

# BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET & PYRFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

## Minutes of the Committee Meeting held via Zoom at 19:00 on Thursday, 20 August 2020

### Present:

Stewart Dick (SD) – Chair  
Lynette Davies (LD) – Secretary  
Andy Grimshaw (AG) – Pyrford Village Representative  
& Chair Pyrford NF  
Dharma Sivarajasingham (DS) – Treasurer  
Isabelle David (ID) – Membership Secretary

Robert Munford (RM) – Editor  
Eleanor Grady (EMG) – B VR  
Keith Creswell (KC) – WB VR

Penny Hoskyn (PH) - WB Forum  
Wade Pollard (WP) – WB Forum  
Gary Elson (GE) - Cllr

Quorum: 8 members - the meeting was quorate.

**Reports circulated and to be appended to minutes:** Planning, Treasurer, Membership, West Byfleet VR, Byfleet VR, Pyrford VR, Pyrford Forum, Cllr GE report

### 1. Welcome & Apologies for absence

SD welcomed everyone to this, the third, virtual meeting.

Apologies had been received from Lynn Cozens.

### 2. Minutes of the Meeting on 22 July 2020

The minutes were reviewed.

Jean Pierre's surname was corrected in the attendee list and AG was added to those who had attended the WBBA Zoom meeting on 8 July re Sheer House (page 2, Planning Report, last bullet)

With these corrections, the minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2020 were agreed as a true record to be signed by the Chair at some point in the future.

### 3. Matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting

All actions had been completed or were covered by the agenda for this meeting.

### 4. Planning Report

SD had prepared a report and additional comments were made as follows:

- 20 Tanglewood Close – Cllr Elson noted that there were issues around this application which he was following up.
- SADPD – unlikely to be any action on this before the end of September.
- Planning issues also included in Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum report.

### 5. White Paper – Planning for the Future

SD commented on the paper which he had submitted noting that the proposals, should they be confirmed, would likely only become law by the end of this Parliament. However, there were four measures which merited immediate consideration: changes to the standard method of assessing local housing need, first homes, small site threshold re contribution to affordable homes, fast route to housing and planning consent.

SD's recommendation was that this should be a focus for the community and tracked by the Neighbourhood Forums, particularly Pyrford and West Byfleet.

SD was thanked for producing such a comprehensive summary of a lengthy paper.

### 6. Active Travel Vision – agree policy

A very ambitious policy had been prepared by KC for approval and circulated before the meeting. SD invited KC to talk to his paper.

KC reported that he had put this policy together with the co-operation and enthusiastic support of the NFs. Whilst containing nothing particularly contentious it did include some projects for the very long term ie another tunnel under the railway linking the two sides of WB.

AG was interested to know how a balance between cars/cyclists/walkers could be achieved. KC believed this would only be through better education, better facilities and better markings. A new highway code was currently under consideration and cycling proficiency was offered by schools. KC did not see a place for education in the policy.

RM wondered if target dates should be included but KC thought that this might be limiting and not appropriate for the long-term ideas.

Cllr GE was concerned about electric bikes and scooters which were increasing in number. It was noted that electric scooters were illegal and could only be ridden on private land. Speed regulators were needed for electric bikes and this was being addressed in the proposals for the new highway code.

EMG was supportive of education through schools and the adoption of 20mph speed restrictions although she was uncertain as to what constituted a residential road. KC said this was any non-classified road. However, 20mph speed restrictions had been turned down in the past by SCC and were not supported by the police unless it could be enforced with restriction measures. Cllr GE confirmed that there had been council discussions about 20mph limits but they had not been supported.

EMG was also keen that the policy should address greening and street furniture. KC's view was that this would be better covered by a policy on public spaces.

SD thanked KC for all his hard work on preparing this policy which he proposed for adoption by the RA, seconded by Cllr GE. This was agreed unanimously.

KC would write an article for the newsletter and the policy would be posted to the website.

## **7. Sheer House Working Group**

WP noted that the membership of the SHWG was almost agreed and that the terms of reference now needed to be worked up. An inaugural virtual meeting would take place very soon and once the ToR had been agreed representatives of both Keeble Brown and RVG would be invited to attend meetings.

Membership was discussed. The proposal was for representatives from WBNF, WBBA, the RA plus the three local councillors. It was felt that including representatives of the wider areas affected by the development ie Woodham, New Haw, Sheerwater would result in too large a group. PNF had expressed a wish to be included but, once again, it was noted that RA members represented the wider community of the three villages and not just the village in which they resided. In addition, two of the councillors were from Pyrford and were confident that they could cover the interests of that village.

Key to good communications would be to have someone from RVB at meetings. The site manager, once appointed, would be ideal.

WP, SD and Cllr GE had already been in contact with Keeble Brown.

The SHWG would not be a planning group. Outline planning consent had already been granted and WBNF had previously objected to various aspects of the application. In these circumstances the SHWG did not expect to be in a position to raise any further objections, it was now time to work with the developers towards the best outcome for the community. This would not preclude members of the public raising their concerns.

## **8. Councillors' Reports**

Cllr GE had submitted a written report.

He was pleased to note that there had been some progress at Marshalls Parade although it continued to be slow.

He also reported that recent bad weather had resulted in several trees coming down in Pyrford, Teggs Lane was particularly affected, and he was working with SCC to get these cleared up.

There were no other reports.

## **9. Editorial**

### **The Resident 165 – deadline for articles now 24 August 2020.**

RM summarised the articles currently planned for this issue; usual committee reports with Sheer House development being covered in the reports from KC (WB VR Report) and WP (WBNF Report), bare foot fundraising walk by Chris Brannigan, Basingstoke Canal, WB allotments and lockdown, gardens in lockdown, Sopwith Drive yellow lines, refurbishment of St Mary's Centre, Byfleet by Fresh Start, Octagon – sale of first house on Broadoaks.

**BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET & PYRFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION**  
**AUGUST 2020**

---

West Byfleet medical centre had been asked for a statement on the expected effect of the new developments on medical provision. RM would follow up.

WP and AG would include comments on NCIL projects in their respective reports

EMG would include the seed programme in the Byfleet VR report but was willing to provide a more in-depth report for the next issue.

ID was awaiting a response on sponsorship by Octagon of an RA leaflet to be distributed to every household in the Three Villages

**Post meeting note:** Octagon had agreed to sponsor a leaflet

Costings had been provided by ID/RM for the various options for publication of the next issue:

- online newsletter only
- hardcopy newsletter only
- combination of online and hardcopy – ie short print run costs + online cost
- production of double-sided A4 leaflet
- delivery of newsletters to all members
- delivery of a leaflet to every household in the 3 villages

These were discussed in detail.

It was clear that printing a small number of copies was not cost effective and made no sense due to the upfront costs. With the expected drop in membership income for the current year as a result of the suspension of collections due to Covid, the RA needed to be mindful of the cost of producing (and delivering, if this was not to be by street reps) the newsletter.

DS questioned the need for 3,500 copies when membership appeared to be closer to 2,300. He also wondered how many members had actually gone on the website to look at the last issue. Stats provided by Anita Flavell last month appeared to show a spike around the publication date which was encouraging.

Member email addresses had increased from 30-50% but this meant that there were still members relying on the paper copy.

Producing another electronic copy would hopefully encourage further signups along with information proposed for the leaflet which would canvas for new members and promote contact via email.

Expectation was that there would be a return to paper copies but at what point in the future was as yet undecided. If 75% of members provided emails would that be the time to go electronic?

Newsletter delivery in the current situation was the key concern given the demographic of the street reps but research into whether the street reps were willing to deliver needed to be done. It was agreed that VRs should canvas the street reps and KC agreed to draft an email for VRs to send out.

**Action KC**

Given the concerns around costs and delivery – a second Covid spike was expected and cases had risen recently in the area – it was agreed that the next issue should be electronic and freely available as before.

Should sponsorship of the leaflet (production costs and delivery) as outlined at the last meeting become available ie from Octagon, RVG etc this would go ahead – if not in the autumn, in spring 2021.

**Post meeting note:** Octagon had agreed to sponsor a leaflet

ID/RD were thanked for all their work getting the costings together and organising articles for the next issue.

## **10. AGM 2020**

The AGM planned for March 2020 had been postponed in light of Covid restrictions precluding public meetings and the challenges of organising a virtual AGM. A quorum of 35 people was needed and there was no provision for proxy voting or even holding a virtual meeting in the constitution. However, recent legislation had indicated the possibility of postponing until end September and holding a virtual meeting

PH reported that it might be possible to hold the meeting using technology available at the Church of the Good Shepherd with social distancing possible in the space available. St John's Church, WB, had also been proposed but the same technology was not available.

After some discussion it was agreed that it was not appropriate to ask people to meet F2F in current circumstances and that the AGM should be further postponed.

SD would include an explanation in his report for the newsletter which would be repeated on the website and noticeboards around the three villages.

It was noted that the first resolution at the AGM would need to be approval of the postponement and action taken.

## **11. Village Representative Reports**

**West Byfleet** – KC had circulated his report for the newsletter as this covered the same ground as his committee report. He made the following additional comments:

- The petition to complete the cycling/walking path along the Parvis Road between Byfleet and Broadoaks now had 202 signatures
- The proposals to close the road under the railway in Camphill Road to cars and the removal of barriers on the pavement outside Waitrose had been scrapped. However, it was reported that Cllr Boote was looking to reinstate the barrier removal proposal.
- Boarding had now been put up around the Sheer House site.
- It was to be noted that there were still 138 business activities in WB despite the departure of all the SH tenants.
- AG reported that the library had re-opened but only for a short while as it had now been shut due to flooding following the recent heavy rain.

**Pyrford** - AG had submitted a report.

Work at Marshall's Parade was noted together with other planning issues.

Yellow lines at the junction with Lincoln Drive and Old Woking Road had been included in the 2020 Woking Parking review.

KC asked about the installation of a kissing gate on Twisted Stone footpath and whether it restricted access to mobility vehicles. Whilst this was the case, AG noted that there were a few other paths in the area with such gates. AG had discussed this with Marion Malcher, the footpath officer.

**Pyrford** NF – AG had submitted a report.

- A number of planning applications were listed.
- Paperwork for the re-designation of the PNF had been sent to WBC who had returned with some comments and paperwork would now be re-submitted.

**Byfleet** – EMG reported the following

- Currently all quiet in Byfleet! Shops were opening up and social distancing was being observed.
- There would be a new date for the inauguration of Godfrey's bench
- One of the street reps would not be continuing

## **12. AOB**

There had been a reduced agenda for this meeting but DS had circulated a Treasurer's Report.

AG asked why the RA were not using the reserves.

DS explained that this was not the case and by controlling expenses, the expectation was to return to cash positive later in the year. Reduced subscription revenue was expected and advertisements were running at a lower level than last year. With uncertainty as to how long this would continue the reserves might be needed to cover the ongoing costs of the RA and the production of the newsletter whether online or on paper or both.

Funds would not be made available for donations at the current time (unless in exceptional circumstances) but kept for emergency actions such as the funding of any legal action/advice needed by any of the villages.

Payment of the RA grant to PNF was still outstanding and the situation was being addressed by both SD and DS. Solutions had been put forward and a meeting was now needed to resolve the issues.

SD noted that he had prepared a paper outlining the planning responsibilities of the RA and the NFs. This would be circulated to the committee for discussion and agreement.

**BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET & PYRFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION  
AUGUST 2020**

---

**Drop-in dates:**

**14:00 on Saturday, 10 October 2020** – AG to cancel Pyrford Village Hall booking as this would no longer be needed

**Meeting closed at 21:10**

**Date of the next meeting – Wednesday, 16 September 2020**

**Meetings for 2020-21 – all at 19:00 on the third Wednesday of the month, by Zoom until further notice:**

**2020**

21 October

18 November

December – no meeting

**2021**

20 January

17 February

17 March

21 April

19 May

16 June

21 July

August – no meeting

## **TREASURER'S REPORT**

### **20<sup>th</sup> of August 2020**

The following Statement of Financial Affairs is for the period from 1<sup>st</sup> of January 2020 to 20<sup>th</sup> of August 2020.

#### **July update on financials**

Our year to date subscription collection £7,599 pounds and now most cash collected during Covid-19 lock down is banked. We have invoiced £1,180 to date for advertising and collected £880 to date. Our total cash reserves continue to remain healthy at £26,890. For the current year up to June 2020, we have a deficit of £699. We still expect to return to cash positive later in the year with controlling expenses. Invoice raised for Alan Greenwood in March (£150) continuing to remain unpaid.

The £544 Stag print invoice relating to issue 164 was paid in July.

We will be paying the annual grants to the Neighbourhood Forums hopefully soon. We are still waiting for Pyrford on a couple review comments. We will deduct £500 from West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum.

Notes and open items.

- 1 RA had received an invoice for £4,491 from Bell Cornwell. This is below the anticipated £5,000 funds set aside by the RA in 2019. This invoice was settled in January 2020.
- 2 Charitable status and gift aid – progress is slow due to regulation 19, Covid-19 and other urgent matters. We are deferring this until 2021.
- 3 COVID-19: In 2020, subscriptions income is expected to be up to 25% lower than 2019. This is due to the lockdown and paused collection activity for almost 4 months. This reduction is expected to be around £3,500 based on our 2019 results. We also expect to have fewer advertisements in our resident magazine and expect collection to be slower.

Dharma Sivarajasingham  
Hon. Treasurer  
20/08/2020

**BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET & PYRFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION  
AUGUST 2020**

Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford Residents Association

20 August

to 2020

INCOME	Year to date £	£
<b>Subscriptions and member donations:</b>		
Byfleet	958	
West Byfleet	2,859	
Pyrford	3,331	
Subscriptions not allocated	451	
2019 paid in 2018	-	
2020 paid in 2019 or to be allocated	-	
		<b>7,599</b>
<b>Advertising</b> (includes receipts from 2019 invoices)		1,110
<b>Bank Interest</b>		31
<b>Donations</b>		-
<b>Other</b>		-
<b>Total Income</b>		<b>8,740</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>		
The Resident		2,034
Committee Expenses		-
Street Rep Drop Ins		39
Room Hire not Comm.		131
AGM		105
Fetes		-
Display/Equipment		-
Donations:		500
Community Support		4,792
Insurance		-
Postage, Stationery & Printing		618
Sundries/Losses		-
Database/Web Expenses		1,220
Mileage/Parking		-
Forums - Pyrford	0	
- Byfleet	0	
- West Byfleet	0	
		0
<b>Total Expenditure</b>		<b>9,439</b>
Surplus/(Deficit)		<b>(£699)</b>
Opening Cash		£27,589
Surplus/(Deficit)		<b>(£699)</b>
Closing Cash		<b>£26,890</b>
Analysis of Cash	Current Account	4,275
	Un allocated Collections Accounts	
	+ 2020 subs not allocated	451
	Overnight Deposit	7,008
	32Day deposit	15,157
		<b>£26,890</b>

**BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET & PYRFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION  
AUGUST 2020**

---

* <b>Donations</b>	£
FRIENDS OF BYFLEET - GODFREY BENCH	250
BYFLEET AMENITIES	250
	<u>£500</u>
* <b>Community Support</b>	
BELL CORNWELL RE- SADPD	4,491
Printing Leaflets - walk in Centre	301
	<u>4,792</u>
* <b>Sundries</b>	
	<u>£0</u>



## **PLANNING REPORT**

Of necessity I am for the time being standing in as Planning Coordinator.

I have attempted to extract those applications and/or decisions that I think are either of importance or interest. The vast majority of applications appear to be for fairly standard extensions or tree branch removals.

Wherever possible I have visited the sites and discussed any concerns (if any) with the relevant Forum.

This report covers information received up to Tuesday 18th August

There have been very few applications of interest.

### **1. WHITE PAPER CONSULTATION**

See separate report

### **2. PLAN/2020/0202**

Pyrford Place, Pyrford Road, Woking. Surrey

Erection of two storey boathouse following demolition of existing boathouse refurbishment of existing footbridge and erection of single storey storage building and associated works.

**The RA have objected.**

### **PENDING**

Main reasons are:

- > Not in accord with PNF Plan
- > Building is on Green belt land and conflicts with NPPF in particular paragraphs 145(c) and (d).
- > Description of proposed design is confusing.
- > Proposed structure is hide compared with current - why?
- > Privacy issues.

### **3. PLAN/2020/0571**

Erection of a two storey front extension and single storey rear extension. Erection of front and rear dormers and side and rear roof lights.

Address: 20 Tanglewood Close, Pyrford, Woking, Surrey, GU22 8LG

### **PENDING CONSIDERATION**

### **4. PLAN/2019/1063**

Address: Tamarix, 153 Old Woking Road,

Demolition of existing dwelling and garage and erection of a 2.5 storey building of 5 apartments with associated soft and hard landscaping and relocation of vehicular access to Lincoln Drive.

The RA have **objected**.

Main reasons:

- > Inadequate parking
- > Out of character
- > Loss of privacy
- > Does not comply with PNF Plan policies BE1, BE2 and BE3.

### **PENDING CONSIDERATION**

**5. PLAN/2020/0602**

Address: 47A Old Woking Road

Erection of part two storey, part single storey rear extension incorporating 1no. single dormer, side dormer to existing outrigger, 1no. single dormer to rear elevation and 2no. single dormers to front elevation to create 2no. studio flats at first floor level and 1no. one bedroom flat within roof space. Provision for 2no. parking spaces to rear and revised bin storage layout.

Planning Committee.

**Pending Consideration**

Statutory Expiry Date 15 September 2020

**6. PLAN/2020/0443**

Address: 74 Lovelace Drive, Pyrford, Woking, GU22 8QY

Conversion of garage into habitable accommodation.

**Refused**

**7. PLAN.2020/0687**

Address: Milestones, 117 Old Woking Road, West Byfleet, KT14 6HY

Erection of single rear extension and conversion of garage into habitable accommodation.

Decision - delegated power.

**8. SADPD**

Nothing further to report since my last update. Inspector's final report unlikely before end September.

**9. SHEER HOUSE REDEVELOPMENT**

A working group comprising representatives from:

- > WBNF
- > WBBA
- > RA
- > COUNCILLORS

has been formed. Terms of reference for discussion at the initial meeting are being drafted.

## WHITE PAPER: PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

"Our proposals seek a significantly simpler, faster and more predictable system. They aim to facilitate a more diverse and competitive housing industry, in which smaller builders can thrive alongside the big players, where all pay a fair share of the costs of infrastructure and the affordable housing existing communities require and where permissions are more swiftly turned into homes.

We are cutting red tape, but not standards. This Government doesn't want to just build houses. We want a society that has re-established powerful links between identity and place, between our unmatched architectural heritage and the future, between community and purpose. Our reformed system places a higher regard on quality, design and local vernacular than ever before, and draws inspiration from the idea of design codes and pattern books that built Bath, Belgravia and Bournville. Our guiding principle will be as Clough Williams-Ellis said to cherish the past, adorn the present and build for the future.

We will build environmentally friendly homes that will not need to be expensively retrofitted in the future, homes with green spaces and new parks at close hand, where tree lined streets are the norm and where neighbours are not strangers.

We are moving away from notices on lampposts to an interactive and accessible mapbased online system – placing planning at the fingertips of people. The planning process will be brought into the 21st century. Communities will be reconnected to a planning process that is supposed to serve them, with residents more engaged over what happens in their areas.

While the current system excludes residents who don't have the time to contribute to the lengthy and complex planning process, local democracy and accountability will now be enhanced by technology and transparency.

Reforming the planning system isn't a task we undertake lightly, but it is both an overdue and a timely reform. Millions of jobs depend on the construction sector and in every economic recovery, it has played a crucial role" - **The Rt. Hon. Robert Jenrick MP Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government.**

The proposals for Local Plan reform, changes to developer contributions and development management will require primary legislation followed by secondary legislation. The proposals allow 30 months for new Local Plans to be in place so a new planning framework. The Government would expect new Local Plans to be in place by the end of this Parliament.

So as regards the current Local Plan; Woking SADPD; the Inspector's findings; the further public consultation and the possible release of Green Belt land under the SADPD proposals I assume that we continue as normal.

The below is a brief and very incomplete bullet point summary of some of the recommendations in the above White Paper. There are three main sections:

### **Pillar One – Planning for development**

### **Pillar Two – Planning for beautiful and sustainable places**

### **Pillar Three – Planning for infrastructure and connected places**

#### **Problems re Planning:**

- It is too complex
- Planning decisions are discretionary rather than rules-based
- It takes too long to adopt a Local Plan (average seven years)
- Assessments of housing need, viability and environmental impacts are too complex and opaque
- It has lost public trust
- It is based on 20th-century technology
- The process for negotiating developer contributions to affordable housing and infrastructure is complex, protracted and unclear
- There is not enough focus on design, and little incentive for high quality new homes and places
- It simply does not lead to enough homes being built

#### **Proposals:**

1. **Streamline the planning process**
  - Simplifying the role of Local Plans
  - Local Plans should set clear rules rather than general policies for development
  - Local councils should radically and profoundly re-invent the ambition, depth and breadth with which they engage with communities
  - Local Plans should be subject to a single statutory "sustainable development" test,
  - Local Authorities and the Planning Inspectorate will be required through legislation to meet a statutory timetable (of no more than 30 months in total)
  - Decision-making should be faster and more certain
  - Government will seek to strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions
2. **Embrace modern technology in the planning process. Move away from paper based**
3. **Bring a new focus on design and sustainability**
  - The planning system supports efforts to combat climate change and maximises environmental benefits
  - Include ambitious improvements in the energy efficiency standards for buildings to help deliver the Government's world-leading commitment to net-zero by 2050
  - Ask for beauty and be far more ambitious for the places we create, expecting new development to be beautiful
  - Expect design guidance and codes
  - Ensure that each Local Planning Authority has a chief officer for design and place-making
4. **Improve infrastructure delivery in all parts of the country and ensure developers play their part, through reform of developer contributions**
5. **Ensure more land is available for the homes and development people and communities need, and to support renewal of our town and city centres**

I shall focus on a few of the above proposals which are of the greater interest to our Communities.

### **Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy**

The Government supports that this should remain and should continue to be spent on priorities in the area that the related development occurs. It provides an important incentive to local communities to allow development in their area. **Wish to enhance community engagement?**

### **Community Infrastructure Levy ("CIL")**

- Will be reformed as a nationally set value based flat charge
- New levy will raise more money
- Section 106 Agreements will cease and move to have a consolidated CIL
- This will deliver more infrastructure
- Local Authorities will have greater power on how CIL is used to drive up provision for affordable housing
- This will support existing and new communities
- There is scope for even more flexibility around spending. The Government could also increase Local Authority flexibility, allowing them to spend receipts on their policy priorities, **once core infrastructure obligations have been met**. In addition to the provision of local infrastructure, including parks, open spaces, street trees and delivery or enhancement of community facilities, this could include improving services **or reducing council tax**.

### **Neighbourhood Plans**

These will be maintained as an important means of Community input.

Since 2011 over 1,100 Plans have successfully passed their referendum. They have become an imported tool in helping to "bring democracy forward" in planning by allowing communities to think proactively about how they would like their area to develop.

**However** the Government will wish to consider whether the content of Neighbourhood Plans should become more focused to reflect the proposals of the White Paper.

### **Housing Numbers**

There will be a standard method for establishing housing requirement figures which ensures enough land is released in the areas where affordability is worst, to stop land supply being a barrier to enough homes being built. The housing requirement would factor in land constraints and opportunities to more effectively use land, including through densification where appropriate, to ensure that the land is identified in the most appropriate areas and housing targets are met.

Local Plans will need to identify areas to meet a range of development needs – such as homes, businesses and community facilities – for a minimum period of 10 years.

This standard method will significantly reduce the time it takes to establish the amount of land to release in each area will be a means of distributing the national housebuilding target of 300,000 new homes annually (178,000 built in 2019), and one million homes by the end of the Parliament.

### **The existing policy for protecting the Green Belt will remain.**

There is a separate White Paper Consultation on proposed changes to the Current Planning System which proposes introducing a new standard method for assessing local housing needs. It is proposed to introduce a new element into the standard method, a percentage of existing housing stock levels, which takes into account the number of homes that are already in an area. This should ensure that diverse housing needs in all parts of the country are taken into account. It should also offer the stability and predictability which has been absent when solely relying on household projections. This is so lacking in detail I am unclear as to its possible impact on the Three Villages.

There is a further consultation on four shorter-term measures which will improve the immediate effectiveness of the current system:

- changes to the standard method for assessing local housing need, which as well as being a proposal to change guidance in the short term has relevance to proposals for land supply reforms set out in the White Paper;
- securing of First Homes, sold at a discount (30%) to market price for first time buyers, including key workers, through developer contributions in the short term until the transition to a new system;
- temporarily lifting the small sites threshold, below which developers do not need to contribute to affordable housing, to up to 40 or 50 units;
- extending the current Permission in Principle to major development so landowners and developers now have a fast route to secure the principle of development for housing on sites without having to work up detailed plans first.

### **Infrastructure**

The Government plans to improve infrastructure delivery in all parts of the country and ensure developers play their part.

To better support the timely delivery of infrastructure, the Government plans to allow local authorities to borrow against Infrastructure Levy revenues so that they could forward fund infrastructure.

New development brings with it new demand for public services and infrastructure.

Securing necessary infrastructure and affordable housing alongside new development is central to the vision for the planning system and it is important that there is a strong link between where development occurs and where funding is spent.

Throughout all of this there seems to be an assumption that CIL is spent on infrastructure in the immediate area of the related development. This we know not to be the case. Also see below.

### **Local Plans**

Local Plans should set clear rules rather than general policies for development; be significantly shorter and be prepared much more quickly.

Local Plans will be developed over a fixed 30-month period with clear engagement points, rather than the current inconsistent process which takes seven years on average.

Local Plans will now be prepared under a five stage process. At stage three the Plan will be published for the public to comment on. Comments seeking change must explain how the plan should be changed and why. Again, this process would embody "best in class" ways of ensuring public involvement.

Local Plans should have a clear role and function, which should be, first, to identify land for development and sites that should be protected; and, second, to be clear about what development can take place in those different areas so that there is greater certainty about land allocated for development and so that there is a faster route to securing permission.

They should be assessed against a single statutory "**sustainable development**" test to ensure plans strike the right balance between environmental, social and economic objectives. Unnecessary assessments and requirements that cause delay and challenge in the current system should be abolished. This would mean **replacing the existing tests of soundness**, updating requirements for assessments (including on the environment and viability) **and abolishing the Duty to Cooperate**.

**Local Plans should be informed by appropriate infrastructure planning, and sites should not be included in the plan where there is no reasonable prospect of any infrastructure that may be needed coming forward within the plan period. Planmaking policies in the National Planning Policy Framework will make this clear.**

Local Plans should incorporate the revised standard method for establishing housing requirement figures.

Neighbourhood Plans should be retained (see above) in the reformed planning system. Indeed the Government wishes to encourage their continued use and indeed to help spread their use further.

### **Role and Function of Local Plans**

The Government proposes that Local Plans should identify three types of land – (i) Growth areas suitable for **substantial development**, (ii) Renewal areas suitable for **development**, and (iii) Areas that are **Protected**.

**(A) Growth areas "suitable for substantial development"** – it is proposed that the term "substantial development" be defined in policy to remove any debate about this description. It is envisaged this category would include land suitable for comprehensive development, including new settlements and urban extension sites, and areas for redevelopment, such as former industrial sites or urban regeneration sites. It could also include proposals for sites such as those around universities where there may be opportunities to create a cluster of growth-focused businesses. Sites annotated in the Local Plan under this category would have outline approval for development. Areas of flood risk would be excluded from this category (as would other important constraints), unless any risk can be fully mitigated;

**(B) Renewal areas "suitable for development"** – this would cover existing built areas where smaller scale development is appropriate. It could include the gentle densification and infill of residential areas, development in town centres, and development in rural areas that is not annotated as Growth or Protected areas, such as small sites within or on the edge of villages. There would be a statutory presumption in favour of development being granted for the uses specified as being suitable in each area. Local Authorities could continue to consider the case for resisting inappropriate development of residential gardens.

**(C) Areas that are Protected** – this would include sites and areas which, as a result of their particular environmental and/or cultural characteristics, would justify more stringent development controls to ensure sustainability. This would include areas such as Green Belt, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), Conservation Areas, Local Wildlife Sites, areas of significant flood risk and important areas of green space. At a smaller scale it can continue to include gardens in line with existing policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. It would also include areas of open countryside outside of land in Growth or Renewal areas. Some areas would be defined nationally, others locally on the basis of national policy, but all would be annotated in Local Plan maps and clearly signpost the relevant development restrictions defined in the National Planning Policy Framework.

In **(A)** and **(B)** above, the key and accompanying text would set out suitable development uses, as well as limitations on height and/or density as relevant. These could be specified for sub-areas within each category, determined locally but having regard to national policy, guidance and legislation (including the National Model Design Code and flexibilities in use allowed by virtue of the new Use Classes Order and permitted development). For example, it may be appropriate for some areas to be identified as suitable for higher-density residential development, or for high streets and town centres to be identified as distinct areas. In Growth areas, the Government would also want to allow sub-areas to be created specifically for self and custom-build homes, and community-led housing developments, to allow a range of housing aspirations to be met and help create diverse and flourishing communities. In the case of self and custom-

build homes, local authorities should identify enough land to meet the requirements identified in their self-build and custom housebuilding registers.

For **Protected Areas**, the key and accompanying text would explain what is permissible by cross-reference to the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Development Management Process for the above three types of Land**

**(A)** Areas identified as **Growth Areas** (suitable for substantial development) would automatically be granted outline planning permission for the principle of development, while automatic approvals would also be available for pre-established development types in other areas suitable for building. There will therefore be no need to submit a further planning application to test whether the site can be approved. Planning decisions should focus on resolving outstanding issues – not the principle of development.

Detailed planning permission will be secured in one of three ways including a reformed reserved matters process for agreeing the issues which remain outstanding.

**(B)** Areas suitable for development (**Renewal Areas**), there would be a general presumption in favour of development established in legislation (achieved by strengthening the emphasis on taking a plan-led approach, with plans reflecting the general appropriateness of these areas for development). Consent for development while not automatic would relate to what was in the Plan

In both the **Growth** and **Renewal** areas it would still be possible for a proposal which is different to the Plan to come forward (if, for example, local circumstances had changed suddenly, or an unanticipated opportunity arose), but this would require a specific planning application.

**(C)** In areas where development is restricted (**Protected Areas**) any development proposals would come forward as now through planning applications being made to the Local Authority (except where they are subject to permitted development rights or development orders), and judged against policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

So:

#### **POSITIVES**

- > Neighbourhood Forums continue
- > Neighbourhood Forum Plans remain but will need change and diminished as regards influencing planning
- > NCIL continues
- > Green Belt protection remains
- > Infrastructure - no site should be in the Plan if there is no prospect of the necessary infrastructure coming forward.

#### **NEUTRAL**

- > Housing numbers - need more information
- > Simplifying Local Plans - rules rather than policies
- > Sole test - sustainable development.

#### **NEGATIVE**

- > The level of consultation with the community when preparing the Local Plan is not at all clear
- > Development Management Process. In many cases approval of planning applications will be "automatic" with an adverse impact on local influence and democracy.

This is a consultation White Paper and most of the proposals also have alternative options which I have not addressed.

Stewart Dick  
RA Chairman

## **Our Active Travel Vision**

All the major political parties are now supporting the move to get more people walking and cycling, now known as "Active Travel" to help reduce congestion, to reduce pollution and to yield direct health benefits to residents.

The Residents Association welcomes the ambition of the Government in encouraging Active Travel and setting appropriate standards for safe walking and cycling.

Our vision is that:

1. The major road routes through our neighbourhoods, i.e. Parvis Road, Old Woking Road, Sheewater Road, Sopwith Drive and Oyster Lane will have dedicated and separated protected cycle and walking paths on both sides of the road whenever space or major redevelopment permits.
2. As soon as possible and as a step towards 1 above, all the above will have shared pedestrian and cycle paths or protected lanes (existing Old Woking Road lane eastbound to be protected) on both sides of the road to national standards and segregated where space allows.
3. Safe cycling routes will be reinforced or introduced in Chertsey Road, Camphill Road, Station Road, Woodlands Avenue, Madeira Road, Pyrford Road, Oakcroft Road and Coldharbour Road.
4. Additional non-vehicular tunnels (or bridges) will be provided at West Byfleet Station, Camphill Road and Oyster Lane to provide segregated safe access for cyclists and pedestrians across the railway independent of road traffic.
5. Appropriate signal control crossings will be put in place to facilitate the continuity of active travel paths and safe cycling routes, particularly Sopwith Drive near Viscount Gardens, Parvis Road at Sopwith Drive, Sheerwater Road at Madeira Road and Old Woking Road at Coldharbour Road.
6. The National Trust will raise the standard of the Wey Navigation towpath to a similar standard to the Saturn Trail along the Basingstoke Canal at least though Runnymede, Elmbridge and Woking Borough Council areas.

As a general principle,

7. All active travellers, whether by cycle, scooter, mobility scooter or on foot, will be encouraged to show consideration to other users including warning of approach from the rear.
8. All new major Road schemes in Surrey will make provision for dedicated separated pedestrian and cycle paths.
9. All designated active travel paths will have direct crossings and marked priority over joining roads at junctions.
10. All residential roads and roads adjacent to playgrounds and schools will have a 20mph speed limit.
11. Residents will be supported in introducing road landscaping and traffic calming schemes on residential streets.

The Residents Association and three local Neighbourhood Forums, Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford, would ask all political parties to commit to the above at Local Authority level. We would ask all residents to support these moves and, in using these facilities, to observe the highway code and to show consideration to other users irrespective of their mode of travel.

The Residents Association recognises that some of our requests (particularly 1&4) may take many years to reach fruition but believe it is important that Local Authorities recognise the needs of the Community into the future and ask that the other requests are considered urgent priorities.



**Pyrford Ward Councillors Report – Gary Elson 16<sup>th</sup> August 2020**

It seems that Pyrford felt the worst of Tuesday's storm; WBC staff and Serco were quickly in attendance to remove fallen trees and roads engulfed with mud and debris.

They returned on following days and have done a great job clearing up our roads and pavements.. Big Thanks to them.

Following concerns regarding anti-social behaviour around the Pyrford Cricket Club ground and pitch, the Social Club and the Village Hall car park a further meeting with Surrey Police took place on Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> August. In attendance were 3 officers who have been tasked by Commander Dave Bentley to investigate and report on how the situation can be improved and to recommend measures for prevention. The team which is headed by PC Hugo Hubbard includes PCSO Neil Wilkinson and the DOCO (design out crime officer) Stephen Cake.

This team has also be assigned to patrol and monitor similar issues occurring in the Woodlands Avenue Car Park in West Byfleet and the Sheer House site which is currently being boarded up.

I have asked WBC to repair fencing, cut back vegetation and reline the Woodlands Avenue car park and to look at other measures to improve lighting / CCTV and how vehicle movements can be managed in an effort help prevent some of the criminal activity and ASB taking place.

The 9 Hole Golf Course at Twisted Stone is now open, no movement seen regarding the approved plans for the Club House.

The works in the Waitrose car park now seem to have been completed and the site cabin removed. Waitrose see an ongoing need to provide extra home deliveries in the future even when the current Coronavirus eases further. In response they have bought an extra 6 delivery vehicles and the work that took place in the delivery yard was to increase the warehouse loading area to service the extra vans.

Construction on the 2 new retail / residents sites in Pyrford next to the Village Bakery and in West Byfleet adjacent to Costa are progressing well, hopefully this will continue so they can be ready before Christmas.

Not much else to report at this time, that may be seen as a good thing!

**PYRFORD VR REPORT - 20 August 2020 (as at 16 August 2020)**

**A) PYRFORD STREET REPS**

Total monies received from members via Street Reps this year to date is £3,536 ( £205 of which is yet to be entered on the membership database) which represents 77% of the total collected in all of 2019. There are a few streets in Pyrford without a Street Rep, such as: Dean Close, Old Woking Road, Pyrian Way, Rowley Close and Orchard Lea.

**B) MARSHAL PARADE DEVELOPMENT SAGA**

Hooray even more progress! Building the external walls has increased a few feet after the RSJ's were finally installed and is now at the first storey level. (The garage block behind the parade was demolished in late December 2017 and work started in late March 2018 to prepare for foundations, progress is terribly slow. Work is forever starting and then stopping and seems to have stopped).  
Under the current circumstances, it is not clear when the units will be completed.

**C) TWISTED STONE FOOTPATH**

The landowner has installed a kissing gate and fencing at the Pyrford Road end of the Public Right of Way, opposite Lee Farm Cottages. The width is c 1.5m, which is legal, but it makes social distancing difficult. A note requesting "no cyclists" has also been erected.

**D) PYRFORD OPENING UP**

Life in the village has started to resume a sort of "new normal". All the shops in Marshal Parade are now open. Please do use them as much as possible.

**E) PYRFORD STORM**

Last Wednesday, a "tropical" storm covered Pyrford. As Gary Elson reports many trees came down and Serco has cleared many fallen trees. Recently, a resident brought to my attention that Teggs Lane has many fallen branches, some from dead trees. Serco are aware but have said it is SCC responsibility. VR is following up.

**F) PARKING AT JUNCTION OF OLD WOKING ROAD WITH LINCOLN DRIVE**

The planning application for 153 Old Woking Road has highlighted many concerns about parking close to this junction. A request for yellow lines at the junction has been suggested as part of the 2020 Woking Parking review.

**G) PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

These are covered in more detail both the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum report and RA Planning Report.

**H) VILLAGE EVENTS**

**POSTPONED** Dulux London Cycle Ride to 26<sup>th</sup> -27<sup>th</sup> September 2020

Coldharbour Road

Andrew Grimshaw  
Pyrford Village Rep

## The Resident 165 August 2020 West Byfleet Village Representative Report

### Street Representatives

Street Representatives are key to the success of the RA, we have a great team in West Byfleet. However, we still need to identify street reps for the top of Coldharbour Road, Claremont Road, Rivey Close and Madeira Road and related side roads. We also need better street rep coverage for blocks of apartments such as Globe, Magna, Wentworth, Tattenhall and Rosemount. Anyone one who is interested in giving a few hours back to the Community, should contact your Village Representative (see contact details on last page)

Covid  
The excellent volunteer efforts in West Byfleet have continued and even widened. Our appreciation goes to all who are helping their neighbours, if you need help or want to volunteer see <https://surreykind.org.uk/>

### Sheer House

The excellent news since the last magazine is that there has been tangible progress on the redevelopment of Sheer House. The Retirement Village Group (RVG), backed by AXA Insurance Group have taken over the site and are submitting detailed plans within the same overall planning consent as before for retirement apartments. They have shown an encouraging willingness to engage with the community. Although we have concerns about wind tunnel effect and lack of sunlight in the public square and the mass on the Old Woking Road, the plans were approved by WBC and we will have to make the most of it. With RVG being very happy to engage, we are hopeful of them achieving an attractive and welcoming public and retail space that will considerably add to the village. There will be a few years of disruption but I am sure we will all welcome the replacement of this dead albatross from around the neck of West Byfleet.

Once work on the site commences, some disturbance is inevitable but the contractors will keep to sociable hours and will make a contact available for any concerns or problems arising. In the near future, we have been advised, hoardings will be erected for the safety of the public and to help protect the site from vandalism. If anyone would like to report a problem to RVG, they can either call freephone 0800 061 4979 or email [info@sheerhouseredevelopment.co.uk](mailto:info@sheerhouseredevelopment.co.uk).

### Woodlands Car Park

A group of residents and RA officer met with Councillor Gary Elson and the local Police Commander, David Bentley, to discuss anti-social behaviour in and around the car park. The area will be more closely monitored and it is hoped we will see a tangible reduction in such behaviour.

### Community Gardening Group



The WB Community Garden Group have planted a fresh border outside the Library with the agreement of SCC staff. Although of short duration with the Sheer House redevelopment, this will help improve the street scene, aid the air quality and provide an example of community work in practice, many thanks to the participants particularly Katrina, Louisa and Rebecca

The WB Community Gardening Group planting on Birch Walk has also been generally successful with some dedicated volunteers ensuring watering takes place in the dry weather, well done to the Group and we look forward to more planting schemes around the village.

### **Broadoaks Development**

Irrespective of political views, many will remember Richard Wilson with fondness. One of Richard's achievements as Councillor was to get a commitment for a shared path on the Southside of Parvis Road together with a controlled crossing to the Recreation Ground as part of the Broadoaks Redevelopment Plan. He even used some of his Councillor funds to construct a shared path across the corner of the Rec, to avoid the Camphill Road/ Parvis Road junction, conceptually as part of the scheme. The Broadoaks' developer, Octagon, are meeting the commitment and building the path immediately adjacent to their premises and paying for the controlled crossing. The crossing has now been installed and is somewhat closer to Highfield Road than was initially feared but some adjustment to the Recreation Ground entrance will be needed to avoid congestion. With regard to the remainder of the stretch between Byfleet and Broadoaks, a petition has been raised to ask Surrey County Council to complete the commitment. See <https://petitions.surreycc.gov.uk/ParvisPathway/>

At the time of writing 164 people have signed the petition. The petition is open until 24<sup>th</sup> October and will be presented to the next Woking BC/ Surrey CC Joint Committee meeting in November.

See also the Active Travel Vision article on page xx.

### **Businesses**

The vast majority of businesses have now reopened in the village and it is good to see the pavement cafe society resurrected.

It is disappointing that we are now down to only one chemist in the village and that not being open on Saturdays. The RA, on the website, have provided a list of alternate pharmacies in the neighbourhood and those offering deliveries. RVG have said a new pharmacy will be one of their retail priorities when the redevelopment is completed.

Property Agents are reporting high levels of interest with many new properties coming on market and viewings taking place with PPE and distancing measures in place.

All residents are asked to remember we still have a thriving retail sector even with the Sheer House redevelopment and are asked to support their local shops.

Until next time

Your West Byfleet Village Representative Team

## PNF Report August 2020

Due to Coronavirus much of the activity has been in abeyance, but a recently a second Zoom Committee meeting was held.

Two Newsletters were issued in June 2020 and are available at <https://pyrfordforum.org/news-letter-archive/>

### CONSERVATION

Following the launch of the Conservation Noticeboard, the video team has decided to sojourn Pyrford Portraits and produce a video about conservation activities around Pyrford. Various interviews have been undertaken and it is hoped short trailers might be available towards the end of August.

If anyone has items that PNF could include please contact PNF by email at [info@pyrfordforum.org](mailto:info@pyrfordforum.org)

### SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

Covid-19 has also impacted Woking Borough Council development plans and the final report from the Examination in Public is still awaited. There is no definitive news.

### RE-DESIGNATION OF FORUM

Under the Localism Act 2011, the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum (PNF) existence is unfortunately time limited. The approved Neighbourhood Plan is still valid until 2027, but a representative group for the Pyrford Area needs to be re-designated every 5 years.

The PNF Committee has decided to seek re-designation of the Pyrford Forum for the existing Pyrford Neighbourhood Area. Work has been continuing behind the scenes and draft paperwork has been sent to Woking Borough Council for review.

### HERITAGE CONSERVATION ASSESSMENT

Work continues on the assessment.

A DVD, produced by Tim Matthews and Cliff Bolton, on Pyrford's heritage sites and the importance of heritage conservation was shown at the AGM. It was well received and copies available on the night were all sold. Fundraising for the £13,000 cost has generated c£11,500 so there is a shortfall of £1,500. So far £200 has been raised.

An intended visit to Surrey History Centre in July had to be postponed but the Centre is now open, and it is hoped to rearrange. Comments by PNF on the draft document have been returned to the consultants. Feedback from consultants is awaited.

### SHEER HOUSE

The PNF Committee, at its last video Committee meeting, expressed concern about how Pyrford residents would be clearly represented during the next phase of Sheer House. The proposed Sheer House Task Group did not include an elected member of the PNF Committee, nor a member of the RA Pyrford Village team. Whilst there are WBC Councillors, two from Pyrford Ward, all three are currently on the WBC Planning Committee.

### SIGNIFICANT PYRFORD PLANNING APPLICATIONS

At the last PNF video Committee, there was also some discussion around monitoring planning applications.

Since its plan was approved, PNF has routinely monitored planning applications to ensure its policies are not likely to be breached and on rare occasions, when PNF felt it was necessary, PNF has lodged comments.

The Committee felt that this area needed some clarification as to the exact responsibility between RA & PNF.

There have been no significant applications validated or decided since the last report. The following are still under consideration:-

**153 Old Woking Road**

Demolition of bungalow & erection of three storey 5 (previously 7) apartment block. Vehicular access off Lincoln Drive.

Two consultees, Surrey Highways and Woking Trees have raised concerns. A revised plan for 5 flats has now been accepted by the Planning Officer and the 78 objectors to the previous plan notified. So far 21 objections have been received.

**Twisted Stone Golf Club Pyrford Road**

Temporary consent is sought for a period of 12 months for use of part of existing car park as a greenkeepers maintenance compound and siting of storage containers (retrospective)

**Wisley Golf Club Wisley Lane**

Engineering operations to The Garden Course to include replacement drainage and irrigation system, relocation of 5th and 8th tee boxes and re-profiling of section of the bank at the River Wey along with works to the bunkers to improve drainage and playability.

**Pyrford Place, Pyrford Road**

Erection of two storey boathouse following demolition of existing boathouse, refurbishment of existing footbridge and erection of single storey storage building and associated works" has been sought.

**Mark House Aviary Road**

Erection of a part single and part two storey rear extension following the demolition of existing rear conservatory. Alterations to the main roof to include a rear dormer and 2no. rooflights to the rear and 3no. rooflights to the front to facilitate the conversion of the loft into habitable accommodation.

**1 Lady Place Cottages Church Hill**

Erection of a two-storey rear extension

**Church Farm House Church Hill**

Listed Building Consent for the proposed replacement conservatory, internal alterations and modification to existing paving/footpaths.

Andy Grimshaw  
PNF Chair