

Virginia Water Neighbourhood Plan Forum Meeting

The Estate Office, Wentworth 4 pm 8th July 2021

Present:

John Pyle (JP) Chairman
David Coen (DC) (CLLR)

Robert Bates (RB)
Carol Manduca (CM)

Nicola Bates (NB)
Gill Morgan (GM)

Philip Beesley (PB)
John Tenconi (JT)

Topic	Minutes	Actions
1. Welcome JP Received Apologies	Apologies Andrew Tyley(AT) James Periton (JDP) Harmohan Dhanjal(HD) Jonathan Hulley (JH) expected (CLLR)	
2. Approval of minutes Conflicts of interest Future meetings	Minutes May 21 JP proposed. GM seconded. No matters arising not included in the agenda Proposed that the initial list of conflicts should be updated, where there are specific conflicts of interest relative to an agenda they should be mentioned in the minutes, members should advise JP ahead of the meeting 9 th September , 11 th November 2021 at 4 pm	Update of the conflict of interest list
3. Cllr David Coen	<p>Welcomed. DC aspirations . * Object to the gravel *object to the incinerator *zero approach to flytipping *provisions for youth *support for the neighbourhood plan .</p> <p>JP asked about Ashley Smith (AS) and the Whitehall Farm development, and the role of AS and remit he has under delegated powers. (AS chose not to refer the application to the planning committee, before responding) Issue is called to the deferred planning committee on 28/7 as numbers of residents want to attend and hear the explanation of the position AS took without consultation. All CLLRs to be invited to pass a motion of objection to the amended response proposed by RBC at the full council meeting. (JH is on the planning committee of SCC so some separation appropriate.)</p> <p>JP concerned about the expectation on the NF to resolve numerous pressure issues</p> <p>CM asked for DC to clarify the approach to decision taking in the council and particularly the role of NP</p> <p>DC advised that NP has absented himself from all decisions re CEMEX, he has seen no evidence of conflict.</p> <p>DC will ask JH and CH to raise this on behalf of the NF and advise on the response. CM believes that AS is unlikely to have taken the line he did without pressure. She illustrated the difference in the decision RBC took 7 years ago. DC is told that RBC position carries very little weight, so he wondered why AS chose not to object. DC believes that CLLRs should hold the officials to account, and also have good working relationships to get things done. Strong feelings are often expressed by CLLRs, but followed by sudden unexpected changes of mind.</p>	DC to raise issue around NP and report back

	<p>AS can seem to be officious – as head of planning he is very knowledgeable on rules of the game and it can make CLLRs feel inadequate. Motivation of professional officers are different from the councillors representing their constituents. CLLRs do have options when they remember they are representatives.</p>	
<p>4. Professor Philip Beesley</p>	<p>Environmental side. Emeritus professor, Honorary fellow of RHUL Involvement in the green areas, particularly the Cabrera trust land. Warden of the nature reserve. He has colleagues he can consult in green and eco issues. Notes have been provided to JP of the Cabrera Trust activities. JT asked if there are people at the college who could help with specific tasks needed to complete plan. NF would need to identify and scope tasks. Jon Doughty has some areas to follow up with PB. NF could also use resource from the University of Reading</p>	
<p>5. JP Update</p>	<p>Working through the 3 parts of the action plan...(core group have a copy) *traffic and development *design and development *connections and communications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awaiting info from the Historic society. Judith Vaughan • Details of Rights of way and footpaths PB to help • Oneill Homer Consultants action plan advice • Phil Jones Associates master planners and design review core area and connections thereto ready for next consultation. Expansion of the centre and uses for the properties. Providing Streetscapes and policies. • Motion associates who helped WRA on traffic are being brought in • JP sent letter to AS /PT re the Hurst Lane issue as requested. Response (circulated) has been seen by Oneill Homer, who are concerned that too much is expected of the NP. Strategy is for the council. Green Belt can't be a policy developed through the NP . O'neill Homer will provide a suggested response which JP will share with members. • Community Panel will be advised of the process for the revision to the plan to 2030+. Community panel is led by Georgina Pacey who is also the link to NF <p>JP Potential conflict if we cannot influence development through the NP as RBC policies may differ. Ottershaw is also concerned. CM asked how we can influence. Covid has brought new variables with radically different assumptions and a different environment. How do we stay abreast of the changes?</p> <p>JP reported on significant developments upwards in Staines rather than outwards taking grass. RBC have to build 500 new units per year in the borough. Requirement under the local plan is that VW take 426. RBC are looking for new land to build housing on. JP believes VW are caught with GB and must stay away from site allocation. The best that can be done is to shade 'no further development' areas. Implication is that RBC wants to engage with the NF about the master plan for Padd farm, Hurst Lane, Longside Lake. Early stages and aim is to stay close to RBC to hear developing thinking.</p>	<p>Recirculate with minutes (Done)</p> <p>JP to circulate draft</p>

	<p>DC observed that the council is very stretched and suggestions would be welcomed as to where developments can take place. JT understood there was a commitment not to look to VW for more areas. CM believes that developers bring pressure as there is more money to be made from developments in VW. JP advised that within the last 18 months the Government had removed the strategic (housing allocation) approach from the remit of NF. NB concerned that we are limited in what can be done. JP waiting for clarity from Jon Doughty, NF can influence but have no power. NB concerned about AS' derogatory, dismissive tone, contrasted to the hopeful tone of the Jonathan Bore report.</p> <p>DC agreed with all the points made, he would be disappointed to see the NF have no teeth when taxpayer's money is being spent, and he would be very keen with JH and CH to identify who to see, new approaches, carrying messages in the best forums to support NF.</p> <p>JP aims to monitor it closely and keep a close watch on central government. RB thinks we need to take account of the changes in lifestyle following Covid, and we need to be clearer in what we want to defend and find policy guidelines to assist. JT The core of the plan access, amenity and preservation of the green belt will be the glue that holds the plan together. CM suggested we formulate a 'policy idea' to make VW unique, the jewel in the crown of RBC. (para 2 in the action plan) to describe the character as referenced earlier in the document . Without a parish council if NF doesn't have a say then no one has a say whilst the local plan is currently being amended JT suggested 'This area is the jewel in the crown of Surrey, as it is blessed with a wonderful environment , it has a world class golfing establishment , it has many listed buildings, it has a huge chunk of the Crown estate, it has a world class university ,what we are about is facilitating the enjoyment of those things , through the management of tourism (park and ride) we want to encourage people to come and share this beautiful leafy area , it is not an industrial zone, it is a resort area'</p> <p>Maximises what VW already has, Aim to use that statement as the policy idea</p>	
<p>6. Distribution of responsibility</p>	<p>JP outlined the work that is being done in his office around raising funds, but there are many areas of the report where more detail is required, for which he has engaged various professionals. Surveys will be needed to support their work JT recommended students to be used. PB advised work would have to contribute to their academic assessment, closely defined research.</p> <p>Core group is: JP, JT, AT, RB. CM asked for some understanding of what is needed. Prioritise all the activities we need to get done and identify top priorities. Extensive discussion followed of how to take this work forward. JP suggests each takes an area to walk the foot paths, for example</p> <p>RB and JP will get together, RB keen to get untapped community groups on board. Work to be done with 10 days to clarify the details</p>	<p>Outline of what is needed next</p>

<p>7. Finances</p>	<p>JP aiming to raise money from PGA and WRA, seen as big stakeholders. Application to JH for £1000. There is sufficient money to cover Homer and Doughty, but £30K required to cover the experts needed.</p> <p>GM asked how the appointment of consultants has been made. Core group looked at the issues and changed some of the scope, iterative vetting process, scope was cut back council will know. Motion will be known to the council from its work on Longcross. The amount of estimated spend is typical of the costs of a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>NB concerned about the detail work commissioned, Is there a record for future scrutiny and transparency, how many quotes, is collaboration a requirement in the recruitment of consultants She mentioned the spend on the centre whilst the accessibility to the centre is poor. NB asked for the details to be circulated noting the coy the costs and the outputs agreed with each consultant</p> <p>JP said outside advice is needed for the policy work and then the local support comes from the consultations. Every NP has professional advice to back up the communities concerns on policy. It won't get it through RBC without consultant's involvement.</p> <p>JT believes that the input from the consultants will cover this in a more holistic view, looking at the whole area not just one of six areas. JP confirmed that PJA are looking at the central area to produce ideas to make it more attractive and usable, and also looking at the access and roads surrounding. Wider access to the central core is covered including traffic management and traffic calming. This part will need to convince SCC as roads are resurfaced. Consultants give ideas and support to allow informed consultation.</p> <p>JP believed he had support for this work on the Core area.</p> <p>Half the costs of Motion the traffic consultants can be saved if NF do the survey. Detail is required in the local plan to support the two residential areas to show how access can be improved. A question was asked about PJA work looking at the centre but, what is it the centre of? PJA will be informed by the traffic consultants about the difficulty of access.</p>	<p>Circulated prior to the meeting with minutes.</p> <p>List of consultants costs and outputs agreed to be circulated</p>
<p>8 Planning</p>	<p>New application, Longside Lake and maybe some leisure cottages. Tarmac were unaware of the application. NF can expect a statement from Tarmac introducing their thoughts. NF see this as an opportunity of this as a leisure facility to be encouraged</p> <p>GM (conflicted Hurst Lane) -- anomaly of the overlap of areas in Thorpe ward. Lack of clarity as to around the boundaries. There seems to be stranded land where planning applications can be missed by people most affected CM thought NF might not be successful in raising the issue, but planning in Thorpe ward should come to VWNF.</p>	<p>Follow up this issue and advise NF</p>
<p>9 Community engagement</p>	<p>Carry forward to a meeting with JP and JP as above item 6</p> <p>Everyone who engaged on the previous survey should be reconnected</p>	
<p>AOB</p>	<p>Fixed bi-monthly meetings</p>	

