

# Virginia Water Neighbourhood Plan Forum Meeting Minutes

14<sup>th</sup> May 2020

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

**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 received from Peter Lomas.</p>
<b>Agree Minutes of Previous Meeting</b>	<p>Minutes from the 26<sup>th</sup> March 2020 Committee Meeting were approved by NB and seconded by PJL.</p>
<b>Chairman's Reports</b>	<p>JP introduced Andrew Tyley to the meeting explaining as Andrew is an Chartered Architect and works within an International practice Andrew unfortunately will not have a great deal of time to devote with joining the Forum, but has agreed to sit on the sub-committee and assist in delivering the core elements of the plan.</p> <p>AT introduced himself and gave an overview of his areas of expertise to the Forum.</p>
<b>Priorities and Key Issues</b>	<p>JP had previously sent to committee members the review of the questionnaire from RB and the subsequent report completed by PJL. PJL report explained, where have we got to.....where might we go next..... And most importantly.....where <u>MUST</u> we go next.</p> <p>PJL reiterated that there had been a great response with the questionnaire and the analysis given by RB was superb, but it is apparent and understandable that not the whole population of Virginia Water responded, and as the Forum, we need to ascertain why they didn't respond and who didn't respond, in order to identify where the holes and gaps within the community are?</p> <p>We need to show that we have striven to reach the 'hard to reach' population of the community, people who don't normally get asked.</p> <p>What do we do next - PJL recommended that we;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• publish the outcome of the questionnaire and thank the community.</li> <li>• identify a vision for the NP</li> <li>• looking at potential areas for NP policies</li> <li>• look to putting forward some more radical ideas, which may get rejected, but will keep the community interested and excited and also to give residents some additional choices.</li> </ul> <p>PJL role will be to eliminate the non-planning issues that are raised, as these will not be put in front of the Planning Inspector going forward.</p>

	<p>The Local Plan - which is very nearly adopted, and Inspectors expect for it to be reviewed from 5 years of adoption, so liaison with the Borough Council needs to remain close in keeping with conformity of Local Plan.  Vision - JLP recommended the forum look at other local Neighbourhood Plans which gives examples of the way the community ought to be further into the future.</p> <p>Drill down to produce some objects, this will be taking the vision and to ascertain what can be achieved in VW.  Convert the objects to a series of outcomes (policies). PJL already supplied list of policies as examples to look at.  Need to look at how to retain the village feel and how do we put it into planning policies so we can;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) define it</li> <li>b) protect it</li> <li>c) enhance it</li> </ul> <p>PJL highlighted that transport planning and advice will be required at a later stage. JP agreed and will discuss further with the sub-group as to companies which could be approached.</p> <p>JDP to give RJP contact details to HP, in order that JP can contact them.</p> <p>We need to confirm what the Neighbourhood Plan will look like, along with visuals/graphs and diagrams, and will need to incorporate,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an introduction</li> <li>• define the timescale</li> <li>• describe the Neighbourhood area</li> <li>• analyse the issues within the plan period and beyond</li> <li>• need to report how we have engaged with the community and who</li> <li>• define the vision/key issues/objectives</li> <li>• to comply with all obligations including EU currently</li> <li>• set out the policies and projects in planning language</li> <li>• need to talk about the successful of the plan, ie what are we doing by the words of the plan, how energetic are we in terms of implementation and monitoring.</li> <li>• Finally, all technical details to be added into as Appendices</li> </ul> <p>PJL advice is that content is up for grabs but certain rules do need to be followed.</p> <p>AT asked the question with regards to who administers the objectives of the plan and in what way is this done? PJL explained that once the plan becomes part of the development plan, Runnymede and Surrey Council's are responsible for ensuring the plan is adhered to and implemented. In the absence of the Parish Council within VW, it would be advisable to create a NP delivery group in order to express a view on planning applications going forwards as we would have a great influence via local Councillors.</p> <p>Sub working group forum to focus on setting a series of actions and delivery dates to build out the deliverables under PJL roadmap. AT suggested putting together some wording which does include some themes of thinking that we could use in the way of looking at the plan and take PJL guidance on this. This needs to be discussed during the next working group meeting.</p> <p>Every Forum meeting the sub committee will update on their progress.</p>	<p>JDP</p> <p>Sub Group</p> <p>Sub Group</p>
--	---	--

	GM requested that when finalised the draft vision statement to be circulated to all Forum. JP agreed.	JP
<b>Trumps Farm Incinerator</b>	<p>JH updated the meeting with the application details and also that an on-line petition is currently being circulated.</p> <p>This is on the land adjacent to the Trumps Farm and Kitsmead Lane, so will sit alongside the current waste recycling site. This is a matter for Surrey County Council, as it is looking to include the incineration of medical biological by-products, so not dissimilar to the 2007 proposal which was rejected, due to a public campaign.</p> <p>JH recommends that we should consider raising local public awareness, and to ascertain how we can challenge and to be a position when an application is lodged by The Waste Energy Power.</p> <p>However this incinerator sits outside of NP area, unsure of details currently, but it is a great concern to the community, and subject to the detail, we as a Forum need to look to oppose it and to highlight publicly our concerns, with the help of Mel Few, and to draw in his expertise.</p> <p>Whatever campaign put together it is to include the WRA and WRA are sending out a newsletter requesting signature on the petition.</p> <p>CM to draft a letter to Mel Few and report back, to ascertain his opinions and to find out the context of the wider campaign and to have a co-ordination in responses.</p> <p>JP also advised that he would like to invite Mel Few to the next Forum meeting in June. MF to respond with his considered opinions by the 30<sup>th</sup> May.</p> <p>HP is in the process of loading this petition onto the WRA website.</p> <p>WRA have requested Rob Shrimplin to do a watching brief on this and to do further investigations, so he can further advise the WRA Committee.</p> <p>It was felt helpful if Mel Few would debrief Nigel Moss, WRA Chairman on the situation given that the incinerator is not in the NP area. JP to request.</p> <p>It was noted that previously this application was not successful on the grounds on increased traffic.</p>	<p>CM</p> <p>JP</p> <p>HP</p> <p>JP</p>
<b>Monthly Planning Applications including Hurst Lane/Stroud Road</b>	<p>RB gave his overview on the specific area of Hurst Lane/Stroud Road which is of significant concern, and as it is within the boundary, the Forum needs to have a better understanding of the issues as this will remain under pressure for any potential future development.</p> <p>Following on from a Planning Meeting which RB attended, he feels that through small scale planning applications, RBC are merely dropping houses onto the landscape in an uncoordinated manner as a means to solve the problem of inappropriate development at some sites - sites have appeared whilst under protections such as saved policy GB13. RB felt that the risk of such applications being granted permission on the basis of offering a remedy for inappropriate development was that it could set a precedent for similar sites to use the same game plan elsewhere.</p>	

	<p>For a location such as Hurst Lane - where there is a mix of residential and sites where enforcement has been historically limited of planning infractions - this could lead to smaller sites having the potential to submit substandard 50/60 home layouts with minimal CIL, no infrastructure, no potential doctors surgery and not enough funds to sort out the transport or access problems.</p> <p>Whilst there is a risk of such un-coordinated development in the region, there is also an opportunity that this is a suitable site for consideration for wider redevelopment. Hurst Lane as a whole is very much contained by nature barriers, access with new roundabout, natural footpaths etc, giving very little opportunity for the site to coalesce with the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Whilst within the Green Belt, there is a significant coverage of residential dwellings, hardstanding and light industrial (contested) usage - more akin to a brownfield site - and this could relieve pressures in the village elsewhere. It could be a possible garden village with the potential to have natural green spaces, local shops etc, to entice affordable family homes and to create a new community which sits in the VW boundary. CM confirmed that this is an opportunity which the Neighbourhood Plan should closely look at.</p> <p>One of the problem sites - Bellbourne Nurseries remained part of Thorpe Ward at the last Ward redistricting which places the site both at odds with its' immediate neighbours to the North, South and West as well as its' location in the Neighbourhood Plan. When we set the Forum up we were promised the Council would keep us advised on Planning Applications within our Ward and close to our boundaries yet these particular applications have not been notified to the Forum. We, as the Forum, need to ensure we are receiving full notification from RBC on all Planning Applications.</p> <p>CM will draft letter to Ashley Smith, new Head of Planning at Runnymede to ensure we are kept fully notified and also to request a meeting directly, as we will be taking substantial interest and will be attempting to find a master developer who would like to reunify the sites and promote a cohesive plan.</p> <p>JDP updates from previous applications at the last meeting;</p> <p>Bridge Lane - Football Club and Nursing Home was to ascertain if there was any environmental impact, it was deemed there was not. Nursing Home are currently back in negotiation with the landowner to try and renegotiate. JDP will keep meeting updated of progress.</p> <p>CABI Application - 33 units, no update on decision, only five letters of representation - nothing to update. JT raised his concerns over what will be increased construction traffic on what is already considered a dangerous stretch of road on Callow Hill.</p> <p>JP requested traffic is added to the next sub-committee agenda.</p> <p>Since previous meeting Virginia Water Ward has received 28 applications which include Bellbourne Nurseries and the vast majority being non contentious applications, 18 applications are on the Estate.</p>	<p>CM</p> <p>JDP</p> <p>JP</p>
--	--	--------------------------------

	<p>Three applications for comment as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Bellbourne, which has previously been discussed.</li> <li>b) An application on bollards near to the traffic lights by the station, JDP believes this is to stop commuter parking. JH is aware of this application. JDP feels this application could be the first of many to restrict parking around the station.</li> <li>c) An application for a 20 metre mast, on the grassy knoll on the left hand side of the road by the bridge in Trumps Green, it is believed this is to give commuters better network coverage when travelling on the train. No letters of representation on the site currently.</li> </ul> <p>It is felt that a lot of the applications currently being received on the Estate is a ploy to renew current applications for redevelopment to avoid the pending CIL. Inflating applications with no intention to build.</p> <p>PJL advised JDP he believes there to be an accelerated procedure on dealing with mast applications, 21 or 28 days to comment, as it doesn't take as long as a normal planning application.</p> <p>No objections were received from the Forum on this mast application.</p>	<p>JP</p> <p>JDP</p>
<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p>	<p>JH briefed the meeting on his understanding of the status on the Local Plan which is that the Inspector has replied to the Planning Authority and as far as she is concerned, the Local Plan is signed and she will confirm that and the details will be forwarded to Runnymede BC in due course and information will be disseminated to all Councillors including JH.</p> <p>It is understood that the Inspector is satisfied that the Local Plan meets the soundness tests and will be circulating her decision shortly. It is then for the Council to adopt any amendments. Currently unsure of timescale however a debate will be tabled within the Council shortly.</p> <p>JH will keep the Forum up to date with progress.</p> <p>The CIL will follow from the adoption of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Likely to be considered later this year, even as early as the Autumn. JH will confirm as soon as he has possible dates.</p>	<p>JH</p> <p>JH</p>
<p><b>Income and Expenditure Statement</b></p>	<p>HP explained the annual financial breakdown including the initial funding from Groundwork which was £8,993.00 and the additional individual donations of £2,820.00. Total expenditure being £4,855.58. Total required to be refunded to Groundwork £4,855.58, which will leave a balance of £2,820.00.</p> <p>HP currently working with the Groundwork Case Officer and will be submitting the expenditure report as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>JP reiterated the imminent importance of the need for raising additional funds.</p>	<p>HP</p>
<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p>	<p>16:00hrs, Thursday, 18<sup>th</sup> June, this will be via Zoom Video Link.</p>	