

# Virginia Water Neighbourhood Plan Forum Meeting Minutes

26<sup>th</sup> March 2020

<b>Attendees:</b>	John Pyle	JP	<b>Apologies:</b>	
	John Tenconi	JT		
	James Periton	JDP	Gill Morgan	GM
	Andrew Stimson	AS	Peter Lomas	PL
	Nicola Bates	NB	Jonathan Hulley	JH
	Robert Bates	RB	Harmohan Dhanjal	HD
	Peter Lerner	PJL	Carol Manduca	CM

**Minutes:** Helene Parsons HP

<b>Welcome and Absences</b>	<p>JP opened the meeting and welcomed members. Due to Covid-19 self-isolation period this meeting is conducted using video conferencing facility.</p> <p>Apologies for absence from Jonathan Hulley, Peter Lomas, Harmohan Dhanjal, Gill Morgan and Carol Manduca.</p>	
<b>Agree Minutes of Previous Meeting</b>	<p>Minutes from the 27<sup>th</sup> February 2020 Committee Meeting were approved by NB and seconded by AS.</p>	
<b>Chairman's Reports</b>	<p>JP confirmed that the last 4 weeks has entailed the closing down of the final questionnaires.</p> <p>HP has completed some initial reviews by extracting information from the questionnaire data, also RB has produced a great analysis over the last 24 hours.</p> <p>Once data is analysed, we can then move forward into the core phase of determining what this plan is going to be about and what is the main concerns the community face.</p> <p>JP and PJL have had a series of discussions about the way we move forward, this will be discussed in greater depth once JT has given the up to date position as for the infrastructure levy and CIL position.</p>	
<b>Planning</b>	<p>JDP is reviewing all applications we receive sent within the VW ward and reported there have been 14 applications since last meeting, none of them being contentious although, we as a Forum, should be aware there are two preliminary applications to highlight;</p> <p><a href="https://planning.runnymede.gov.uk/Northgate/PlanningExplorer/Generic/StdDetails.aspx?PT=Planning%20Applications%20On-Line&amp;TYPE=PL/PlanningPK.xml&amp;PARAM0=276232&amp;XSLT=/Northgate/PlanningExplorer/SiteFiles/Skins/Runnymede_AA/xslt/PL/PLDetails.xslt&amp;FT=Planning%20Application%20Details&amp;PUBLIC=Y&amp;XMLSIDE=/Northgate/PlanningExplorer/SiteFiles/Skins/Runnymede_AA/Menu/PL.xml&amp;DAURI=PLANNING">VW Football Club, Bridge Lane, Virginia Water - RU.20/0289</a>  <a href="https://planning.runnymede.gov.uk/Northgate/PlanningExplorer/Generic/StdDetails.aspx?PT=Planning%20Applications%20On-Line&amp;TYPE=PL/PlanningPK.xml&amp;PARAM0=276232&amp;XSLT=/Northgate/PlanningExplorer/SiteFiles/Skins/Runnymede_AA/xslt/PL/PLDetails.xslt&amp;FT=Planning%20Application%20Details&amp;PUBLIC=Y&amp;XMLSIDE=/Northgate/PlanningExplorer/SiteFiles/Skins/Runnymede_AA/Menu/PL.xml&amp;DAURI=PLANNING">https://planning.runnymede.gov.uk/Northgate/PlanningExplorer/Generic/StdDetails.aspx?PT=Planning%20Applications%20On-Line&amp;TYPE=PL/PlanningPK.xml&amp;PARAM0=276232&amp;XSLT=/Northgate/PlanningExplorer/SiteFiles/Skins/Runnymede_AA/xslt/PL/PLDetails.xslt&amp;FT=Planning%20Application%20Details&amp;PUBLIC=Y&amp;XMLSIDE=/Northgate/PlanningExplorer/SiteFiles/Skins/Runnymede_AA/Menu/PL.xml&amp;DAURI=PLANNING</a></p> <p><i>(EIA Screening Option), this is more to do with impact assessment at this stage, which includes redevelopment of the site to provide a two storey 64 unit nursing home with associated landscaped grounds, access and 81 parking bays including clubhouse, 1pitch / 5 aside pitch (both 3G).</i></p> <p>JDP explained that this is the current land owner doing a joint venture with Barchester, a company which specialise in Nursing Homes; at this stage they are merely appealing to the community for initial comment. JDP confirmed that, as an individual, he has submitted his comments, as</p>	JDP

personally he is in full support. However asked the question as to whether at this early stage whether there is an official Neighbourhood Plan comment.

JP asked PJJ what the position is from a viewpoint of other Neighbourhood Plans who are at our early stage, in order that we can make a judgement whether we are going to be making comments also regarding the fact that we currently have no strategies in place.

PJJ confirmed there is no reason why any group shouldn't comment on a Planning Application, PJJ advised not to make comment on behalf of VW Neighbourhood Plan because we are not a 'Plan' as yet, but we would be entitled to comment as a group of people who are looking to put a 'Plan' together should we wish.

PJJ highlighted that this Application is in the Green Belt, which may be seen as a contentious issue which residents will be objecting to regardless of what the Application is for, therefore residents may feel a little sore that us, being an unelected body, has chosen to make comment. However PJJ sees no reason why we shouldn't make a general community based comment.

NB voiced concern that this site could already be seen by residents as contentious due to what the owners have already done regarding the felling of the trees etc. JDP feels this could be opportunity to take it off the hands of an unscrupulous owner and put into a community asset. RB advised to be careful in commenting as with previous unscrupulous owners within VW, as they put in Planning then amend with a change of use once planning is passed, for example Belbourne Nurseries.

NB informed the meeting that they were made aware this week that the Belbourne site has been moved into Thorpe, so will no longer be showing under the VW searches, but still falls within the VW Forum boundaries.

JP raised the question to PJJ if there is anything the Neighbourhood Plan Forum can do about these changes?

PJJ confirmed the Neighbourhood Plan can have a great affect once policies are in place for example preserve the Green Belt/plant more trees, in order to look at these Applications as a group of people we can do nothing more than merely look at the merits of each Application.

PJJ feels the football club is acceptable being in the Green Belt, however the Nursing Home facility might be deemed not to be, and we could have reason to object to this if we choose to as a Forum.

JDP understands that the Nursing Home is intrinsic to the funding of the entire scheme and doesn't feel we are in a position to make a comment as a Forum and also timewise not able to put a comment together prior to the deadline date of Monday, 29<sup>th</sup> March.

NB doesn't wish to make any comments on this site as a group, as she understands how upset people are already over this particular site, she feels this will lead to the community shutting down in terms of interacting with the Forum.

AS was in agreement with NB and feels if we as a group of residents make comment, this may be perceived as the Forum making comment.

**[CABI Proposal, Bakeham Lane, Egham - RU.20/0405](https://planning.runnymede.gov.uk/Northgate/PlanningExplorer/Generic/StdDetails.aspx?PT=Planning%20Applications%20On-)**

<https://planning.runnymede.gov.uk/Northgate/PlanningExplorer/Generic/StdDetails.aspx?PT=Planning%20Applications%20On->

	<p><a href="#">Line&amp;TYPE=PL/PlanningPK.xml&amp;PARAM0=277393&amp;XSLT=/Northgate/PlanningExplorer/SiteFiles/Skins/Runnymede_AA/xslt/PL/PLDetails.xslt&amp;FT=Planning%20Application%20Details&amp;PUBLIC=Y&amp;XMLSIDE=/Northgate/PlanningExplorer/SiteFiles/Skins/Runnymede_AA/Menu/PL.xml&amp;DAURI=PLANNING</a></p> <p><i>Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide 33 new homes together (20 houses – 14 private, 6 equity share, 13 flats (6 private, 7 equity share) with associated open space, access and parking/landscaping.</i></p> <p>These designs were shared with the Forum prior to meeting. JP feels there is not a lot to reject to apart from maybe access, JDP is unaware who is driving this scheme forward and as extra traffic could be an argument, the scheme is actually claiming it could be a reduction in traffic, due to losing employees who would have been commuting daily to/from the site.</p>	
<p><b>Runnymede Community Infrastructure Levy Consultation</b></p>	<p>JT explained the Community Infrastructure Levy Consultation call JP and himself had with the Council earlier in the week.</p> <p>Which entailed two consultations which close on 06<sup>th</sup> April, one consultation being the preliminary rate setting for CIL, which is currently set at £380, the other being the Infrastructure Plan associated with CIL.</p> <p>Concern is felt as the proposal doesn't go anywhere near raising enough money for whatever the final agreed VW infrastructure under the Local Plan could be, if it goes through.</p> <p>The Council envisage there is £100million shortfall on the cost of the infrastructure they have identified for the Borough, so money available in VW that might be proposed between Trumps Green Road and Wellington Avenue and unspecified improvements at the traffic lights by the station being the only two items included, and there is not enough funds to cover any of these, let alone if further items were identified. Council claim to have set this at a prudent rate of 50%. Council have rejected delaying the deadline closing date.</p> <p>In terms of the impact on the Local Plan, the Council accepted there were various initiatives being undertaken like National Highways England which were interfering with the original concept of Longcross being a self-sustaining settlement. Council suggested as a NP Forum we may wish to submit comment as soon as possible with our thoughts regarding traffic calming, speed reduction, speed cameras, bus services, pot-hole repairs etc, these being items we might as a NP come up with. The Council feel we, as a Forum, should start making comments on this as soon as possible, so it could then be items for them to consider.</p> <p>JT/JP agreed they would liaise with Mel Few over the next couple of weeks to ascertain what Surrey County Council's perspective is.</p> <p>RB has had a look at the initial charging, and struggles to understand why Longcross is completely exempt with zero charging with the CIL, as there is a belief that the 106 might deliver something, however his main concern is the figure of £380 per sq<sup>2</sup> is £38k on a 100 sq<sup>2</sup> 3 bed house, so if trying to get more 'affordable' houses within the VW and Egham borough, this is a big hit on top of those properties, so if you have a £600k 3 bedroom house, 7 points of that is CIL which is enough to prevent developers from building that type of dwelling trying to push the prices up to £700k or £800k where you have only got 5 points going on the CIL.</p> <p>Also a comment received by JH was that this was a maximum the Council could charge, which is the Council's discretion to charge up to that amount,</p>	<p>JT/ JP</p>

but in view of having a variable CIL it is giving the Council powers to tax out of the existing developments they don't like ie. build a nursing home when you remove trees, whilst subjectively submitting other opportunities to occur by charging a lower CIL. If you go back to the initial conversation that there is £100million in the Borough, the CIL will not cover it. If we are lucky VW might get some re-phasing of some traffic lights and some additional traffic lights elsewhere, which you can get for a lot less than £100million, so not sure VW itself will be getting a fair return on what they will be delivering and could be a good opportunity to subsidise across the rest of the borough, we understand RBC are in a hole due to poor financial performance and historically poor judgements such as the Leisure Centre, and Addlestone One, and feels it's a way to generate cash. So there are too many variables and set too high to build properties a 'normal' person could afford. There is a degree of subjectivity in what can be enforced, we suggest the Council now have another avenue in what they can and can't commit the variability of the CIL and hit the very people buying the properties.

PJL reiterated that developers are very use to it and the majority of Planning Authorities in England now operate CIL. The Council's would not be allowed to adopt a CIL which wasn't fair which had just been set up for their financial gain or for a certain scheme whereby certain developments could be seen as acceptable and others not, because the CIL, if it has any objections at all, has to go through an examination by an independent inspector who would in turn rule that sort of thing out. What we need to look out for being a Neighbourhood Forum is complex, because as individuals maybe business owners, you may be thinking this is additional costs which we can't afford and what's it for, if PJL was advising a group of developers, he would advise to get the CIL down as much as possible. The point of view from a NP Forum, which is going to work it's way through a NP, is that we will have the power to control 25% of the incoming CIL amount, if the CIL brought into VW £100k we can advise where £25k is spent and organise those schemes, most Parish Councils or NP Forums find this very useful, and can be used as carrot alongside which they will go for a higher CIL as possible. So you are torn, as a neighbour you don't want the CIL to be high however as a NP Forum you want the CIL to be high so that you can get the infrastructure. If not bothered about control, the CIL will come in, you don't accept the 25% then the Council will spend it as they see fit and if you trust the Council to do that, great, but if you want your say on the CIL go for the NP as quickly as possible. You will talk about the infrastructure which is necessary and have your say which PJL advocates that we do, but to be careful not to argue against a £380 CIL because we think its extortionate other places have a higher CIL and developers are use to it, think about what it could bring for the community and start thinking about what infrastructure you need to have. JP and PJL have had a discussion where PJL advised not to put all the eggs into once basket and think of a portfolio of infrastructure needs so we can give example of the sort of things we are thinking about but we are at a very early stage of building a NP, our first consultation is still being analysed and we can't yet speak fully on behalf of the community about what ought to be included in this.

RB main question in terms on the CIL is being a flat amount per square metre which doesn't account for the difference in GBP on a development, he feels it's a very crud form of taxation. The type of houses which is coming out in the survey is being more of what the 'normal' people can afford £38k tax on anyone of those properties is disproportionate to the GBP of that dwelling and could encourage to end up with more properties either out of reach of a community you would want to build a growing community (families with children) another comment coming up in the survey, people are driving

	<p>5-6 miles to school as very few young families can afford to remain in the village anymore. It is these unintended consequences with a CIL that how we will end up pricing out a certain type of development, and its that type of consequence 5-10 years down the line which we must be mindful of. NB added the unintended consequences being extra traffic with parents driving to do school runs twice a day due to distance.</p> <p>RB commenting, he feels this puts a stop to any development under £1m because its not worth it. NB confirmed we need to tie up the survey results we have already with what we are seeing in the CIL, so trying to pull the results we are receiving from residents with what they are wanting to see andhow we can deliver this.</p>	
<p><b>Questionnaire and Publicity – Sub-Groups for Co-ordination</b></p>	<p>JP is keen to set up the analysis of the questionnaire and would like to formulate 3 committee members with PJD leading this group in order to take the analysis and to review the public’s comments as well as some of our own views as to what the core issues of this plan are going to be, as it is from here we can start to create a constructive way forward and we are better off attacking it immediately.</p> <p>JP suggested PJD and a couple of committee members to do this and report back to the Forum in 8 weeks time as to what the core topics are which we should be focussing to make a decision on, it doesn’t mean they are limited to those and what subjects are left to the Forum to decide and debate.</p> <p>JP open this up to the Forum for agreement, RB questioned the 8 week timeline with some of the items coming out of the survey with applications like the football club going in there will be a need sooner rather than later for the Forum to have a position and so in the next 4 weeks we can get those emerging hypothesis it starts to allow the detailed questions to be drawn up.</p> <p>JP feels we don’t have much standing until we have this Plan through and adopted as far as making qualified noticeable observations on matters like the football club.</p> <p>PJD commented that the nearer we are to having a made/adopted NP the more weight our comments will carry, at the minute the Council will see it as a good bunch of people, however in a years time when we have had documentation published, we will have the right, ability and the influence to make comments which are better informed and which the local Planning Authority will take more seriously.</p> <p>PJD confirmed the 8 week period is seen as reasonable and is willing to be involved, and reiterated that his time is chargeable</p> <p>RB has had an initial look through the survey responses and there are a few common themes emerging and doesn’t feel there is 4 weeks worth of work to go through. Not sure at the level of analysis which can be taking from Survey Monkey and is concerned the survey may come out biased towards the retired residents which is against the general sensor statistics of the area, so it would be helpful to look at the different populations of the area, and would there be any themes which come out differently across them.</p> <p>PJD would analysis the issues which have come out of the consultation and suggest areas which weren’t covered or some surprising points where things have been left unsaid, where we may wish to look at policies where they don’t seem to have engaged people very much at this initial stage, so he doesn’t feel the plan will come out 100% from this questionnaire’s results but will help put some focus on some of the issues.</p> <p>RB has seen some interesting findings when looking through the analysis and common themes, traffic being the most common one, access to the station, parking, there are lots of those type of niggles coming out however less certainty coming out with the vast majority of people saying absolutely no to any housing, again RB would like to see if this is amongst certain parts of the population in order to try and understand whether this is</p>	<p>PJD/ RB</p> <p>PJL</p>

	<p>representative to certain age groups, as if this is the case we will need to engage more with these groups to prove to the Council the Plan is truly representative, if every group is saying no to certain things then it's a stronger case to the Council that we have truly listened.</p> <p>Survey Monkey does give row by row analysis, RB to ascertain whether this can be pull this information into a report in order to analysis groups and answers and what comes out of this survey will be the basis for the next questionnaire.</p> <p>PJL suggested once the analysis has been completed from the initial survey to present at a public meeting, as this would be a good way of demonstrating the wide area of ideas and encourage people to explain more by what they commented on to spark further discussions.</p> <p>Maybe due to COVID-19 we should put our thinking caps on for other possible ideas instead of a public meeting, as with the current situation it seems very unlikely we will be able to hold a public meeting for the 4 – 6 months, one idea would be to perhaps focus it down into another survey once we have our answers from the initial survey which we feel is manageable and achievable. The findings from the survey will take PJL 2 – 4 weeks for him to be able to report back to Forum to share with other people and forming into policies to be able to present to the wider Forum.</p> <p>JT suggested as a Forum to put together a list to put forward to the public, ie. traffic mitigations and parking, housing and planning. JT feels we can agree these items between ourselves rather rapidly and then resend to the community given that meetings won't be practical and say how do you feel about these solutions, in this way it would move us forward quicker and the Forum would have something tangible to look at that related to the questionnaire.</p> <p>JP asked if RB would be willing to be included in this sub-committee, RB agreed. Once we have this information we load onto the website so interested residents can see the results keeping it simple with a graph and brief explanation.</p> <p>JP is keen that an overview of the survey is posted on the website. We need to prepare something as soon as we can.</p> <p>Regarding the residents who have put themselves forward to volunteer, JP is particularly interested in people with a technical and professional understanding to join the Forum. JP has identified one IT and one Architect that might with worth approaching. But not inclined to simply just increase numbers on the Forum for the sake of it.</p>	<p>RB</p> <p>PJL</p> <p>RB</p> <p>JP</p>
<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p>	<p>Grant Funding – we had been awarded £8,993 in October from Loyalty. The unused funds to be returned at the end of March 2020.</p> <p>HP had circulated prior to the meeting an Income and Expenditure Statement, showing donations received £2,670 and expenditure to end of March being £3,955.58, confirming that £5,037.42 to be returned to Loyalty and further funding then requested. This will leave a credit balance of £2,670, this being of pure donations.</p>	<p>HP</p> <p>HP</p>
<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p>	<p>19:00hrs, Thursday, 23<sup>rd</sup> April, this will be either Zoom Video Link or in The Estate Office, Wentworth. To be confirmed week commencing 20<sup>th</sup> April.</p>	<p>HP</p>