

BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET & PYRFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

Minutes of the Committee Meeting held via Zoom at 19:00 on Wednesday, 16 September 2020

Present:

Stewart Dick (SD) – Chair
Lynette Davies (LD) – Secretary
Andy Grimshaw (AG) – Pyrford Village Representative
& Chair Pyrford NF
Isabelle David (ID) – Membership Secretary
Robert Munford (RM) – Editor (until 20:00)

Eleanor Grady (EMG) – B VR
Keith Creswell (KC) – WB VR
Wade Pollard (WP) – WB Forum
Gary Elson (Cllr GE) – Cllr
Graham Chrystie (Cllr GC) – Cllr

Quorum: 8 members - the meeting was quorate.

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

1. Welcome & Apologies for absence

SD welcomed everyone to this fourth virtual meeting.

Apologies had been received from Penny Hoskyn, Dharma Sivarajasingham and Cllr Mary Bridgeman.

2. Minutes of the Meeting on 20 August 2020

The minutes were reviewed.

AG noted that he had cancelled the hall booking for the October drop in session which would no longer be taking place.

With this correction, the minutes of the meeting held on 20 August 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:

- **White Paper Consultation** – housing numbers were of note as research had been carried out which indicated that over the past 3 years Woking had exceeded its housing targets. The situation prior to that when targets may not have been met had not been covered.

SD noted the work he and (mostly) Roland Nevitt (WBNF member) had carried out on the response to the consultation. AG thought that it would be useful if the PNF could see this work either to better prepare their own responses or to work on a joint response. WP agreed to ask Roland if his work could be shared.

ACTION WP

Once WBNF discussions had taken place, a decision would be taken as to whether the RA would prepare its own response, support that of the WBNF or both.

EG offered to pass on the information to Byfleet N. SD noted that he had already shared with BRNF the research he had done.

- **SADPD** – Inspector's Report to be published 18 September 2020 followed by an 8 week consultation period. SD, WP and Cllr GC would be meeting the same day to discuss the report focussing on GB10. It was decided that it was too early in the process to include anything in the newsletter.
- **WB Centre Development** – the Liaison Group comprising representatives of WBNF, WBBA, RA and Councillors had been set up. A meeting was scheduled for Monday, 21 September 2020 to agree terms of reference.

Demolition application had been submitted to WBC with a start date of 29 October 2020 together with a proposal to vary conditions of the outline planning permission. Details circulated via social media

- **Unitary Authority** – SCC seem determined to continue with their proposals. Change is likely but what form it might take is yet to be seen.

- **Delegated Planning Rule changes** – Cllr GC was thanked for the very informative article he had written for the RA Newsletter.
- **Pyrford Place boat house** – planning application had been turned down
- **153 Old Woking Road** – had been called in by both Cllr GC and Cllr GE. RA had objected on a number of counts.
- **20 Tanglewood Close** – permitted
- **9 Old Woking Road** – this had gone to appeal with the Secretary of State because of non-determination of the planning application. It was noted that the RA had objected to the original application which had been withdrawn but had supported the subsequent application. SD and WP considered this application to be proposing a building broadly in keeping with the adjacent structures and might have been a useful reference for the Sheer House development. SD/WP would discuss this with Cllr GC.

5. West Byfleet Village Centre Redevelopment Liaison Group

As reported the first meeting would be held on Monday, 21 September 2020. There was uncertainty as to whether a representative from Keeble Brown would attend on this occasion.

AG noted that he had emailed WBC about the demolition and the status of the library which currently remained closed due to storm damage. SCC have indicated that there are no plans for the library to reopen prior to the demolition and there had been no mention of relocation.

There was concern that, although the developers had expressed a wish to provide a temporary space for the library if at all possible, the final decision was for SCC. Losing a library for the expected 3-year build period would be unwelcome. This would be discussed at the Liaison Group meeting and taken up with Cllr Boote, as a SCC councillor.

ID would prepare an email about the liaison group to go out to all members.

Subsequent to this meeting SD has had discussions with Keeble Brown and subject to certain agreements it is hoped that a temporary location will be possible.

6. Treasurer's Report

The Statement of Affairs report covering the period 1 January to 16 September 2020 had been circulated before the meeting. DS had been unable to attend the meeting and there was nothing further to report. There was little change in the figures since the last meeting.

7. Membership Secretary's Report

The report and data which had been circulated before the meeting was noted.

There had been little movement in numbers in the month.

8. Editorial (taken early after item 4)

The Resident 165

RM reported that the draft newsletter would be ready for final review by the full committee shortly. It ran to 20 pages and the focus was on the Three Villages – open for business.

It was noted that this was a newsletter and not a magazine and should be referred to as this from now on.

ID had circulated a draft of the leaflet sponsored by Octagon which would be delivered to all houses in the three villages on 28/29 September 2020. Comments to go to her as soon as possible.

Newsletter to be published on website 27/28 September 2020 so that it was available when the leaflet dropped through letterboxes.

As with the last online issue of the newsletter a number of copies would be printed for the archives.

RM was thanked for all his hard work on this issue.

The Resident 166 – Spring 2021

KC was asked to report on the research he had carried out with the street reps with regards to the willingness to attend a drop in, deliver newsletters and collect subscriptions. This had revealed that 90+% would be willing to deliver but were less keen to collect subscriptions on the doorstep or to attend a drop in.

AG noted he had received the same comments for Pyrford.

Subscriptions would, therefore, need to be electronic and comms (what is this?) to this effect would be needed. AG

noted that subscription envelopes could be made available for those who were unable to pay online.

Thought would be given to delaying the newsletter distribution from February to March/April in 2021 to take advantage of better weather.

AG noted that action would need to be taken to avoid the automatic removal of members from the database. Members were automatically removed after 2 years of non-payment. As the usual doorstep collections had not been possible this year it seemed sensible to see if this removal activity could be changed to 3 years or a temporary suspension be applied. ID would talk to Alan Fuller about how easy it would be to make this change.

ACTION ID

Note that the removal of members from the database was in the constitution. A rewrite of the constitution was in hand and this might need to be included.

Whilst there were no plans to have a leaflet for every issue of the newsletter ID would be considering approaching other sponsors ie RVG.

It would be good to track activity on the website and Anita Flavell would be asked to supply data as she did on a monthly basis.

ACTION LD

Advertising

ID reported that 2 longstanding advertisers had been lost – Kumon, due to retirement and A Grout Gardening who had provided no reason. ID would be looking for more – there were a number of new businesses particularly in Byfleet.

ID had also been asked by some existing advertisers whether a reduced rate would be offered due to publication going online leading to a reduction in cost. ID was in discussions with DS. However, as KC pointed out going online to the whole community not just members potentially broadened the reach. However, a small reduction might be a good gesture in what were difficult times for some businesses.

EG thought that the reduced rate should be offered to all advertisers not just to those who asked. This was supported by all. ID will discuss further with DS.

ACTION ID/DS

The final decision on the above matters was delegated to ID and DS,

9. Review of Planning Applications - responsibilities

A paper prepared by SD had been circulated and was discussed.

The paper sought to clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of the Residents' Association and the Neighbourhood Forums as regards Planning Applications and Planning Policies in the Three Villages.

The RA had worked very successfully alongside the NFs as far as planning was concerned but recent events had led to the need for a review and clarification of responsibilities.

The paper looked at the background to the issue, how planning had been handled in the past, the role of the RA, the roles of the NFs and outlined a proposal for the future.

Historically, the RA had kept a watchful eye on all things planning at both individual and community level, monitoring planning applications and offering advice and support to residents on request. This included objecting to applications if considered appropriate and on occasions presenting before the Planning Committee.

Following government initiatives West Byfleet and Pyrford NFs now have adopted Plans with Byfleet still to be finalised. NFs therefore have a specific statutory remit and responsibility for planning matters in their Plan area

It seemed that some in the community expected the RA to deal with planning. Cllr GC reported that a constituent who had consulted him on a planning issue had commented that with no planning officer in place, she could not ask the RA for advice. She did not seem to be aware of the PNF's role in planning. NFs have planning officers. SD noted that the councillor could have referred her to him as he was acting planning officer.

SD requested Cllr GC to provide him with the contact details of his constituent and he would discuss the matter with her.

ACTION Cllr GC

AG, as Chair of PNF, made clear that PNF had sub contracted planning responsibility to the RA and asserted that this had been agreed by the RA. However, no written evidence had been found that the RA had agreed to this. Whether or not there had been discussions back in 2016 (before the appointment of the current RA Chair) was difficult to ascertain and although the subject had been broached in 2018 there was no evidence that anything had been taken forward or agreed.

The report made clear the view that the NFs were primarily responsible for planning issues within their areas. The RA would however continue to be involved as set out in the Paper This view was supported by WP, Chair of WBNF and by KC.

WP, as Chair of WBNF, commented that planning expertise was moving into the NFs and WBNF had developed a good knowledge base.

KC was keen to see the RA focus on community spaces and public at large rather than individual issues.

EG noted that it had been common practice for RA to deal with planning but now NFs had matured into their roles. It was time to move on.

The proposal was that the RA would work alongside the NFs providing support as appropriate. It would also monitor planning issues affecting the wider community as it had done over the proposed pub development on WB recreation ground and now Sheer House.

SD asked everyone to let him have their comments on the document and the proposal put forward.

10. Website

No reports had been received this month. LD to request from Anita (as above)

ACTION LD

11. Councillors' Reports

Cllr GE had not sent in a report as everything had been covered by KC's WBVR.

Cllr GC also had nothing further to add to comments already made

12. Village Representative Reports

West Byfleet – KC had circulated a comprehensive reports

- The petition to complete the cycling/walking path along the Parvis Road between Byfleet and Broadoaks now had 237 signatures

Pyrford - AG had submitted a report and had no further comments to make.

Byfleet – EMG reported the following

- Library had opened – see website for details
- Byfleet Care were now offering transport again (Covid secure)
- Jane Bond had reported that the Manor House was offering afternoon high teas
- Byfleet Amenities Group had been working on the broken lights on the village green
- Some new shops which could be approached about advertising in the newsletter

Pyrford NF – AG had submitted a report.

- Re-designation of the PNF was underway with Council sending letters to all residents informing them of the 8 week consultation period ending 23 November 2020
- A number of planning applications were being monitored
- Mark House had now been called in by Cllr GC

13. AOB

ID noted that another meeting with Commander Bentley had been organised to talk about Woodlands car park and look at improvements which could be made to the physical environment to discourage disruptive behaviour. WBC were responsible for the car park. Police patrols had been increased.

AG asked if the report on anti-social behaviour in Pyrford had been released. Cllr GE confirmed this was still awaited. The same officers were responsible for the two villages.

Drop in dates: pending decision on format of next newsletter

Meeting closed at 20:48

Date of the next meeting – Wednesday, 21 October 2020

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

2020

2021
20 January

18 November
December – no meeting

17 February
17 March
21 April
19 May
16 June
21 July
August – no meeting

TREASURER'S REPORT
16th of September 2020

The following Statement of Financial Affairs is for the period from 1st of January 2020 to 16th of September 2020.

July update on financials

Our year to date subscription collection £8,034 (Aug £7,599) pounds and all the cash collected during Covid-19 is now banked. We have invoiced £1,180 to date for advertising and collected £1,030. Our total cash reserves remain healthy at £27,432. This is before paying Forum grants and other printing costs as previously explained. For the current year we have a deficit of £158 (Aug £699). We expect to close the year with a small deficit or break even. Invoice raised for Alan Greenwood in March (£150) continuing to remain unpaid. Isabelle has now reconnected with the company after previous contact past away. We expect to receive cash later this month.

We still expect to pay the annual grants to the Neighbourhood Forums soon. We are still waiting for Pyrford to agree a way forward. We will deduct £500 from West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum as previously highlighted.

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 take longer.

Dharma Sivarajasingham
Hon. Treasurer
16/09/2020

Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford Residents Association

to 16 September 2020

INCOME	Year to date	£
Subscriptions and member donations:		
Byfleet	1,079	
West Byfleet	3,164	
Pyrford	3,536	
Subscriptions not allocated	255	
2019 paid in 2018	-	
2020 paid in 2019 or to be allocated	-	
		<hr/>
		8,034
Advertising (includes receipts from 2019 invoices)		1,260
Bank Interest		32
Donations		-
Other		-
		<hr/>
Total Income		<u>9,326</u>
 EXPENDITURE		
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		1,265
Mileage/Parking		-
Forums - Pyrford	0	
- Byfleet	0	
- West Byfleet	0	
		<hr/>
		0
		<hr/>
Total Expenditure		<u>9,484</u>
Surplus/(Deficit)		<u>(£158)</u>
 Opening Cash		£27,589
Surplus/(Deficit)		(£158)
Closing Cash		<u>£27,432</u>
 Analysis of Cash		
	Current Account	5,016
	Un allocated Collections Accounts + 2020 subs not allocated	255
	Overnight Deposit	7,008
	32Day deposit	15,158
		<hr/>
		<u>£27,437</u>

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

MEMBERSHIP REPORT SEPTEMBER 2020 (16 SEPTEMBER 2020)

KEY POINTS 2020 YEAR

Membership subscriptions of **£7764** have been entered into the membership database and subscriptions of **£XXX** have been banked but have yet to be entered and attributed to individual household members. In total £ of membership subscriptions have been received this year.

	Cash held by VRs	Banked not entered	In Membership Database	Totals
		£	£	£
Byfleet			1084	
West Byfleet			3144	
Pyrford			3536	
TOTAL			7764	

Email addresses:

The number of email addresses is **50.8% of total membership**, having grown from 35% at December 2018.

MEMBERSHIP DETAIL 2020 YEAR

As at 16 September 2020 the membership was. The numbers by village are shown below: -

Village	Dec-19	Mar-20	Apr-20	May-20	Jun-20	Jul-20	Aug-20	Sept-20	Month Change
Byfleet	576	548	548	INFORMATION NOT PROVIDED	547	547	547	547	0
West Byfleet	793	764	768		778	779	780	778	-2
Pyrford	1,089	1,018	1,029		1032	1035	1036	1037	+1
Other	11	12	14		15	13	13	11	0
	2,469	2,342	2359		2372	2374	2376	2377	+1
Movement	(381)	6	17		13	2	2	1	

The amounts collected and entered on the database by village are:-

Village	Dec-19	Mar-20	Apr-20	May-20	June-20	Jul-20	Aug-20	Sept-20	Month Change
Byfleet	2,740	100	263	INFORMATION NOT PROVIDED	504	963	963	1084	+121
West Byfleet	4,822	30	1,337		2,254	2854	2854	3144	+290
Pyrford	4,598	306	306		3,186	3331	3331	3536	+205
	12,160	426	1,906		5944	7148	7148	7764	616

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AND THE INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF
BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET AND PYRFORD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION ("RA")**

AND

**PYRFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM ("PNF")
WEST BYFLEET NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM ("WBNF")
BYFLEET RESIDENTS' NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM ("BRNF")**

IN REGARD TO

THE REVIEW OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CONTENTS

1. Preamble.....	3
2. Issue.....	3
3. Background to Forums.....	4
4. Background to the Residents' Association.....	5
5. Was any protocol ever agreed.....	6
6. Planning Applications - the Role of the Forum.....	7
7. The current procedure of the RA.....	9
8. Conclusion.....	10

1. PREAMBLE

The sole purpose of this paper is to seek to clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of the Residents' Association and the Neighbourhood Forums as regards Planning Applications and Planning Policies in the Three Villages. A degree of overlap is inevitable and I regard that as a positive given the desire of all four groups to work closely together.

Since October 2019 I have been the recipient, directly or copied, (and indeed author) of endless emails on the above subject. Many have surprised me. However what is not in doubt is that there is some apparent confusion and a lack of acceptance as to what, if anything, was ever agreed regarding planning responsibility both before Forums had Plans adopted and post adoption. Clearly prior to the formation of Forums there was clarity.

BRNF are in a different position as they have yet to complete their Plan.

What I believe is not in dispute is that while there is a lack of documented principles, there is a consensus that the current procedures have worked with unquestioned efficiency and attention to detail and have served the Three Villages well.

2. ISSUE

"As you know, I have been trying to get to the bottom of the relationship in respect of Planning, both Planning Applications & Planning Policy, between Forums & the RA roles since I became Chair of PNF." Andy Grimshaw, Friday 31st July 2020.

3. NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS

The Coalition Government in May 2010 announced that "the time has come to disperse power more widely

in Britain today." The then Minister of State for Decentralisation had some years before written a book called *Total Politics* in which he argued for a huge shift in power from central Whitehall to communities and individuals. And so the Localism Act reached the statute book which in due course gave life to Neighbourhood Forums.

This background should be remembered. Neighbourhood Forums are a creation of Parliament. They owe their existence to:

- > The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
- > The Localism Act 2011
- > The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Statutory Instrument
- > National Planning Policy Framework
- > National Planning Policy Guidelines.

A Neighbourhood Plan must accord with the Local Plan and National Policies. The fundamental objective is a presumption in favour of sustainable development to meet the economic, social and environmental needs of the Plan Area.

So the purpose of Neighbourhood Forums and their aims and objectives are as described by statute and are as set out in their adopted Plans.

As written these Neighbourhood Plans are about planning issues to protect the distinctive residential, environmental and, if appropriate, commercial character of the respective Plan Areas.

4. BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET AND PYRFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

The RA was formed in 1928. It is a local community group open to local residents (homeowners and tenants) and businesses operating in the Three Villages. It aspires to represent the interests of everyone living in its area and/or contributing to the local economy. It strives to ensure that the Three Villages remain attractive, prosperous, environmentally sustainable, safe and socially welcoming places in which to live.

The RA very simply owes its existences to the wishes and the continuing support of its residents. Its mandate is effectively its Constitution. Its current Constitution was approved in March 2018 primarily to reflect committee restructuring to create inclusiveness and working harmony with the Neighbourhood Forums.

Forum Chairs were invited to join the RA Committee to ensure openness and awareness. A new Constitution is currently being drafted for consideration by the RA Committee. That however will not impact on this paper. Over the years the RA has been an important part of Community life and issues. In addition to the support from our members and the vital contribution from our Street Representatives, we enjoy the respect of our Councillors and our Member of Parliament.

Given its longevity and the many issues that over the years we have campaigned for, it is not surprising that the RA has a detailed and intimate understanding of the Three Village Community and is held in high regard.

5. WAS THERE AN AGREED PROTOCOL?

In any community planning applications can be a controversial and emotive issue.

Prior to the establishment of Neighbourhood Forums it is self evident that the RA had sole responsibility for reviewing all Planning Applications and deciding on a course of action. A decision would be reached on advice from the RA Planning Coordinator and after consultation with ward Councillor and other committee members.

After the creation of the Forums though before the adoption of their Neighbourhood Plans their views would also be sought.

Over a number of years (commencing in 2015 and ceasing in early 2018) it would appear that conversations took place on the subject matter of the relationship between the Forums and the RA regarding the responsibility for the review of planning applications.

I have received various versions of what individuals believe was agreed and several quite dogmatic emails. Suffice it to say that no agreement was ever minuted and I therefore remain resolute in my decision that as there is and never was any written approved record there was no agreement. Individual recollections are interesting but contradictory.

Two matters are clear:

- (i) In the Resident Newsletter issue 152 (Spring 2016) the then Planning Coordinator wrote "RA and Neighbourhood Forums Roles in Planning - we have agreed with the 3 forums that the focus of the RA should be on more immediate near term planning matters with the forums concentrating on longer term planning policy for each individual village. We will of course continue to work closely on all planning matters".
Clearly as no such agreement existed this should not have been published. However it was published in the RA's official newsletter thus our members would assume it to be accurate. Regrettable. However as this was written prior to Plans being adopted it is not particularly relevant today.
- (ii) The Committee structure of the RA was changed to include representatives from the Forums to ensure consolidated focus, common purpose and harmony. This has worked exceptionally well and ensured that the Forums have an important voice at the RA Committee Meetings.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS - THE ROLE OF THE FORUM

The Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum had its Plan adopted in December 2016.

The West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum had its Plan adopted in October 2017.

The Byfleet Residents' Neighbourhood Forum is still preparing its Plan.

Once Neighbourhood Forums had their Plans adopted they, in theory at least, assumed greater day to day responsibility for reviewing planning applications and proposals.

(i) The thinking and purpose behind the creation of Neighbourhood Forums and writing their Plan:

"Instead of local people being told what to do, the Government thinks that local communities should have genuine opportunities to influence the future of the places where they live. The Localism Act introduces a new right for communities to draw up a neighbourhood plan.

Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area. Neighbourhood planning provides a powerful set of tools for local people to influence the types of development to meet their community's needs and where the ambition of the neighbourhood is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area.

Neighbourhood planning enables communities to play a much stronger role in shaping the areas in which they live and work and in supporting new development proposals. This is because neighbourhood plans forms part of the development plan and sit alongside the [local plan](#) prepared by the local planning authority. Decisions on planning applications will be made using both the local plan and the neighbourhood plan, and any other material considerations.

Neighbourhood planning provides the opportunity for communities to set out a positive vision for how they want their community to develop over the next 10, 15, 20 years in ways that meet identified local need and make sense for local people. They can help put in place planning policies that will help deliver that vision or grant planning permission for the development they want to see.

A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications." That was the intention.

Within the context of the above it is an obligation of a Neighbourhood Forum to promote and defend the integrity of its Plan when considering planning applications in its designated area.

(ii) Neighbourhood Forum Plans - Policies to maintain the character of the Plan Area

For this section I shall extract from the PNF Plan.

"To maintain the character of the area, all new developments should (inter alia):

- be designed to a high quality
- ensure that the specific context of the site and the wider character of the street scene are fully taken into account in relation to scale, appearance and materials
- seek to maintain reasonable residential privacy and the character of the area
- provide sufficient off-street parking but not at the expense of removing boundary treatment which is important to the character and appearance of the Area and not result in on-road parking to the detriment of highway safety or adverse impact on the character of the Area
- a subdivision of an existing property should preserve the external character of the building
- respect established building lines and arrangements of front gardens, walls, railings or hedges, where such features are important to the character and appearance of the area
- respect established plot widths within streets where development is proposed, particularly where they establish a rhythm to the architecture in a street
- respect the separation between buildings, and between buildings and the site boundaries, in relation to likely impact on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties
- respect local character and appearance, with particular regard to using landscape to ensure that developments blend into, and do not appear incongruous with, their surroundings."

•
It would therefore appear appropriate that with any individual planning application the Pырford Neighbourhood Forum (or other Forum with reference to the content of its Plan) should focus on the above and other policies and respond accordingly.

It is a responsibility of a Forum to use its best endeavours to ensure that the Policies enshrined within its Plan are, in the absence of material considerations dictating to the contrary, upheld.

7. CURRENT APPROACH OF THE RA

Since March 2018 the approach of the RA has been as follows.

The Planning Co-coordinator presents his Planning Report (it previously having been circulated) at Committee Meetings.

- The Planning Report is discussed
- The relevant Village Representative will express their views
- Councillors where appropriate will advise
- Impacted neighbours may have written expressing concerns
- Most importantly the relevant Forum representative will advise on whether or not applications are in compliance with their Plan
- The Forum representative will indicate whether or nor the Forum intends to object and if so on what grounds
- A decision is then reached on whether or not the RA will object.

This common sense, collegiate and effective approach has worked well and has I believe served the Three Villages efficiently. It is clear and unambiguous.

Particular attention is paid to large developments (if residential over five houses), applications likely to be controversial, retrospective applications and those that might be considered as potentially creating an unwelcome precedent.

8. CONCLUSION

So addressing paragraph 2 "ISSUE", it is not exactly the "West Lothian" question.

The fundamental principle must be that the RA and the Forums do and are seen to work together.

Post the adoption of Neighbourhood Plans it is clear that Forums should assume certain of the Planning

responsibilities previously the sole domain of the RA.

FORUMS (PNF and WBNF)

- > it is an obligation of a Neighbourhood Forum to promote and defend the integrity of its Plan when considering planning issues in its designated area.
- > It is a responsibility of a Forum to use its best endeavours to ensure that the Policies enshrined within its Plan are, in the absence of material considerations dictating to the contrary, upheld.

That should be a primary role of a Neighbourhood Forum. It is why they were created.

RA

The RA will continue with its role as stated in paragraph 7 above. This may result in a degree of overlap but it is difficult to imagine how that would be an issue given the structure of the RA Committee and thus the involvement of the Forums.

The RA would anticipate supporting a Forum in defending its Plans.

The RA is of course conscious of its wider responsibility to the overall Community and it is possible that circumstances may result in the decision by one Forum being to the possible detriment of another Forum in which case the RA must decide on its position for the greater good of the overall Community.

In certain matters impacting on all three Forums it may be efficient and effective for the RA to coordinate a response.

BRNF

Until such times as BRNF have their Plan adopted the RA will continue to lead on Planning Applications working alongside the Chair of BRNF and their Village Representative.

REF/SJCD/Residents Association/Forum relationship/Planning/September 2020.

Village Representative Report West Byfleet For Committee and Street Reps

Admin

Not too much to report this month as still shielding.

Membership subs continue to come in via direct bank transfers. The Treasurer and Membership Secretary will provide details.

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. With the massive increase in apartment accommodation in West Byfleet now and in the future, it is important we increase and improve our representation of members from this type of property. Any potential volunteer contact addresses would be welcome.

Local issues

Work with WB Neighbourhood Forum (WBNF) continues to be excellent and although many issues are necessarily parked at the moment. Much of the following also heavily involves WBNF.

Sheer House. A WB Village Centre Liaison Group has been created; further details are given elsewhere in the WBNF report.

Broadoaks development is continuing and work on road widening and the shared cycle/pedestrian path has been completed, we are still pursuing the idea of making the Rec entrance and the "Richard Wilson" shared path across the Rec more convenient to the controlled crossing to prevent unnecessary congestion.

A245. The remainder of the path stretching between Byfleet and West Byfleet is still not approved despite the commitment dating from 2006 (see <https://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/Data/Woking Local Committee/20061102/Agenda/Item 10 -Broadoaks development.pdf>). We have raised an online petition (12th June) and it went public on 25th June . At the time of writing it has attracted 230 signatures. This is being supported by WBNF, Byfleet Forum and Amanda Boote. The petition will cause the matter to be reviewed explicitly by the Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council Joint Committee at the next meeting on 11th November.

The WB Infant and Junior Schools have reopened with lots of COVID precautions. Parents are collecting Junior children from the School Gate in the Rec which prevents unnecessary crowding but it does throw up the need for a reasonable path to access the road. This would fit in with the proposed perimeter path and landscaping on the Local Community Infrastructure 123 list with WBNF.

More Widely

The Government has voted extra funds to support active travel schemes (walking, cycling etc) during the pandemic, SCC had asked County Councillors to respond and a claim of £1.7m has been made by SCC to HM Gov. The initial suggestion re closure of Camphill Road tunnel to motor vehicles has been withdrawn after pressure from the local population. We are awaiting to see if more constructive projects have been agreed. We are still waiting to hear the outcome. No doubt Amanda will report further. The Active Travel Vision statement has been agreed and published on our website.

The WB Community Gardening Group

Louisa reports as follows:

Our plans are; planting at the station - guerilla gardening and seed bombing! Drop seeds not bombs!

Maintaining Birch Green. Weeding around the hedge saplings. Planting saplings. This is something anyone is welcome to do, anytime. We have saplings ready to plant so just contact if they want to get hold of some and we have an idea and permission already of where to plant them.

Just bring own tools and do it independently.

Also a call for people to water the hedge saplings and the saplings in the middle of Birch Green - look out for the West Byfleet Community Gardening wooden placards if you're unsure of where the saplings are.

Any small group events will comply with Covid Guidelines and social distancing. We are an outdoor group exercising together for our mental health and wellbeing.

Event dates are soon to be added to our Facebook page: just search West Byfleet Community Gardening Group and request to be a member. Meet like minded people who want to make West Byfleet more friendly for people and pollinators!

If people want to contact the group directly email Loubergman@hotmail.com

Other

The following open issues are recorded here for continuity but have had no little apparent movement since last report.

- 1 Woking BC outline planning proposals for districts (SADPD)
- 2 WBC Cycling and Walking Strategy, this was published quietly in March. It is a poor document no reference to the east of the borough except for WB Station being one end of a safe cycling route for Sheerwater (the other end being Woking Town Centre) Active Travel strategy will be discussed at the next Joint Committee meeting of SCC and WBC on November 11th.
- 3 WBNF Community Infrastructure Levy (see WBNF report)
- 4 The West Byfleet Community Festival (West Byfleet Live) (although a date for 2021 has now been published)
- 5 Youth project
- 6 Highways England Walking and Cycling strategy for areas impacted by the M25 J10 proposals.
- 7 Highways England J10 proposals impact on Painshill junction from traffic congestion and non-motorised user perspectives.
- 8 The traffic pollution monitoring from the Parvis Road positioning of detectors at relevant places is still outstanding.
- 9 Camphill Tip uses (Council and BUC elements). Mary Bridgeman raised this at the Climate Change committee of WBC, It gained some support and Deputy Chief Exec Spinks will investigate further and report back. We are waiting to hear.

Businesses:

Note Sheer House report above.

It seems The Pantry, London House Restaurant and Camouflage Wine bar (all the same owners) are all up for sale. Properties are coming to market and property sales continue at pace. Far more activity in West Byfleet particular the Coffee bars and cafes. Thanks to Gary Elson Chair WBBA for their contribution.

We also continue to be grateful for the engagement and support from our local councillors.

Keith Creswell
14/09/2020

PYRFORD VR REPORT - 16 September 2020 (as of 14 September 2020)

A) PYRFORD STREET REPS

Total monies received from members via Street Reps this year to date is £3,576 (£40 of which is yet to be entered on the membership database) which represents 78% of the total collected in all of 2019. The only amount known to come is £250 which would mean 83% of 2019 monies would be collected.

There are a few streets in Pyrford without a Street Rep, such as: Dean Close, Pine Tree Hill, Belmore Avenue, Old Woking Road, Pyrian Way, Rowley Close and Orchard Lea.

Since the last report, unfortunately one Street Rep, after many years of volunteering, has decided to step down.

B) MARSHAL PARADE DEVELOPMENT SAGA

Under the current circumstances, it is not clear when the units will be completed.

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, which has the ward Surrey County Councillor support.

G) PLANNING APPLICATIONS

These are covered in more detail both the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum report and RA Planning Report. The larger boathouse at Pyrford Place has been refused.

153 Old Woking road is expected to go to the Planning Committee on 29th September 2020 meeting with a recommendation to approve.

H) VILLAGE EVENTS

POSTPONED

Dulux London Cycle Ride to 26th -27th September 2020

Coldharbour Road

Andrew Grimshaw
Pyrford Village Representative