

# **CHILHAM SQUARE**

## **Community Engagement Exercise**

### **Second Scheme Development Workshop**

**7pm, Thursday 8 July, Chilham Castle**

## **Meeting Record**

**Note:** The attendance list, presentation slides and group feedback for the meeting are attached to the back of this meeting record. The following should be read in conjunction with the attachments, especially the presentation slides.

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

#### **Opening**

As with previous meetings, Huw Jarvis introduced himself, dealt with a number of practical matters concerning the venue and re-iterated his, CFDB's and Simon Doyle's roles. Huw then handed the leading of the meeting to Simon Doyle.

#### **Agenda**

Simon commenced by asking the meeting whether the agenda item addressing case studies (item 6) could be left to the very end of the meeting and possibly omitted if the meeting went on too long. No one objected.

#### **Comments and Corrections on Previous Workshop Meeting Record**

After acknowledging that three specific and a number of general responses had been received concerning the previous workshop in advance of the current one, Simon asked the meeting for further comments on and corrections to the previous workshop meeting record. Pertinent feedback received prior to and during the meeting included ...

- David Hayes asked Daniel McLeish under item 4 to reiterate the point made in his presentation that "There is no legal right to park on the public highway as it is only intended for the public to be able to pass and repass over it." David had gone on to ask Sgt Mark Wells to confirm this from the policing angle, which he did. Sgt Mark Wells also confirmed that any vehicle preventing free and unrestricted access could be reported.
- Graham Swan mentioned a letter that he had forwarded to Chilham Parish Council. Further, he tabled a letter (attached) addressing the safety record on the Square. Concerning the latter, Anthony Perrett responded that an absence of recorded injuries doesn't mean injuries hadn't occurred, nor that they couldn't happen.
- Sue Smith pointed out that it had been her rather than Graham Swan who had asked the question concerning funding (under item 5). Sue also said that she had asked whether maintenance costs would be put on the parish precept.
- Sue Smith stated that the statement that the Jacobs' proposals did not satisfy community aspirations was not true because the parish community had never had a chance to see the report.

#### **Other Matters**

- Several in the meeting noted that Simon Doyle had had a meeting with Peter Wead earlier in the day and asked whether Lisa Smart would also get an opportunity to express her opinion from the White Horse perspective. Simon pointed out that the general policy was to have meetings only when requested and on a case-by-case and reasonable basis. A meeting with Lisa could be organised.

## 2. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVE

In order to prepare the meeting for the evening's work, Simon ...

- re-visited the consultation exercise objective and the role of the representatives;
- presented weekday and Saturday parking data, most of which gathered by community volunteers since the previous workshop;
- briefly illustrated the movement, parking and aesthetic implications of a series of layouts, emphasizing the parking losses associated with (1) disabled provision, (2) ensuring clear vehicular movement into and out of the Square and (3) providing an open castle-church view; and
- provided an explanation for why parking dominates discussion.

The meeting slides provide more detail. The parking statistics generated the greatest comment.

Simon then explained the group tasks for the evening and the manner in which groups would form. Generally speaking, community representatives were divided by three strongly-held positions. Accordingly, three voluntary groups were suggested as follows ...

- Group 1, tasked with considering how the Jacobs proposal might be improved or left "as is" and presented so as to win community
- Group 2, tasked with developing a "compromise" layout providing 25 to 35 parking bays
- Group 3, tasked with developing a layout providing less than 25 parking bays

No one objected to this suggestion. Before splitting up, however, Tom Reed expressed regret that groups would again form and proceed with scheme development without being exposed to the case studies. Simon responded by saying that the case study material was deliberately eclectic in nature, reflecting both the good and the bad. Although it would prove useful at some stage, presentation now would not only take time but probably aggravate existing divisions.

## 3. GROUP EXERCISE

After outlining how groups were to undertake their work, the meeting split into the three groups described in 2. above. Although people could shift groups during the course of the working session, tables should remain committed to their allotted task. Only one representative changed groups during the course of the working session.

## 4. GROUP FEEDBACK

Alan Millar, Steve Martin and Tom Reed (assisted by Diana Holbrook) gave feedback for the three groups in turn. Group materials (layouts, feedback sheets, etc.) are attached to the back of this meeting record.

In the ensuing discussion the following was raised ...

- Ray Wilkinson suggested that all of the layouts be autotracked to confirm they were workable from a vehicular movement perspective.
- Ben Glancy pointed out that it was difficult for Group 2 to identify a layout because it was more diverse in terms of opinion and there was also a wider range of possibilities than was the case for the other groups.
- Peter Higgs expressed concern at Group 3's layout, asking that it be checked for being to scale – there seemed to be too much space.
- Diana Holbrook said it was important for space to be provided for groups to assemble safely prior to weddings and funerals. There was a difference in opinion concerning whether it was the pedestrians that got in the way of cars or vice versa.
- At least two members of Group 2 expressed an interest in the layout developed by Group 3, saying they might shift groups.

## 5. OPEN DISCUSSION

Simon questioned the need for another scheme development workshop, suggesting that the groups progress their proposals and the cases for them separately. Simon offered to meet with each group in three week's time to fine-tune and finalise proposals, inclusive of materials and finishes and Taylor's Hill Car Park proposals. Plans could then be made for a final open meeting at which the various proposals or a selection could be presented.

**Note:** Developments subsequent to the workshop necessitated the postponement of a visit by Simon to Chilham.

## 6. CONCLUDING MATTERS AND MEETING CLOSURE

Huw Jarvis brought the meeting to a formal closure by asking for further comments and confirming that everyone had had their "say".

Simon then asked attendees that if they felt they had made a verbal contribution that needs recording that they please get it to him or Geoff.

# **Annexures**

**Attendance List**

**Presentation slides**

**Group Feedback**