



# DORCHESTER TOWN COUNCIL

Council Offices, 19 North Square, Dorchester, Dorset. DT1 1JF

Telephone: (01305) 266861

**Adrian Stuart, Town Clerk**

10 October 2017

You are invited to a meeting of the **DORCHESTER HERITAGE JOINT COMMITTEE** will be held in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER, MUNICIPAL BUILDINGS, NORTH SQUARE, DORCHESTER** on **MONDAY 16 OCTOBER 2017** commencing at **7.00pm**.

Town Clerk and Secretary to the Committee

## **Declaration of Interests**

Members are reminded that the Code of Conduct requires Members to declare any interest which they have in any matter under discussion. If the interest is regarded as a Personal Interest the Member may remain and take part in the consideration of the item but if the interest is a Prejudicial Interest the Member must withdraw from the Chamber during the consideration of it.

## **Membership**

West Dorset District Council: A. Canning, J. Dunseith, S. Jones

Dorchester Town Council: C. Biggs, G. Jones, T. Loakes

The following Members may attend and speak but not vote:

Mr S Conibear (Duchy of Cornwall), Mr P Mann (Dorchester Civic Society), Mr A Chisholm (Dorchester Chamber for Business), Mr C Copson (The Keep Military Museum), Ms C M Hebditch (Dorchester Local Nature Reserve), Dr J Murden (Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society), Mr T Loasby (Blue Badge Tourist Guides) Mr J Smith (Dorchester Association), A Bright (Shire Hall), Mr R M Biggs (Dorset County Council)

## **AGENDA**

### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

To receive any apologies for absence.

### **2. MINUTES**

To read, confirm and sign the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 17 July 2017 (copy enclosed).

3. **DECLARATIONS OF PREDETERMINATION**

Members to declare if they consider that they have predetermined or may predetermine in the relation to the following items and to indicate the action they will be taking when the item is considered.

*NOTE: It is the responsibility of individual Members to decide whether they have predetermined in relation to an item. Members who make a declaration should leave the room during the discussion and voting.*

*Members who may wish to take part in the decision making process as a member of another committee, at which the item is to be considered, should decide whether they wish to participate at this stage.*

4. **THE REAL TOWN TOURS – DORCHESTER - APP**

To welcome Phil Gordon, BID Project Director to the meeting.

At the last meeting of the Committee Members gave consideration to the new Dorchester BID Real Town Tours App. Members welcomed the development of the App and requested that a representative from the BID attend a meeting of the Committee to discuss how the Committee could work further with the BID to develop the App further.

5. **PEDESTRIAN WAYFINDING SIGNS**

Members will be advised that the contract for the Pedestrian Wayfinding scheme has been let to Wood and Wood Signs.

An initial site meeting and walkabout is planned for 10.00am on Friday 27 October 2017, from this the strategy report will be drafted. The Member group established at the last meeting is requested to note this meeting and attend if possible.

At the last meeting the Committee also requested some information with regard to how Chichester had dealt with the issue of A Board proliferation in the town. Attached is a copy of the report considered and agreed by Chichester District Council in August 2013.

6. **NAPPERS MITE CLOCK**

Members may have noticed that Nappers Mite Clock has been removed. The clock has not worked for many years but horologists Graham and Debbie Bebington from Clox on Time have repaired the internal motor, free of charge, and have volunteered to help restore the clock. To this end a project plan was agreed as follows:-

Clock Dials to be re-painted – to be undertaken by local sign writer – cost £550  
New clock hands – to be made by specialist contractor – approximate maximum cost £600  
Fettle the drum repaint and new clock face retaining braces - £200  
Remove and re-erect clock – Clox on Time – free of charge  
Cherry Picker Hire - £450

The Committee is asked to support this project and to consider making a small grant to cover some of the costs. Dorchester BID have offered a contribution of approximately £200 and it is suggested that other partners may also wish to make a contribution towards the project.

7. **HERITAGE TOURISM**

To consider a report by the Town Clerk (enclosed).

8. **INFORMATION SIGNS - UPDATE**

Frink Sculpture – This board is being revised following the comments made by the Committee at the last meeting.

9. **QUESTIONS**

To receive questions submitted by Members in writing to the Dorchester Town Clerk and in respect of which the appropriate notice has been given.

10. **URGENT ITEMS**

To consider any other items that the Chairman decides are urgent.

11. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

To consider a date for the next meeting of the Committee.



## **DORCHESTER TOWN COUNCIL**

### **DORCHESTER JOINT HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**17 JULY 2017**

At the Meeting of the Dorchester Joint Heritage Committee held on 17 July 2017:

#### **PRESENT:**

Dorchester Town Council	Councillors: C. Biggs G. Jones
	Officer: S. Newman
West Dorset District Council	Councillors: A. Canning (Chairman)
Dorset County Council	Councillor: R. Biggs
Blue Badge Tourist Guides	T. Loasby
Dorchester Association	J. Smith
Dorchester Civic Society	P. Mann
Dorchester Chamber for Business	A. Chisholm
Dorchester Local Nature Reserve	C. Hebditch

#### 1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J. Dunseith and S. Jones (West Dorset District Council), J. Murden (Dorset Natural history and Archaeological Society), A. Bright (Shire Hall) and C. Copson (The Keep Military Museum).

#### 2. **ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

It was proposed, seconded and

#### **RESOLVED**

That Councillor A. Canning be elected Chairman for the remainder of the 2017-18 Council Year.

#### 3. **ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

It was proposed, seconded and

## **RESOLVED**

That Councillor G. Jones be elected Vice-Chairman for the remainder of the 2017-18 Council Year.

### **4. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 April 2017, a copy of which had been circulated, were confirmed and signed.

### **5. DECLARATIONS OF PRE-DETERMINATION**

There were no declarations of pre-determination.

### **6. THOMAS HARDY TRAIL**

Members were reminded that at the last meeting of the Committee it was resolved:-

*“That enquiries be made as to which organisation was responsible for the implementation and ongoing maintenance of the Hardy trail.”*

The Committee was informed that West Dorset District Council was responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the trail – if Members knew of any information boards that were missing or needed updating they should be reported direct to the District Council or via the Deputy Town Clerk.

## **RESOLVED**

That the position be noted.

### **7. PEDESTRIAN WAYFINDING SIGNS**

The Committee was informed that the full grant application to the South Dorset Local Action Group Leader Rural Development Programme for a grant towards a new pedestrian wayfinding scheme for Dorchester had been approved. It was proposed that an outline design and scheme would be worked up over the summer and it was hoped that the draft scheme would be available for Members consideration at its next meeting.

It was noted that the Committee had previously identified a Group to work on the wayfinding scheme and it was agreed that this Group continue so as to enable progress of the scheme between formal meetings of the Committee should the need arise.

It was reported that Officers from Dorset County Council had been invited to attend a meeting to see if it was possible to take advantage of this opportunity to do something about the proliferation of ‘A’ boards in the town. Members felt that this opportunity should not be missed and noted that Chichester had been successful in reducing the number of ‘A’ Boards.

Members also discussed what should be signed as a part of the wayfinding scheme and agreed that a policy should be established. The Committee also considered whether a CityScape map could be incorporated into the scheme or whether that map could be provided independently.

## **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the grant received towards a pedestrian wayfinding scheme for Dorchester be welcomed.
- (2) That the group previously established to discuss the detail of the scheme continue. The Group comprised of the Chairman of the Committee and Councillors S. Jones, A. Chisholm, J. Dunseath, F. Kent-Ledger and Kate Hebditch.
- (3) That a policy for what should be included within the signing be established.
- (4) That information be sought from Chichester regarding how that town had dealt with the issue of 'A' Boards.

## **8. THE REAL TOWN TOURS – DORCHESTER APP**

Members received a presentation on a new town trails App which had been developed by Dorchester BID. The Committee felt that the App was good and could be developed further with additional trails, being available in other languages etc.

The Committee felt that it would be beneficial to invite a BID representative to the next meeting to see how the Committee could work with the BID to develop the App further.

In respect of the content already included within the App it was noted that there was reference to 'Poundbury New Town' which it was not.

## **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the Real Town Tour App be welcomed.
- (2) That a representative from the BID be invited to the next meeting of the Committee to discuss how the Committee could work with the BID to develop the App further.
- (3) That the reference to 'Poundbury New Town' be changed.

## **9. 2016-17 STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS**

Members considered the Committee's Statement of Accounts for 2016-17.

In regard to the sales of 'Let's Explore Dorchester' it was felt that it might be worth contacting 'Roving Books' and have the title included within its stock.

## **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the 2016-17 Statement of Accounts be received.

(2) That 'Roving Books' be contacted to see if the 'Let's Explore Dorchester' would be suitable for inclusion in its stock line.

10. **CORRESPONDENCE**

Members had before them correspondence received from a local resident regarding the location of Thomas Hardy Statue and Frink Statues and suggestions for ideas to improve South Street.

The Committee welcomed the interest of the local resident and gave consideration to the matters raised. With regard to the Thomas Hardy statue Members agreed that the location was not ideal. However, the cost of moving the statue had been investigated some year ago and the cost at that time was approximately £40,000 and it was therefore felt that this would not be feasible at the present time. With regard to the Frink Statue Members felt that the present location was the correct one as it was the old Dorchester Gallows, it was also noted that the statue was now Listed and approval to move it was therefore highly unlikely.

The Committee agreed that it would be good to have additional public art in and around the town centre to add to what was already in place. It was felt that a sculpture trail could be developed, maybe via the new Town Trails App.

**RESOLVED**

That the correspondent be thanked for the interest he has shown in the Town but that for the reasons given above his suggestions not be pursued at the present time.

11. **ST OSMUND'S MIDDLE SCHOOL – WW1 EVENT**

The Committee was informed that St Osmund's Middle School was researching Dorchester and The Great War. The school pupils were working with local historians and musicians to present their findings in the form of a play, open to all, which would include music and singing. The play was to be performed at Thomas Hardy School in March 2018. The research and play was very much a community project and was very Dorchester based – it was bringing the history and heritage of the town to life for the young people working on the project. The pupils were looking for financial support to help with the cost of sound, lighting, scenery etc.

Members felt that this was a very worthwhile project and should be supported subject to a DVD of the play being passed to The Keep Museum and the Committee being acknowledged as a funder of the project.

**RESOLVED**

That the Deputy Town Clerk be authorised to give a grant of £750 to the project, following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

12. **DORCHESTER BOUNDARY STONE**

Members were reminded that at the last meeting of the Committee it was agreed that investigations be made into whether it would be possible to directly engrave the Dorchester boundary stone which had recently lost its cast iron plaque. Following discussion with a local



stonemason it would seem that this was not going to be possible due to the quality of the stone. The stonemason had proposed an engraved stone plaque which could then be attached to the stone.

It was suggested that a 3D plastic print of the plaque might be a solution and the Vice-Chairman agreed to investigate this possibility.

It was also reported that local historian Jo Draper had recently died and the Committee felt that consideration be given, at the next meeting, as to whether there was an opportunity for some form of memorial or plaque for Jo.

## **RESOLVED**

(1) That the Vice-Chairman of the Committee investigate whether a 3D render of the Boundary stone plaque would be appropriate.

(2) That that consideration be given, at the next meeting, as to whether there was an opportunity for some form of memorial or plaque in respect of Jo Draper.

## 13. **INFORMATION SIGNS - UPDATE**

### Maumbury Rings

The Deputy Town Clerk informed the Committee that the new 'Welcome to Maumbury Rings' and 'Looking After Maumbury Rings' signs had now been installed and had received favourable comments.

### Frink Sculpture

Members had before them the draft new information board for the Frink Sculpture. The Committee felt that the information board was good but that it could be changed to reduce the amount of information about Chideok, increase the information about Elizabeth Frink and link to other related sites. It was noted that the board would have a QR tag included and that a significant amount of additional information could be included on the website. It was agreed that the board would be revised taking into consideration the points raised by the Committee.

## 14. **QUESTIONS**

No formal questions had been submitted.

## 15. **URGENT ITEMS**

The representative from the Dorchester Chamber of Business reported that he had booked a table at the Portland Port Trade Fair on 19 October 2017. If any Member wished to promote their activity please contact him. It was noted that the TIC did have a good video of some of Dorchester's many attractions.

The Vice-Chairman queried whether a 'heritage audit' of the town had ever been completed. It was noted that Historic England had a large amount of information with regard to Listed building and monuments, there was a significant amount of archaeological information and

the Dorset County Museum held the Thomas Hardy archive. It was also noted that the County Council historic towns project would have collected data but that this had yet to be put into a report due to a lack of funding.

It was agreed that it would be beneficial to have a comprehensive audit at some stage.

16. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Monday 16 October 2017 commencing at 7.00pm.

Chairman:

Dated:

# **'A' Board Advertisement Control in Chichester**

## **Chichester District Council**

### ***Planning Committee***

***21 August 2013***

#### **1. Contacts**

Andrew Frost, Assistant Director Development Management.  
Direct Line: 01243 534892, email: afrost@chichester.gov.uk

Shona Archer, Manager Enforcement Team.  
Tel: 01243 534547, email: sarcher@chichester.gov.uk

Carol Purnell, Housing and Planning Portfolio Holder,  
Tel: 01243 605927, email: cpurnell@chichester.gov.uk

#### **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 That the proposed approach to addressing the unauthorised display of A Boards within the city centre be agreed.**

#### **3. Background**

- 3.1** In October 2007 officers at West Sussex County Council (WSCC) recommended that as Highway Authority, they adopt a policy that:-

- a) Gave a licence for signs to be placed on the highway to be granted within designated areas that were agreed with the Local Planning Authority and other appropriate partners
- b) Ensured that all unauthorised signs on the public highway be removed within a timescale dependent upon risk
- c) Be implemented through standard operating procedures for licensing and enforcement to be agreed with the District and Borough Councils.

The recommendations were agreed and WSCC has produced conditions for the licensing of A Boards.

- 3.2** Subsequently, the City Centre Manager working with planning officers, considered the scope for controlling the display of A Boards without resorting to the use of formal enforcement action. A number of actions were considered including:

1. A shop guide with copies distributed to shoppers in the City and then subsequently an On-line searchable shopping directory;
  2. Promotional opportunities such as large TV screen in shopping streets;
  3. Reviewing the hanging-sign guidance within the Council's Shopfront and Advertisement Design Guidance. This review was completed and updated guidance was adopted by the Council for development management purposes;
  4. Provision of poster sites in Council owned toilet facilities;
  5. Limited permanent signage to replace A Boards where they are used as directional signage i.e. finger post signs or similar.
- 3.3 Actions 1 and 3 of the above have been completed and as a result, hanging signs are now permissible in side streets off the four main streets in the city centre subject to the controls specified in the Council's shopfront guidance.
- 3.4 Officers from Chichester District Council, the City Council, WSCC and the City Centre Partnership have held periodic meetings to discuss the growing number of A Boards within the city centre and the alternative advertising options that could be used to control them. They have also considered the feasibility of carrying out formal planning enforcement action. However, permanent removal of A Boards has not proceeded primarily due to the economic downturn wherein it was not considered appropriate to instigate formal enforcement action against businesses that appear to derive up to 30% of their business from the display of an A Board.
- 3.5 The use of 'monolith' advertisements was trialed in 2008 with two temporary installations but these did not receive public support and an application for 22 monolith direction signs, up to 2.6m high, in Chichester city centre was withdrawn in light of strong opposition to them on grounds of their design, scale and siting. The concept of the monoliths was to replace all of the exiting directional finger-post signs throughout city centre and the need for A Boards.
- 3.6 In 2012, the City Centre Manager, Kim Long, transferred to the City Centre Partnership and is now part of the Chichester Business Improvement District (BID) plan. In the first year of the BID expenditure included marketing and the independents' guide. At present they are considering the use of a modified street map of Chichester with advertising to be displayed in prominent public locations and consider that signage is a necessary associated resource to assist traders and direct customers to them. As part of this on-going piece of work, the partnership has now turned its attention to the use of A Boards in the city centre and has commenced a series of meetings with stakeholders to consider the proliferation and cluster of A Boards in use today.
- 3.7 The partnership and stakeholders have considered the following options:
- Prohibit all A Boards within North, East, South and West Street;
  - Licence A Boards in all other locations;
  - One A Board per business, but none allowed if there is a hanging sign or outside dining area
  - Heritage finger post signs to be modified; and
  - Use of wall signage

3.8 No decisions have been taken in respect of the above and discussions are likely to continue before any agreement between the parties on a preferred option is achieved.

#### **4. Outcomes to be achieved**

4.1 To secure the removal of unauthorised A Boards displayed in the City Centre.

4.2 As of 7 June 2013, it was reported that some 198 'A' Boards are now displayed in the city centre as opposed to the 86 that had been displayed in 2006. Their use has therefore become an even greater issue in the intervening period and causes concern in terms of visual harm and in some cases highway obstruction. Concerns about safety have also been raised due to the large clusters of signage in some locations and their instability. Given these circumstances, it is now considered that this matter requires attention.

#### **5. Proposal**

5.1 To use the Council's planning enforcement powers under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 [the **Act**] to require the unauthorised display of A Board advertisements to cease; and where voluntary removal of the signs is not forthcoming to either:

a) Instigate legal prosecutions against the offence committed; or

b) Use the power to remove structures used for unauthorised display of an advertisement [section 225a of the Act].

#### **6. Alternatives that have been considered**

6.1 Toleration – the existing situation to be allowed to continue. 'A' Boards are a fashionable way for business to promote their goods and services in Chichester adding to the colour and atmosphere of the street scene for residents and visitors alike. However, experience shows that if the A boards are left unchecked the number of premises using them increases, thereby exacerbating the problem.

Licensing – This is toleration under controlled conditions. The advertisements do not benefit from consent under the advertisement regulations but they are controlled through conditions imposed on a licence. It is an approach that has been used by Adur District Council and Horsham District Council. Adur however experienced difficulties resourcing the enforcement of the process and did not robustly market or manage the scheme. Horsham has applied local conditions. A licensing approach could be adopted in Chichester but there is no prospect of this process being delivered in the foreseeable future as it requires procedures to be written and agreed and in some instances, the devolution of responsibility from one authority to another. This will necessitate suitable member engagement.

Undertakings from retailers to refrain from displaying any pavement advertising – officers are not confident that such an undertaking would be forthcoming or adhered to as the situation has become competitive.

#### **6.2 Resource and legal implications**

6.2.1 S.224 (3) of the Act makes it an offence for any person to display an advertisement in contravention of the Regulations. The relevant regulations are the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 (the Advertisement Regulations). Where an offence is proven the contravener shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine, currently not exceeding £2,500 and, in the case of a continuing offence, £250 for each day during which

the offence continues after conviction. This provision applies to all types of unauthorised advertisement.

6.2.2 S.225A of the Act enables a local planning authority [LPA] to remove, and then dispose of, any display structure in their area which is used for the display of advertisements in contravention of regulations. A LPA may not remove a display structure unless it has first served a removal notice on the person responsible for the display. In most cases, the LPA can recover its expenses but if, in the exercise of this power, damage is caused to the land or chattels compensation may be recovered by any person suffering the damage from the LPA. A structure for the purpose of this section is:

- (a) a hoarding or similar structure used, or designed or adapted for use, for the display of advertisements; .
- (b) anything (other than a hoarding or similar structure) principally used, or designed or adapted principally for use, for the display of advertisements; and
- (c) a structure that is itself an advertisement.

There is a right of appeal to a magistrate's court against a notice issued under section 225A.

6.2.3 Section 132 (2) of the Highways Act 1980 makes provision for the highway authority to remove any picture, letter, sign or other mark painted, ascribed or affixed on the surface of the highway, or any structure or works on or in the highway. The Council has obtained delegated powers from the County Council to remove unauthorised fly-posters and placards under the Highways Act which are actually marked on or fixed to the highway itself, or to a tree, structure or works on the highway. This power does not extend to A Boards.

6.2.4 An unlicensed A board is likely to be an obstruction of the highway. Section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 makes it an offence for a person, without lawful authority, to wilfully obstruct free passage along the highway. However, WSCC only consider that an obstruction has taken place if an A Board obstructs the use of a footpath to such a degree that a person cannot pass it without having to step into the road. Obstruction is therefore limited to the area physically occupied by the A Board and if this is not sufficient to render the right of way impassable then no action is taken under the Highways Act.

6.2.5 The Council's adopted Enforcement Strategy 2009 categorises advertisement control as a low priority. However, it is within the scope of the planning enforcement team to undertake proactive projects where resources allow. For this reason, planning officers in enforcement will be tasked with undertaking this project, if agreed, as part of their daily duties under the supervision of the team manager.

6.2.6 In the first instance, letters will be sent to all retailers displaying an A Board to explain the offence being committed and requesting that the board be removed. They will also be told that if the board is not removed they may face prosecution proceedings. At this stage, the action is resource light but if a number of traders do not comply then a burden will be placed upon the Council's Legal Services Team to instigate the proceedings.

6.2.7 It is estimated that if approximately 10% of traders fail to remove their A Board, it could generate the need for some 20 additional prosecutions to be commenced in the Magistrates' Court at the same time. Although the cases should not give rise to complex legal issues, each prosecution is time consuming in terms of paperwork. As there is only one litigation solicitor

in the Council, this would have implications for other work and may lead to the need to consider outsourcing.

6.2.8 Similarly, if the Council takes action under s225A of the Act, there is a risk of incurring costs to (i) remove the display structure (A Board) in the first instance and (ii) the possibility of paying compensation for any damage that may be caused in taking the action. In addition, time will be taken up defending appeals in the magistrates' court which may also impact upon legal services.

## **7. Consultation**

7.1 Consultation has been carried out with:

- The Council's Litigation Solicitor;
- Manager of Legal Services
- Public Relations Manager
- Economic Development Manager

## **8. Community Impact and Corporate Risks**

8.1 Businesses may respond negatively to enforcement action and so it is important that we make the business community aware of why we need to take action and explain that we want to work with them to find alternative solutions.

8.2 Residents and visitors have differing points of view on the relevance of A Board advertisements. For some the advertisements are an integral part of a vibrant street scene and lend colour and interest to the City centre. For others they add to the proliferation of street clutter and cause obstruction, particularly for persons with impaired vision. There have also been a limited number of instances where an A Board advertisement has fallen and caused minor injury. Removing A Boards will therefore be perceived as a positive action by some and viewed adversely by others for whom the advertisements provide information, direction and street colour.

8.3 For the business community the enforced removal of A Board advertisements will adversely impact upon the number of visitors to their premises and ultimately the loss of income.

## **9. Other Implications**

9.1 Human Rights and Equality impact:

The Human Rights of the affected parties have been taken into account and the recommendation is considered justified and proportionate

## **10. Appendices**

10.1 None

## **DORCHESTER TOWN COUNCIL**

### **DORCHESTER JOINT HERITAGE COMMITTEE – 16 OCTOBER 2017**

#### **HERITAGE TOURISM**

1. With the imminent opening of Shire Hall and the ongoing plans to redevelop Dorset County Museum there is now, for the first time, a real opportunity to develop Dorchester's Heritage Tourism offer. These major opportunities are backed up by early plans to improve other key heritage assets such as The Keep and the History Centre, investments in informal heritage and core infrastructure such as paving and signage, coupled with significant investment in the accommodation and restaurant sectors in the town, while retail remains strong.
2. To date all of these initiatives have happened ad hoc – there has been no master plan to change the quality of Dorchester's offer, simply a recognition by individuals and groups that the town has enormous potential.
3. Dorchester Town Council has recently reviewed its Corporate Plan. In 2015 the Council reserved £70,000 to develop Heritage Tourism initiatives in Dorchester, in particular focusing on Branding, Signage, improving informal heritage and developing apprenticeships in Heritage Tourism, but at that point there was no imperative to drive the initiative forward.
4. The Council's Policy Committee has recently considered how to bring the Heritage and Tourism sectors together to start a dialogue regarding how the town can maximise the benefit from the individual initiatives. Two short meetings will be called involving key representatives of the Heritage sector and the business sector, with West Dorset DC and Dorchester TC officers. Both Jon Murden and Anna Bright have agreed to take part.
5. Early ideas will be fed back through the normal channels to all three sectors (Chamber and BID, the Councils, the Heritage forum formed last year). The aim is to complete the meetings and outline preliminary ideas by the end of November.
6. The Joint Committee will receive an update report at your January meeting. The Committee may wish to consider calling a Heritage Forum meeting once it has received the report.

Adrian Stuart  
Town Clerk