ballot, both on line and on paper: Over 1400 returns had been received so far, with 94% favouring the HV delaying proposal. The deadline for return had been extended to end February, so that number should rise. The meeting recorded grateful thanks to all who had helped in the process but, in particular DR and KG

**ACTION: Responses to be kept for evidence, including post codes.**

**6.2 Legal issues** Grateful thanks were recorded to Chloe Nash for the work she had put in analysing the legal issues in preparation for the Fairground Inquiry. After discussion of

whether to pay for specialist legal advice it was concluded that HV should focus on its present course of establishing the strongest possible evidence of community support for the proposition that the proposed investment should be delayed. **It was therefore agreed that HV should not pay to seek expert legal advice.** However, RGS offered to seek the advice of chair of Open Spaces Society on case law and precedent in the hope that they could give us pro bono advice on the powers of the inspector.

**ACTION: RGS to contact the OSS as above.**

**6.3** SB summarised that even if the decision of the inspector supports the WBC application HV will have played its part and will continue to use the evidence of the ballot to press WBC to defer any actual expenditure until after the community consultation on the NP has been completed.

## **7 POLICE STATION**

SB had received an email report from James Birkett reporting that, so far, no interested developers had been identified.

**ACTION : Police Station sub-group to meet to decide whether it is a viable proposition to bid, and whether HV should withdraw now.**

## **8 NEXT MEETINGS**

Wednesday 19 March at Haslewey while Town Hall roof being repaired

Tuesday 22 April at Haslewey

Wednesday 21 May

Tuesday 24 June

**SMJB 21.2.14**