

Virginia Water Neighbourhood Plan Forum Meeting Minutes

18th June 2020

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

Minutes: Helene Parsons HP

Welcome and Absences	JP opened the meeting and welcomed members. Due to Covid-19 lockdown period this meeting is conducted using video conferencing facility.	
Agree Minutes of Previous Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes from the 14th May 2020 Committee Meeting, after a slight amendment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed for approval by JP ○ Seconded by NB 	
Surrey County Council Views on Current Facilities <i>Councillor Mel Few</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Mel Few gave his overview to the committee enabling a better understanding on how Surrey County Council look upon traffic, transport, education and health issues, all these having significant implications throughout the village including the proposed incinerator and the vision from the Inspector on the Local Plan. <p><u>Incinerator</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed by a private company to install an incinerator for medical waste on the site belonging to Mr Collier, which is the current site of the anaerobic digester, in theory the incinerator is designed to take all medical waste for the South East. • The Officer who is looking through the documentation that has been lodged with the county is reporting that the application fails in a number of significant area and referred it back to the application, in which they have ten days to respond to the objection. <p><u>Traffic Issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the number of issues including speeding, cycle routes and speed bumps throughout the area; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MF has asked highways and they, as at the governments request, have given a grant for funds to be available for easing back communities to work and for commuting. ○ Councillors have been requested to refer back with answers regarding their local villages as to what the County Council's would like to have installed. For VW this would cover the through roads, Wellington, Stroud and Christchurch roads. ○ MF requested the Committee decide what roads they would like considered by Highways and JP to advise MF. SCC will need to take into account the implications any changes would have on neighbouring traffic. 	JP

Longcross

- JP asked MF his thoughts with the County Councils view on Longcross and the impact on the village, would it be likely that SCC will be required to make changes, as this is being removed from the Green Belt which implies a development?

MF has already lodged with County Highways on Runnymede's plan incorporating the S106. If the plan is accepted by RBC then they switch over to CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy).

MF has highlighted there are four elements he would like installed in this area;

- a) Relook at the area of Wellington Avenue and Trumps Green Road which is currently a dangerous intersection.
- b) To install a traffic light on Trumps Green Road under the narrow railway bridge.
- c) Consideration to be given to the right turning traffic coming from Longcross South turning into Kitsmead Lane
- d) Square off the junction leading to Staple Hill.

These above points have been put forward to the developers, when the Local Plan is committed and agreed by the local Borough Councillors, it is likely the planning application will be received from Crest Nicholson for discussion, and SCC will be consultees on that plan, MF will ensure these points are looked at from Runnymede's side.

- CM - asked for clarification what basis SCC figure of 600 houses of the 1700 houses at Longcross which would be allowed to be built prior to completion of the A320 upgrade?
- Also, are RBC anticipating problems with traffic in that area, as original plans were that increased traffic would go towards Woking and not Virginia Water?

MF - confirmed he was not aware that SCC had come up with this, however Runnymede's plan is contingent upon the A320 being fixed to allow the traffic to pass from Junction 11 through to the Otter roundabout, taking into account the Longcross development and St Peter's development and a HIF bid (housing infrastructure fund) was included for £44m, and MF confirmed that a HIF bid has been awarded for £41.5M

Contingent on RBC be allowed sufficient Green Belt space for 4,700 homes to be built.

Access off M25 Junction 11 to be upgraded and;

Compulsory purchase orders on properties which exist between St Peters roundabout and the Otter roundabout, these also contingent on RBC Local Plan being approved and agreeing on the number of houses in the Plan.

- Longcross is a major element in the A320 approval by the Inspector but the properties along the Ottershaw Road on either side are not in RBC housing development area, so the question remains where will they deliver these additional homes?

	<p>4,000 extra homes in Green Belt, this takes into account 2,000 houses in Longcross North and conversion out of Green Belt the land to the left on St Peters Way, which is currently Green Belt, and on the land where currently the Christmas Tree Farm is located.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JP - raised the parking issues in Christchurch Road due to the success of the Crown Estate lake particularly during Covid-19 lockdown and residents struggling to continuously suffer with gaining access to their homes due to the volume of car parking, what are SCC thoughts to have this issue resolved looking toward the future? <p>MF - double yellow lines already in situ in Christchurch Road and currently in discussion with the Highway Authorities to move the double yellow lines from the School to further down the road toward A30.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JDP - double yellow lines from the school to Piccolinos had already been sanctioned, waiting to see if RBC receive any residential objections. <p>New signs are currently being produced to enforce no parking/no stopping etc, these will be erected as soon as ready. RBC are responsible for the on-street parking offences as well as the off-street parking offences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JT asked about the details on the traffic enquiry. MF confirmed he had forwarded the link to JP. • JT asked what is behind the thinking and what is trying to be achieved by the central government. MF did confirm they have been allocated the chance of being the second testing site for 'track and trace' in the South of England, waiting on guidelines to be issued. <p>Looking at if there is a second wave of Covid-19 how would they police safe measures, would they lockdown Virginia Water as a whole village, however there is no way to enforce this, as the police don't have the powers. Government have requested for the County Council's to come up with relevant schemes and ideas to reduce village through traffic. JT highlighted that this is a great opportunity for the Neighbourhood Plan Forum to put suggestions to MF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JP confirmed he will forward the link from MF to all Committee members and will be an action to further discuss with the sub-group. 	JP
<p>Planning Applications <i>James Periton</i></p>	<p><u>Core Judo Planning Application</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JP has been re-approached from Mr Purssey who is still awaiting a decision by the planning authority. • JP, JT and A Tyley visited the site. • Mr Purssey has requested to attend the next Committee meeting to present the changes to the application, premises and community use. It was felt the Committee should remain in a neutral position and spend meeting time on more key issues. • JP will liaise with RBC and Mr Purssey to inform him of this decision. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JT raised a concern that when we get more advanced in this plan we end up with something more all embracing in the area we may have prejudiced if that development has gone ahead, which may preclude us to doing something else in that area which the Forum decide is a good idea. So therefore it should be about individual local representation rather than Forum representation at this stage until our Plan is further developed. • JDP confirmed since previous meeting 13 applications have been received, and in his view none of these applications in his view are deemed to be controversial or significant. • There has been a further application for a telephone mast at junction of Trumps Green Road and Kitsmead Lane as previous mast, this is to strengthen internet reception for train commuters. JDP is aware there are some residents who have voiced concerns with RBC on possible health issues with this application. • No updates on Virginia Water Football Club or on the CABI site, JDP will continue to monitor. • Bellbourne site, an additional application been received for a further five houses previous five houses on Steve's Haulage Yard land was previously rejected as problem site and bad for the Green Belt, this went to appeal, Inspector has commented there is no reason not to have houses there. Bellbourne have reapplied, its highly unlikely to be rubberstamped by RBC on the grounds Inspector has commented it is a bad site. 	
<p>Runnymede 2030 Local Plan <i>Jonathan Hulley</i></p>	<p><u>Publication of Inspector's Recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JH gave his overview on Inspector that deals specifically with the proposals of the garden village, VW North and VW South site allocations. • Report dated 28th May, that the Inspector feels it is sound plan from a planning perspective drawing in examples and commentary from other parties and looking at it from a wider Borough perspective. • JH has focussed on the areas that have direct impact on VW which is essentially if we look at the site allocations that are proposed we know that as far as VW is concerned there are two site allocations that find themselves referred to in the final version of this report; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) VW North, the Merlewood proposed development. Comparing the Inspectors summary of why she believes this site could be developed on and what is being proposed and the objections raised by third parties, JH is not convinced that the Inspectors arguments stack up in the way they need to. Not the numbers, 120 new homes on the site, but the impact on the development on the existing infrastructure and that the site is a natural wooded area. JH raised concern that this site is difficult for the Inspector to judge. b) The same for VW South, do not want to see that one town merges with another and to have a natural 'green' barrier. The Inspector has commented there is a 200 metre 'gap' however JH feels the Inspector is referring to the area over 	

	<p>the other side of the M3, again this is not a site that lends itself to development.</p> <p>Unfortunately, both these sites in the Inspectors view have been identified as potential sites for development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wider plan perspective looking at 1779 new dwellings on the Longcross Garden Village site some of that allocation has already been delivered on the Longcross North side. • Yellow bus system that some of the current residents of the Garden Village make use of is coming to an end and will be replaced with a different form of service over time, but JH feels this is an example the Inspector is not current on the facts, again JH is concerned her report does not take into account the level of detail and its impact on VW. • JH would like to hear from the Committee to the next steps and to gain Committees understanding of where the plan sits. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ JP feels there are some grounds on her initial report that may now lead to a judicial review brought by some parties. <p>JH agrees, to show her decision is unreasonable, and to show the decision she has come to is not sustainable. JH added the way the Inspector dismisses the alternative sites, is very disappointing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ JT raised concern that RBC is unlikely to have the funds to resist these applications. ○ CM felt very concerned after reading in the review the reference to the 106 agreement and the existing 106 agreement, so unless it is going to be amended and extended, it really gives no basis that not much is going to be done to ensure facilities, bus services etc, from Longcross. ○ The second point regarding buses to VW, Sunningdale and Woking, biggest concern for buses within the development, unless they provide some shuttle bus service. ○ Thirdly, the basis of the agreement between SCC and RBC on the understanding of 600 houses potentially available to be built prior to the A320 improvements, this is in addition to RBC providing a further 4000 houses on Green Belt. • JH commented that the draft plan talks about 7480 across the Borough, 424 in our Borough, including Longcross. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ JH to confirm with Mel Few the allocation of 4,000 houses? ○ 7,000 across the Borough plus a further 4,000 awarded for the A320 to be established. ○ This was conditional on the HIF bid. • JP asked if the judicial view period, does this follow the Inspectors decision by 6 weeks? • CM confirmed it is from the date of the decision 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No decision on soundness until this is an adopted plan by the Council • It is on the basis the Council adopt the full plan including the full modifications proposed by the inspector on the 16th July which is the date of the meeting. 	
Presentation of Initial Vision Statement for the Forum <i>Robert Bates</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RB updated the Forum on the initial work carried out by the sub-group translating the findings from the Questionnaire into the Initial Vision statement for the Neighbourhood Plan 	
Any Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Core Strategy meeting to take place on the 9th July. 	
Data of Next Meeting	16:00hrs, Thursday, 23 rd July via Zoom Video Link.	