**Minutes of Committee Meeting**

**7.30pm, Tuesday 20 September 2016, Ham Children’s Centre**

**Present\***

Justine Glynn (Acting Chair)

Helen McNally

Jean Loveland

Danielle Coleman

David Williams

Penny Frost

Andree Frieze

Chris Ruse

Siriol Davies (Co-ordinator)

\*As the meeting was not quorate, any recommendations made in this meeting will be put to the wider committee by email for approval.

1. **Apologies** for absence were accepted from Brian Willman and John Goddard.

2. **The minutes of the Committee meeting of 16 August 2016** were approved(with a reminder to SD to distinguish between JG and JGd.)

3. **Matters arising not covered on the agenda**

Re. a response from the Cassel developers to our last letter, they responded to BWn asking to see copies of updated policies, which have been forwarded.

Re. Richmond Local Plan, BWn received an acknowledgement of receipt of Forum comments.

4. **Update on the work of our consultant Sarah Gatehouse**

CR reported that SG had started work in early September and made a visit to Ham on 9th where she was shown around by LF, BWn and himself. She has seen the policies, proposed a structure and identified duplication which needs to be eradicated. As it is more work than she had anticipated, she now expects to finish at the end of October, rather than September as originally intended. This has cost implications. CR will ask LF to give a more detailed estimate of costs, so that JG can confer with the treasurer JGd. Further expenditure needs to be approved by the committee through email. JG noted that Forum finances are healthy and read out a report from the treasurer (see item 9 below for financial report).

This delay to the editorial process will mean a change to the timetable agreed last year. Points to consider are:

Schedule for the Council revision of the Local Plan

The requirement for a minimum 6 week consultation period on the draft NP before submission.

Publication dates for the H&P magazine, which is our main vehicle for communication

Timetable for announcements about Ham Close, to avoid confusion with NP consultation.

After prolonged discussion, it was recommended that:

the AGM be postponed to 21st February. It should include a short presentation and perhaps tables for each policy, for the purposes of **clarification**, not consultation.

CR, JG and LF to produce a revised timetable, to be attached to the minutes of this meeting for approval by the committee, with a deadline for responses.

The November issues of the magazine could be used to alert the public to the date of the AGM and include the draft introduction to the Plan i.e. What is a NP? What are the aims? Why is it important? How have we consulted? How the 6 week consultation will take place.

The February magazine could then include a reminder of the AGM and a summary of the draft Plan

The 6 week consultation period could start before the AGM (date to be decided).

DC suggested including quotes in the November magazine e.g. ‘What I think is best about the plan is….’

HM mentioned that next February half term there is an event at the Children’s Centre which could be an opportunity to publicise the AGM.

5. **To agree a strengthened policy for Ham Close**

JG had done a FOI request on 2nd September re. the financial viability of Ham Close; it takes 20 working days to get a reply.

The revised policy sections for ‘Central Ham Opportunity Area’ had been circulated. There were no objections. It was decided that it would not be wise to put this in the next issue of the magazine, but to say that a revised policy would be available on our website.

Sarah Philby of LBRuT had asked for a meeting with the committee and drafting team. JG will respond, suggesting an evening meeting.

6. **To discuss arrangements for the November AGM**

See above, item 4.

7./8 **Meeting with Richard Broome about Ham Parade and sketches commissioned for St Richards Square**

CR reported on his meeting with Richard Broome of Outerspace Consultants, based at Teddington Lock, who had offered to do some sketches for the Plan to show how proposed changes might look. As Ham Parade is a complex area, he started with St Richard’s Square. Copies of a sketch showing shared space, removal of bollards and the large planting box in front of the shops were circulated. There was concern that if this was put in the Plan, people would assume that it was a definite plan for the site. However, it could be used as an illustration of the concept of shared space in the transport section, with the understanding that as a policy it needs to be integrated with better public transport to reduce car use. To be realistic more cars should be shown in the picture. H McN commented that removal of kerbs can be dangerous for children. CR to ask Richard Broome to make some amendments and show to the committee again.

PF suggested doing a survey of users of the space. However, it was felt that consultation had already taken place and Justine Langford is an expert on shared space.

AF had a contact who had offered to do a sketch of a proposed bridge to Twickenham. It was recommended that she consult with Justine Langford as this is part of the transport policy.

9. **To be updated on the financial situation**

JG read out a report by JGd on the current state of finances as follows:

 Funds held:       £9,418, split between the funders as follows:

            From LBRuT                             £2,437

            From My Community                 £6,985

The relevance of the split is:

1)     The grant money from My Community was advanced in mid-June as part of a grant of £8,680.  If the money is not spent by Mid-December, we have to ask for a grant extension up to a date not later than 31 March 2017.

2)     The costs of administrative services (Siriol) cannot be paid from My Communities money.

**Looking Forward**

1)     Out of the Communities money, we have paid the first instalment of Sarah Gatehouse’s fee for the drafting.  The balance of the fee for the drafting, the graphics and another edition of the magazine will have to come out of this money.

2)     At present, it does not look as though we need to ask LBRuT for the balance of the funding that they agreed at the last meeting.  However, it will be awkward if we do use up our existing LBRuT grant and we need to draw down funds for administrative services when LBRuT will want documentation for work on the plans.

10. **To note that the chair sent a note of congratulation to the Head of Grey Court for their excellent exam results**

The committee took note.

11. **To be updated on the 65 bus situation**

The re-routing of the 65 during road works had led to a demand for a direct bus from Twickenham to Kingston. BWn had written to the Richmond and Twickenham Times on this issue. Change is unlikely.

12. **Any other business:**

AF reported on the village forum where sections of the Local Plan were reviewed in groups with a mediator. Topics included residential property in the centre of town, speed limits etc. It was noted that public opinion was against building in the garden of St Michael’s Convent. Perhaps our policy needs to be reviewed accordingly.

AF advised that she is proposing to draft a letter to both Richmond and Kingston councils re. concerns over safety at Ham Cross junction. She is consulting with local organisations e.g. the Forum, HUG, HAG and Tudor Area Residents’ Association Kingston (TARAK). The committee agreed that they would support such a letter in principle.

SD asked the committee to note that the plan to hold the next committee meeting at Ham House for the consultant to present the edited plan is no longer viable.

13. **Date, time and place of next meeting** – 7.30pm, Tuesday 18 October 2016,

Ham Children’s Centre, to be chaired by JG.

**ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO FULL COMMITTEE FOR APPROVAL**

**New timetable for plan delivery (attached)**

**Revised policy sections for Central Ham Opportunity Area (attached)**