

**Note – this is a corrected version of the issued minutes, containing amendments as agreed at meeting held 7<sup>th</sup> December 2011.**

**1. Present**

- Ray Morris (RM), Neil Colman (NC), Glyn Charlton (GC), Bruce Sturdy (BS), Barbara Dagger (BD), Andy Dagger (AD), Morris Little (ML), Denis Fowle (DF), Alan White (AW), Ian Bruce (IB)

**2. Apologies**

- Lynda White (LW), Lucy Dorton (LDo), Brian Dorton (BDo)

**3. Declarations of Interest**

- None, although noted that GC is Chair of East Farleigh Parish Council (EFPC), and AW is a Member of EFPC.

**4. Minutes of Previous Meeting**

- N/A

**5. Survey Results**

- Results of Survey were as follows:

Yes	136	61.0%
No	83	37.2%
Abstain	4	1.8%
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>223</b>	
Willing to contribute towards cost	25	11.2%

**6. Discussion of Survey Results**

- This meeting held specifically to discuss results of feasibility study survey.
- RM thanked NC on behalf of Group for undertaking analysis of survey results.
- Agreed that full results of survey (including comments) would be published.
- Group posed question – “Does the result of the Survey constitute a sufficient margin and mandate to proceed with a feasibility study?” Votes in favour – 8; votes against – 0; abstentions – 2 (GC & AW).
- Decided that to go forward with the Study, Group would need support of EFPC. *RM to write to EFPC explaining what is happening and offer to attend December EFPC meeting.*
- Agreed that the Survey responses (and additional comments) would need to be used to define the Brief for the Study. The Draft Brief would be presented to EFPC for additional comments prior to instructing the works.

- Agreed that once the Study had been undertaken a public exhibition to present findings would be held.
- *NC to find previous request to EFPC requesting that Study is undertaken. [See Post Meeting Note 1]*
- *NC to write to all those Survey respondents indicating they would be prepared to contribute towards cost of Study.*
- *NC to write to Paulina Stockall re funding from Transport Budget.*
- Is any funding available from Friends of School?
- Agreed that a Commissioning Document to define scope and requirement of Study was required. *RM & IB to meet with Matthew Woodhead (MW) to discuss. [See Post Meeting Note 2]*

#### **7. AOB**

- Clarification – name of Group is East Farleigh Village Plan Action Group.
- GC asked if other members of the Group wanted him to continue to be part of the Group. The firm opinion of all other members of the Group was that GC provided extremely valuable input and was instrumental in creating the Plan. As such, agreed that GC should remain part of the Group.

#### **8. Next Meeting**

- Next meeting (non-Extraordinary) to be held on Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> December 2011, 1930, The White House PH

**Post Meeting Note 1 – request to EFPC re Study**

NC does not have a copy of the original request as the email to the Clerk of EFPC was created via the EFPC website.

Can a copy be obtained from EFPC?

## **Post Meeting Note 2 – Meeting with Matthew Whitehead**

Email correspondence following meeting between Matthew Woodhead and RM/IB.

Initial response from MW following meeting:

**From:** Matthew Woodhead  
**Sent:** 25 November 2011 12:30  
**To:** Ian Bruce; Ray Morris  
**Subject:** Village Plan

Ray/Ian

*Sorry I have not come back to you earlier. I have been liaising with our Highways team on the scope of their potential involvement in advising on Highway improvements as part of the study. Based on a recent similar project they undertook their fees were almost the same again to that which we have quoted which clearly makes a big difference to the costs. This also did not include any detailed design or costing of a scheme (as they are not insured to give costing advice). I am therefore discussing this further with them on Monday and whether we are therefore the best people to be able to undertake the study in general for you as clearly this is likely to be a crucial part of the outcome. I will let you know further on Monday following my further discussions when the Director of the team is back in.*

*Kind regards*

*Matthew Woodhead*  
**Director**

Follow-up response from MW:

**From:** Matthew Woodhead  
**Sent:** 01 December 2011 17:13  
**To:** Ray Morris; 'Ian Bruce'  
**Subject:** Re: Village Plan

Dear Ray/Ian

*Apologies for the delay in responding. Unfortunately our conclusion on the matter is that we do not feel that we are the best people to be able to offer you what you need to get from the report. A key part for you will be costings and whilst we can give ball park figures on something like the green we are not able to do this on the highways. We would also not be able to design highway solutions.*

*You would therefore be left with too many unknowns having paid a lot of money and we feel the best outcome for you would be to get a Surveying practise with quantity surveyors to undertake it. Some of the bigger practises like Davis Langdon will have the other areas of expertise you will need too all under one roof. This is likely to be the most cost effective for you.*

*I hope you can see we are being completely open and honest with you with what the Village requires*

*and making sure you get what you need for the best value. Following the meeting our assessment is that there will be more suitable practises that will be able to undertake fully what you need in this instance. I am happy to be on the end of the phone should I be able to help in any other way going forward and wish you every success.*

*Kind Regards  
Matthew Woodhead*

Response from RM:

***From:*** Ray Morris  
***Sent:*** 01 December 2011 18:31  
***To:*** 'Matthew Woodhead'  
***Subject:*** RE: Village Plan

*Dear Matthew*

*Thanks for letting us know – I appreciate your frank assessment of the task. We'll obviously be discussing this at the next meeting and may well be taking up your offer of telephone support.*

*Thank you too for the all the work you've done on our behalf up to now.*

*Onwards and upwards!*

*Best wishes  
Ray*