

Farnham Board Minutes

Date & Time:	17 Jul 2020, 09:30 – 11:00
Venue:	Video Conferencing - Teams
Chair:	Cllr Tim Oliver
In attendance:	Cllr Colin Kemp, Cllr Wyatt Ramsdale, Cllr Stephen Spence, Cllr Andy MacLeod, Cllr John Ward, Cllr Paul Follows, Cllr John Neale, Rt Hon Jeremy Hunt MP, Tom Horwood, Zac Ellwood, Chris Tunstall, Paula Gough, Iain Lynch, Ben Funning, Steve Howard, Sach Baig, Tamara Stone (Sec)
Observers	Cllr Sally Dickson, Cllr Carole Cockburn, Cllr Alan Earwaker, Cllr Peter Clark, Cllr Mark Merryweather, Cllr Jerry Hyman, Richard Nelson, Cllr Pat Evans, Cllr Penny Marriott, Cllr Paula Dunsmore,
Apologies	Katie Stewart, Simon Griffin

	Item
1	<p>Introductions</p> <p>The Chair welcomed all board members to the second meeting and welcomed the observers from FTC/WBC. The intention was to hold future meetings in public (though they would not be public meetings) and there would be an opportunity for non-board members to submit questions in advance. The Local Liaison Forum would remain the mechanism for more open public engagement. The idea was to be transparent and engaged with the views of stakeholders, partners and residents in Farnham and the surrounding areas.</p>
2	<p>Minutes of the Meeting from the Last Board (22 May 20)</p> <p>No issues had been raised regarding the minutes from the last meeting, as such they were ratified as a true and accurate record.</p> <p>A query was raised regarding the appropriate sharing of minutes and papers from the Board. If there were items that were sensitive for example of a commercial nature, this would be separated, into a part 2. It would be confirmed for the Board and external observers what could and could not be shared. ACTION CT/PG was to prepare a note confirming the management of public meetings including the Public process, the asking of questions and the mechanism for sharing information.</p>
3	<p>Governance</p> <p>The 3 recommendations on the Governance report as follows was discussed:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a) Agree the revised Terms of Reference for the Board and the Local Liaison Forum, Annex A and B;</p>

	Item
	<p>b) Note the Chair(s) and Vice Chair for the Local Liaison Forum detailed in paragraph 5; namely Andy MacLeod and John Neale as Co- Chairs and Wyatt Ramsdale as Vice Chair and</p> <p>c) Agree the Draft Terms of Reference for the Programme Board, Annex C.</p> <p>The board was content with the papers as provided, no further queries were raised and as a result, these papers were ratified.</p>
4	<p>Progress Report</p> <p>An overview of progress to date was provided to the board. The main change of note was the receipt of £400K revenue from SCC and the engagement of Atkins to cover 4 bits of work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero net carbon review which will produce the Optimised Infrastructure Plan • Hickleys Review • Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Review • HGV Review <p>SCC had also contributed to the FTC Camera System which would allow the ability to monitor traffic and traffic counts. In addition, there would be early discussions with Police/Borough Commander about possibly checks that could be done to educate and deter HGV traffic. Considering opportunities and options for speed checks in the town centre/Upper Hale road was progressing with Police contact but it was also noted that Police time was stretched with other responsibilities. That said there were good relations with Police contacts and conversations would continue to hopefully get some speed checks undertaken within the town.</p> <p>Regarding planned progress going forward, talks continued with Crest about Brightwell development, connectivity, mobility and the issues surrounding the section 106.</p> <p>The vision statement was progressing, and a lot of work continued to ensure appropriate consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>Work progressed regarding the submission of cycling/active travel bids and measures being put in place as part of COVID-19 safety restrictions. Jeremy Hunt MP raised concerns over the temporary cones and restrictions in the centre of Farnham at present. His felt that the board could lose the goodwill of the residents as the current measures looked more like road works. Although planters had also been placed in the town, there was a feeling that the board could miss an opportunity to create a permanent attractive change in Farnham. Critically, this was not just a superficial issue but also a real safety concern for pedestrians as barriers were not fixed. Notwithstanding, it was felt that making the measure a more attractive and fixture would encourage the residents to keep them in place, thus being a quick win with large impacts for the betterment of Farnham. ACTION CT to continue to liaise with the Highways and Transport teams to see what could be done in the short term. In addition, CT would consider options for more permanent measures (with street design innovations – possibly Create Streets) beyond that.</p>
5	<p>Vision Statement Update</p> <p>The draft vision statement had been circulated and comments from stakeholders had been received and considered as part of the updates. The Vision statement would be reviewed alongside the draft Communications plan and would be used to implement the programme, and any funding mechanisms needed to secure support plans. The vision statement would evolve</p>



	Item
	<p>as the programme progressed, and the Optimised Infrastructure plan would detail the 'how to' elements.</p> <p>The following recommendations were submitted as part of the supporting papers:</p> <p>It was recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Vision statement updates be noted, and b) The Vision statement be approved c) The timeline of its release to stakeholder groups and public domain to be discussed and an approach agreed with the Board <p>Regarding point c above, it was felt that the sooner the document could be released to the public for comment the better, to ensure that they were included as part of the journey. However, to ensure the governance elements were also completed, the 3 organisations would gain approval, of this early draft, through their governance chains. The public comments would be fed in, possibly utilising the LLF on 5 Aug 20, before final sign off would be sought. In the meantime, the document would be subject to a plain English exercise. ACTION: CT/PG authorised to release the draft Vision statement and for SCC/WBC/FTC to progress the preliminary draft through their respective governance chains. In parallel, it would be released to the public and discussed at the next LLF with comments being fed back for final sign off.</p>
6	<p>Stakeholder Management and Communications</p> <p>Local Liaison Forum: An overview was provided about the LLF. It was felt that much of the feedback from the Public was positive. Discussions were ongoing about the practicalities of how the forum would operate. ACTION: updates would be provided to the Board members at board meetings; not for approval but for information.</p> <p>Cycling Campaign in Farnham: The Cycling forum had done some great work and CT was working with Officers from SCC to try and ensure a Farnham bid as part of the overall Surrey Covid Active Travel Phase 2 bid to be submitted by the 7 August.</p> <p>Stakeholder management and Communications Plan: A draft package of documents had been provided to the board and was a huge piece of work to ensure the Strategy fully supported the wide variety of stakeholders and Partners. It was acknowledged that the development of this package of documents was iterative and further refinement would take time to ensure it fully supported the community's needs. It was also confirmed that a dedicated comms manager would also be funded.</p> <p>Jeremy Hunt MP stated that the board would have to be careful not to over prepare the messaging and ensure that the residents saw substance and felt listened to. The residents wanted to see a sensible and simple coherent plan with real change on the ground happening sooner rather than later. A communications top heavy approach would go down poorly in Farnham; and could lose stakeholder support. The board agreed that whilst a wider strategy and detailed Comms plan was appropriate for Officers working on the Project, the public facing document/messaging should be clear, simple and concise. ACTION: PG/BF would produce a one-page summary communications plan, before the next meeting, and would liaise with the WBC Comms team. In addition, PG/BF would agree a plan to progress by mid-august.</p>
7	<p>Brightwell Development</p>

Item	
	<p>Discussions had been had with WBC and Crest stakeholders about Brightwell's, and these had been positive to date. There were some issues, as expected but discussion re the possible deferment of the S106 and S278 for East Street and the Royal Deer Junction was going well. Sitting on the joint board with Crest Nicholson board would help this engagement further. Cllr Steven Spence requested an opportunity to introduce David Walton to the Chair, Cllr Mel Few, Cllr Colin Kemp and the lead Officer for SCC as he felt that David had great experiences with Cultural regeneration that could benefit this scheme. ACTION: Cllr Spence would progress outside of the meeting.</p> <p>Zac Ellwood noted that although conversations with Crest had indeed been positive, he wanted to ensure the Board were aware that Crest still needed to check their contractual positions with people that have already signed up to the Site. In addition, they would also confirm their overall timescales to see what issues and risks there would be in not doing the work now and that these constraints and dependencies would need to be understood and managed.</p>
8	<p>Feedback from COVID-19 Interventions</p> <p>Further to earlier discussions regarding HGVs going through the centre of Farnham the Chair proposed that a discussion should be had with Google about Sat Nav routes and possibilities to divert away from the town centre. ACTION. CT to incorporate into the commission with Atkins.</p>
9	<p>AOB</p> <p>Quick wins: Cllr Wyatt Ramsdale mentioned that improvement of the Iron Stone sets on Castle Street may be a quick win, and he also offered that he believed the A road status could be playing a part in the reason why Sat Navs take vehicles through the centre of town and that it may be worth reviewing that linkage as part of our investigations/discussions with Google. Chris Tunstall confirmed that discussions regarding the Iron Stone sets were underway and he agreed it would be a quick win. In addition, he would consider the A road status as part of the Atkins commission.</p> <p>The Chair thanked everyone for their efforts especially the progress of the LLF that would be a key contributor going forward.</p> <p>Next meeting date:</p> <p>Friday 18th September 9.30am-11am</p>