

BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET & PYRFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

**Minutes of the Committee Meeting held via Zoom
at 19:00 on Wednesday, 21 October 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)
Dharma Sivarajasingham (DS) – Treasurer

Eleanor Grady (EMG) – B VR
Keith Creswell (KC) – WB VR
Penny Hoskyn (PH) – WB Forum
Wade Pollard (WP) – WB Forum
Gary Elson (Cllr GE) – Cllr
Graham Chrystie (Cllr GC) – Cllr
Mary Bridgeman (Cllr MB) – Cllr

Quorum: 8 members - the meeting was quorate.

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

1. Welcome & Apologies for absence

SD welcomed everyone to this fifth virtual meeting.

Apologies had been received from John Bond.

2. Minutes of the Meeting on 16 September 2020

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 September 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** – the work on the consultation responses carried out by Roland Nevitt for WBNF (with input from SD and WP) was now almost complete and would be submitted.

Woking BC would be responding and making a submission

SD reported comments made by Cllr Barker at a council meeting that CIL would be collected and remitted to the Government; that it would not be available to local Councils for infrastructure spending and that Neighbourhood Forums would have their powers curtailed and would lose their local CIL were noted. SD, having revisited the white paper considered these comments to be incorrect. SD had discussed the matter with Jonathan Lord who was also of the view that Cllr Barker was misinformed.

- **SADPD** – now in 8 week consultation period. Both West Byfleet and Byfleet NFs were raising public awareness and a petition which now had over 1,400 signatures had been launched. This meant that the council would be obliged to note and debate the petition. There would be an opportunity for someone to speak at the council meeting on 3 December 2020 (failing that the following scheduled for 11 February 2021).

KC was concerned about the proposals for Camphill Tip (AG wished to record a conflict of interest as he was a Trustee of BUC)

Anyone responding should include comments about both West Hall and Camphill. Representations can only be made on the Modifications themselves not any unmodified statements, which the Inspector has allowed through.

SB, ID, EG and KC had all joined online zoom Q&A sessions organised by WBC. A lot of information had been given and concern voiced by participants about services and infrastructure.

Cllr GC noted that although it seemed the West Hall site would be released for housing, there was some way to go before it was developed. The site was not without difficulties for development given the travellers pitches, highways issues, traffic loading etc.

SD was mindful of Pyrford's position vis-à-vis the SADPD and would write a balanced submission, on behalf of the RA which would emphasise the fact that there was no need to build on green belt.

AG asked why the statement re the SADPD posted on the RA website had only been sent to WB and Byfleet residents. This had been an oversight which would be rectified and the statement would now be emailed to Pyrford residents.

Action ID – email RA statement on SADPD to Pyrford residents

A number of comments on the statement had been posted. Two were taken down as they were considered potentially damaging.

- **WB Centre Development** – the Liaison Group was meeting fortnightly with representatives of RVG/contractor present as follows:

26/10 – Transport consultant

9/11 – Architect

23/11 – Public realm landscape designer

7/12 – Demolition contractor

A demolition contractor was still to be appointed with construction not expected to start until end 2021. RVG had indicated that demolition would start 29 October 2020 but this now seemed unlikely with stripping out planned for June 2021.

Amendments to the planning permission had not yet been seen despite RVG promises to supply them along with a model.

Rumours that the height of the development would be increased were believed to be incorrect (Cllr GC) despite talk of an extra floor. There was a suggestion that the deadline for comments on the amendment to planning should be extended beyond 25 October. Cllr GC would see what could be done.

It seemed that two traffic entrances to the site had been requested. This would be an issue for SCC highways.

There was some concern that, after a good start, communications from RVG/Keeble Brown (KB) were less frequent which was making residents feel that things were happening out of sight without consultation.

19:30 KC joined the meeting

- **Unitary Authority** – this had now been withdrawn. WBC were proposing a review of councils. NFs taking over more of the responsibilities currently held by parish councils seems to be one of the possible proposals.
- **Pyrford Place farm** – AG noted this proposal was for a bungalow on green belt land. He also noted that there was evidence the applicant did not live at the address given. RA/AG will discuss an objection from the RA. Cllr GC will look into the address issues.
- **Waitrose** – change to delivery hours – extra hour on Sundays and Bank Holidays for eCommerce not HGV deliveries. RA supported.

See report for other planning applications.

5. SADPD – update

Discussion minuted under item 4

6. Planning Responsibility – resubmission for Adoption

Nothing further to discuss and the proposal was **agreed for adoption**.

Next step was for the NFs to discuss.

AG noted that he would be likely to meet with resistance from PNF for reasons previously discussed in detail.

WP noted that the White Paper suggested that there would be bigger role for NFs in local planning and with this in mind this way of working made sense. He also noted that there was more and more planning activity and greater resource was needed.

With the reduced capacity within the RA – SD had taken on the role of interim planning officer in addition to being Chair – ID suggested that NFs needed to share the load and work with the RA on planning.

Cllr GC noted that the work of the planning officer fell into two parts – monitoring and reporting on applications and making representations in person to the WBC planning committee which was not an easy task requiring some time and experience. Cllr GC reported that training could be provided for anyone taking this on.

7. Health & Wellbeing in the Three Villages

A paper prepared by SD had been circulated for discussion and for agreement as to whether it was worth pursuing. With the expected increase in housing in the area there would be increased pressure on medical facilities, schools, infrastructure. AG suggested the addition of dentists.

ID thought this might be a good way to get more people engaged with the RA – a lot of the comments on the SADPD were around concerns for the local infrastructure. She suggested that a shorter statement be posted to the website for comment.

Action SD/ID to post shorter statement on website

DS explained the options open to GPs for expansion and what might work. Contact with the CCG would be key.

KC had written to the CCG but had not had a very satisfactory response.

Getting the local medical practices on board would be a good idea. Perhaps they should be asked to lead this ?

Certainly needed to find out what issues they were facing. However, SD was not certain that the health centre was taking on board what was happening.

SD, PH, KC will continue the discussions on this topic.

20:30 Cllr GE joined the meeting

AG noted that Pyrford and Byfleet residents would be keen to see the provision of facilities devolved rather than concentrated centrally in WB. However, the way current discussions on health were going ie Woking Walk In centre this seemed unlikely.

8. RA Annual Grant to PNF

A process for agreement had been circulated and was **agreed** as an acceptable solution.

Everyone who had worked on this was thanked for their efforts.

9. West Byfleet Village Centre Redevelopment Liaison Group

Reported under item 4 above.

10. Treasurer's Report

The Statement of Affairs report covering the period 1 January to xx October 2020 had been circulated before the meeting.

DS reported settlement of Lodge Brothers invoice (£150).

Grant to PNF would go out - £1,311. WB grant was £563.

Public liability insurance was due for renewal.

Currently, community grants were on hold and KC asked that this might be reviewed to see if help could be offered to the villages with Christmas decorations. DS reported that breakeven would not be achieved this year and there would be a small deficit. Moving to online newspapers had yielded some savings to offset the expected reduction in subscription income.

It was believed that RVG had agreed to fund the Christmas lights in West Byfleet but Cllr GE was asked to check which invoices had been provided. If it was agreed, a level of RA funding would be available for each village.

11. Membership Secretary's Report

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

ID had contacted Alan Fuller and he had amended the programming so that automatic removal of members from the database happened after 3 years rather than 2. This was intended as a temporary measure necessitated by the cessation of doorstep collection of subscriptions. Note the constitution states 2 years.

12. Editorial (taken early after item 4)

The Resident 165

RM was commended on another excellent edition of the newsletter. Comments had been received via email on the content and format and RM would be incorporating as appropriate.

The Resident 166 – Spring 2021

RM actively thinking up ideas – wondered about doing something on the history of the three villages. RM was given various links to local residents who had a wealth of knowledge in this area and who, in some cases, had written articles and books on the villages. He was also directed to Byfleet Heritage Society and a Pyrford history website.

Other ideas - a feature on local business (Pyrford's turn?), puzzle corner, update on work at St Mary's Community Centre in Byfleet, Byfleet flood relief scheme, update on collection of subscriptions ie various options, spring gardens, AG & ID to feature in 'Get to know your Committee', butterflies, photos of Halloween and Christmas decorations, (bad) parking in the villages, updated list of defibrillators with instructions as to use, spring & summer events list? Byfleet boats event (if it happens – EG to find out), Remembrance Sunday, article on Broadoaks, Sheer House update (on demolition if it starts).

AG reminded everyone that the possibility of delaying publication from February to March/April when the weather would be better for delivery by hand had been suggested. Further discussion needed.

ACTION ALL – discuss spring publication date

Flyer

7,500 copies had been printed and delivered. Unfortunately, not all households had received a copy. The distributor had been organised by Octagon and arrangements had been made to print another 1,500 for delivery to those streets which had been missed out. Octagon had been very helpful in rectifying the situation.

About a dozen emails had been received following the circulation of the flyer – new members and existing members giving their email addresses.

ID was thanked for her hard work in organising the flyer and sorting out the delivery issues.

It was agreed that the flyer had been a good idea and WP wondered if the providers of the affordable housing on Broadoaks might be approached as the next sponsor. ID to follow up.

ACTION ID – investigate Broadoaks affordable housing providers as flyer sponsor

Advertising

ID and DS had not yet met to discuss reduced fees but would be doing so.

Issue 165 had produced £1,000 of advertising.

13. Website

Anita Flavell had supplied website data which had shown the increase of activity when the statement on SADPD had been posted, the leaflet delivered and newsletter put on the website.

As previously noted the WBNF petition re SADPD had received over 1,400 signatures.

ID wondered who was responsible for responding to comments on the website. It was noted that two had been taken down as inappropriate and comments in general were only answered to rectify a point of fact.

14. Councillors' Reports

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

Cllr GC had nothing to add to previous conversations but did report on developments with Woking Football Club. A new prospective owner had come forward with a good rescue plan.

15. Right of Way Report – Marion Malcher

No report.

16. WBNF AGM – agreement that Keith Creswell continues to serve as an RA Representative.

The proposal was agreed unanimously.

17. 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 277 signatures. This would now go before the Joint Committee on 11 November 2020. KC would send a copy of the Active Travel Policy and Vision to Cllr GC and Cllr Amanda Boote for reference at the meeting.

Action KC – send Active Travel Policy to Cllrs

- Sally Cantello, WBNF, had a contact with expertise in renewable energy systems who could advise on any proposals for Camphill tip site.

Pyrford - AG had submitted a report.

AG noted that 153 Old Woking Road had been approved

SCC had announced it would not be supporting the Surrey Cycle Race after 2021.

Byfleet – EMG had provided a report and further noted:

- It was hoped that Graham Osborne would take over the AMO role for Byfleet
- Garden seeds project had started
- The memorial bench for Tony Coombs had been installed

18. Forum Reports

West Byfleet – WP observed that in view of KC's comprehensive report there was little to add.

- Concept plan for WB recreation ground was being worked up. KC and Sally Cantello were liaising with local groups to get a wish list. KC to report back in November
- SCC £100m community project fund - there will be three levels of funding:
 - > £10,000 - £100,000
 - > £100,001 - £500,000
 - > £500,001 and above.

The Fund is currently preparing to launch in February 2021

Pyrford - AG had submitted a report

PNF had started considering how to spend the £28k NCIL and had 3 projects in mind:

- Refurbishment of cricket pavilion – could be £12-40k depending on what was covered
- Security for village hall, pavilion, Arbor
- Wilding project ie for verges etc

Byfleet – no report

19. AOB

ID noted the inclusion of her picture in a News & Mail article on the community gardening group and reference to the RA supporting the work of this group.

Drop in dates: pending decision

BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET & PYRFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION
October 2020

Meeting closed at 21:22

Date of the next meeting – Wednesday, 18 November 2020

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

2020

December – no meeting

2021

20 January
17 February
17 March
21 April

19 May
16 June
21 July
August – no meeting

BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET AND PYRFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE MEETING - 21st October 2020

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. Further as a result of the more streamlined planning process (Item 5 below) an increasing number are dealt with under delegated power.

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

This report covers information received up to 20th October

There have been very few applications of interest.

1. WHITE PAPER CONSULTATION

HOUSING NUMBERS

Parallel with the main White Paper above there is a consultation on shorter term issues ahead of the main reforms. These include proposed changes to the standard method of assessing local housing need. This will primarily be done by the use of an algorithm! Likely outcome is infrastructure spending in the north and few new homes, many new homes in the south and little infrastructure spending beyond current commitments. While the housing numbers for Woking are actually advantageous, for the South East as a whole they are deeply alarming.

CONSULTATION

WBNF Committee have completed their discussion and agreed their consultation responses. The paper is currently being finalised which will then be submitted. There is no doubt that the current planning system is cumbersome, complex, uncertain and far too slow. Also the time it takes to have a local Plan approved is not acceptable. An important and concerning element is the potential reduction of local democracy in planning decisions.

WB FULL COUNCIL MEETING - 15TH OCTOBER 2020

Agenda item 9 was the Planning Process. Councillor Barker in moving a motion stated that :

- > CIL will be collected and will be remitted to the National Government. It will not be available to local Councils for infrastructure spending.
- > Neighbourhood Forums will have their powers curtailed and will lose their local CIL.

Neither of these statements were actually part of the motion but were made.

Councillor Cundy (portfolio holder) then spoke and did not contradict the statements.

I have revisited the White Paper and I am confident that these statements are without foundation.

WBC will be making their own submission to oppose many of the proposals.

2. SADPD

The Inspector's report with modifications was published on the 18th September. We are now well into the eight week consultation period.

WBNF and BRNF are actively working on raising public awareness and opinion and there is a petition currently with around 1,500 signatures.

For those who write to WBC every letter will be passed to the Inspector. Comments should wherever possible relate to the Inspector's Main Modifications.

There have been a number of posts on social media which are offensive, untrue and quite possibly defamatory. Where we can we have removed them. The RA will not be associated with such conduct.

While the focus in West Byfleet understandably is on West Hall (GB9 and GB9A), can I also draw your attention to Policy UA 40 Camphill Tip (page 173) where the Inspector's description of a "sustainable location" is utter madness.

WBC have been holding consultation Zoom meetings with the community. I have attended one which I did not find particularly helpful. Isabelle attended the same meeting.

3. WEST BYFLEET VILLAGE CENTRE REDEVELOPMENT

A liaison group comprising representatives from:

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

has been formed. Terms of reference have been agreed. we have held two meetings with RVG (the developer) - 28th September and 12th October

RVG have submitted their demolition application (**PLAN/2020/0753**) to Woking Council along with a demolition statement. Approved

Reference: PLAN/2020/0619

Proposal: EIA Scoping Opinion in respect of a proposed section 73 application to vary conditions 04 and 05 of outline planning permission reference PLAN/2017/0128 to enable the reconfiguration of Block B to a "H" shape, relocate a core of Block B, provide a pedestrian bridge link between Blocks A and C, provide balconies on all facades of Blocks A, B and C and make changes to the basement level, land use parameters, car parking and timescales.

Reference: PLAN/2020/0801

Section 73 application for variation of conditions 04 and 05 (approved plans/documents) of PLAN/2017/0128 dated 21.12.2017 (Outline planning application (all matters reserved except for access) for demolition of all buildings on the site and retail and leisure led mixed use redevelopment comprising up to 5,000 sqm GIA of retail and leisure uses (Use Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/A5), up to 2,000 sqm GIA of commercial use (Use Class B1a), up to 20,500sq m GIA residential (or maximum of 255 units) (Use Class C2/C3 or C3), up to 300 sqm GIA of community use (Use Class D1), together with the provision of basement space, car and cycle parking, highway works, public realm improvements and associated works) to reconfigure the upper floor layout of Block B to provide an H shaped form, make changes to Classes A1-A5, B1(a), C3 and C2 floorspace parameters, reduce the minimum parameter of basement floorspace and amend the level of the basement AOD, reduce the minimum parameter of residential car parking spaces (no change to the amount of public parking), increase the maximum storeys (whilst maintaining the maximum height AOD), introduce second vehicular access point onto Madeira Road, amend the layout of private amenity space and increase balcony locations and reflect amendments to the Use Classes Order that came into force on 1 September 2020.

Status: - Pending Consideration

Comment Date: - 25th October 2020

In the meantime demolition is unlikely to start before June 2021 with onsite construction commencing December 2021. They expect to have section 73 consent in December with detailed Planning Consent in March/April 2021

The next meeting of the Liaison Group is scheduled for the 26th October when Transport will be the main issue for discussion. RVG remind us that that they have a longer term commitment to West Byfleet and they are not short term developers.

4. UNITARY AUTHORITY

I reported that Cllr Tim Oliver, leader of Surrey County Council had written to the Minister requesting that the Minister invites SCC to submit a business case as soon as possible setting out their proposals for a single unitary authority for Surrey. The Minister has confirmed that he will not be issuing an invitation so that is another £50,000 wasted by SCC.

This was to be done under the Recovery and Devolution White Paper to be issued this Autumn. That White Paper has now been renamed the Local Economy Recovery and Devolution White Paper and has postponed until some time next year.

Woking Borough Council will however be undertaking a Community Governance Review which will include the role of Parish Councils.

For the time being any thought of a Unitary Authority for Surrey is dead but that does not mean that there will not be change.

5. DELEGATED PLANNING RULE CHANGES

Councillor Graham Chrystie has written a helpful and informative article in the Resident Newsletter issue 165.

6. 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.

CALLED IN

WBC are minded to approve this application. It has been "called-in" by Councillor Elson.
Recommended for Approval

APPROVED

9. 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

10. 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. **PERMITTED**

11. PLAN/2019/1013

Address: 9 Old Woking Road

Erection of a part four storey, part three storey building comprising 2x ground floor retail units (A1 use) and 5x dwellings (3x two bed and 2x three bed) and associated parking and bin and cycle storage following demolition of existing building.

There is an Appeal to the Secretary of State against the non-determination of the planning application.

No further news.

12. PLAN/2020/0694

Address: 8 Grafton Close, West Byfleet

Larger single storey rear extension

REFUSED (Delegated) - 22nd September 2020

13. PLAN/2020/0661

Address: 59 Boltons Lane, Pyrford, Woking

Proposed two storey side extension with habitable loft room with rear dormer, including new detached garage following demolition of existing garage.

PERMITTED (Delegated) - 22nd September 2020

14. PLAN/2020/0811

Address: 73 Hollies Avenue, West Byfleet

Erection of replacement garage/store following demolition of existing garage/store

Awaiting Decision (Delegated)

15. PLAN/2020/0813

Address: 115 Station Road, West Byfleet

Erection of a rear outbuilding following demolition of an existing rear outbuilding (amended description).

Pending Consideration (Delegated)

16. PLAN/2020/0799

Address: 7 Hamilton Avenue, Pyrford, Woking

Erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension

Pending Consideration (Delegated)

17. PLAN/2020/0828

Address: 30 Boltons Lane, Pyrford, Woking

Demolition of the existing single storey side structure followed by the erection of a two storey side and front extension, a first floor extension to the side and front and a new open plan Porch to the front of the existing dwelling.

Pending Consideration (Delegated)

18. PLAN/2020/0807

Address: Waitrose 60 Station Approach

Variation of condition 12 of planning permission 86/1286 dated 26.06.1987 for the erection of a supermarket, associated servicing car parking, landscaping and provision of a separate car park for the health centre.

Current delivery times:

- > Monday to Saturday 6.00 - 23.00 hours
- > Sunday and Bank Holidays 7.00 - 21.00 hours

Proposed delivery times:

- > Monday to Saturday NO CHANGE
- > Sunday and Bank Holiday 7.00 - 22.00 hours i.e. plus ONE HOUR

The extra hour on Sundays and Bank Holidays is sought only for eCommerce operations and no changes to the current delivery restrictions for HGV deliveries are sought.

PENDING CONSIDERATION. COMMENTS BY 2ND NOVEMBER. RA SUPPORTS

19. PLAN/2020/0523

Address: Mark House, Aviary Road, Pyrford, Woking

Conversation Area

Privacy Issues
PNF did not object

Called in by Cllr Chrystie

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.

PERMITTED

20. PLAN/2020/0846

Address: Pyrford Place Farm, Pyrford Road, Woking

Erection a single storey dwelling and formation of a vehicular access onto Lock Lane following demolition of existing stables and field shelter

Pending Consideration (Delegated) Comments by 27th October

21. PLAN/2020/0897

Address: Larkspur 1 Orchard Lea Close Pyrford Woking

Rear extension after demolition of conservatory. New pitched roof to replace flat roof over en-suite bathroom. Open canopy over front door. Replacement windows. Render to front elevation (retrospective).

PERMITTED

22. PLAN/2020/0771

Address: Little Orchard Aviary Road Pyrford Woking

Proposed replacement of old wooden conservatory with a poly carbonate roof, and new UPVC windows, with a new fibre glass insulated flat roof, with a lantern.

Pending Consideration Consultation Date - 5th November

23. PLAN/2020/0901 (delegated)

Address: 12 Lincoln Drive Pyrford Woking

Erection of a single storey rear extension and first floor side extension.

Pending Consideration Consultation Date 6th November

TREASURER'S REPORT
20 October 2020

The following Statement of Financial Affairs is for the period from 1 January to 20 October 2020.

July update on financials

Our year to date subscription collection £8,139 (Aug £8,034) pounds. We have invoiced £1,180 to date for advertising and collected £1,030. Our total cash reserves remain healthy at £27,493. This is before paying Forum grants and other printing costs as previously explained. For the current year we have a deficit of £96 (September £158). We expect to close the year with a small deficit or break even. Invoice raised for Alan Greenwood in March (£150) received a cheque on the 16th October but yet to be banked.

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 than usual.

Dharma Sivarajasingham
Hon. Treasurer
20/10/2020

BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET & PYRFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION
October 2020

Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford Residents Association

to 20 October 2020

	Year to date	
INCOME	£	£
Subscriptions and member donations:		
Byfleet	1,329	
West Byfleet	3,164	
Pyrford	3,581	
Subscriptions not allocated	65	
2019 paid in 2018	-	
2020 paid in 2019 or to be allocated	-	
		8,139
Advertising (includes receipts from 2019 invoices)		1,260
Bank Interest		34
Donations		-
Other		-
Total Income		9,433
 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		1,310
Mileage/Parking		-
Forums - Pyrford		-
- Byfleet		-
- West Byfleet		-
		0
Total Expenditure		9,529
Surplus/(Deficit)		(£96)
 Opening Cash		 £27,589
Surplus/(Deficit)		 (£96)
Closing Cash		£27,493
Analysis of Cash	Current Account	5,276
	Un allocated Collections Accounts +	
	2020 subs not allocated	50
	Overnight Deposit	7,008
	32Day deposit	15,159
		£27,493
* Donations		£
FRIENDS OF BYFLEET -		
GODFREY BENCH		250
		250

BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET & PYRFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION
October 2020

BYFLEET AMENITIES

		<u>£500</u>
*	Community Support	
	BELL CORNWELL RE-	
	SADPD	4,491
	Printing Leaflets - walk	
	in Centre	<u>301</u>
		<u>4,792</u>
*	Sundries	
		<u>£0</u>

Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents' Association



**DISCUSSION PAPER
ON
HEALTH AND WELL BEING
IN
BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET AND PYRFORD
AND
OTHER IMMEDIATE SURROUNDING AREAS**

PROPOSAL

That the Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents' Association (the "RA") consider establishing a Sub Committee for the purpose of understanding and discussing the adequacy of the current and likely adequacy of the future provision of Health Care Services in its area. The aim will be, in conjunction with other relevant bodies, to lobby to ensure that medical facilities continue to meet the needs of an expanding and ageing population.

While the RA will be represented on any such Sub Committee, the intention is that it is chaired by say a retired local General Practitioner and that other committee members include local residents with relevant skills and experience.

It is thought that such a committee should not solely focus on General Practitioner cover but also for example district nurses, health visitors, social care etc.

BACKGROUND CONSIDERATIONS

1. **The Big Picture.** You will recall that of particular concern to our community under this programme was the future of Woking Walk-in Centre and whether it would be upgraded to an Urgent Treatment Centre; remain as is or perhaps be closed. This programme commenced in August 2018 and in January - March 2020 there were consultations with the public effectively by invitation. The RA discovered about this purely by accident and too late for the consultations. We were far from alone in knowing nothing about it and clearly the level of information and communication was not acceptable.

We did arrange a public meeting with NHS North West Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group which had to be cancelled due to COVID-19 and indeed the Big Picture is currently on hold as staff have been re-assigned.

However a total lack of communication with the public on such an important matter is not acceptable.

2. **NHS North West Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group.** On 1st April 2020 (I hope that the date is not of significance) this body merged with NHS East Surrey, NHS Guildford and Waverley and NHS Surrey Downs to form

NHS Surrey Heartlands Clinical Commissioning Group. Again we knew nothing about it and there was and there remains a total lack of communication with the public as to the implications.

So what are the implications of this consolidation for Woking and the three Villages? Is it the NHS equivalent of a SCC Unitary Authority?

3. **Appointments.** What is the future for appointments with your doctor?

4. **Range of Services.** In spite of there being limited space for expansion, there now seems to be a remarkable range of additional health care services available at the Health Centre in West Byfleet. Does the community know what they are and their availability?

5. **Population expansion.** In Broadoaks Park there will be around 250 new dwellings PLUS an 80 bed care home. In Sheer House there will be circa 200 apartments for the "elderly". If West Hall proceeds there will be 550 additional dwellings. This will result in a very significant increase in the immediate population with obvious health demands.
Further the West Byfleet Health Centre in addition to the three villages covers Woodham and parts of New Haw and Wisley.

6. **Quote from a practice manager at the Health Centre.** "We continue to monitor the re-development in West Byfleet village, but at this time are unable to plan for any additional pressure on our facilities but will do so as more information is released."

7. **Statistics on GP patient numbers.** "Large GP practices can have many, many thousands on their list. Even smaller two-GP practices can have two or three thousand.
So a few hundred more residents (from Broadoaks and then Sheer House) - even though mainly elderly - should be able to be accommodated amongst existing practices, unless they are all completely 'full' and/or have no wish to expand even slightly.
The ratio of GPs to residents across England is c.8 for every 10,000 people.
So we basically only 'need' one more full time GP for every thousand new residents.
So that's roughly one to cover the increase in population from Broadoaks plus Sheer House, plus another in due course 'for' West Hall. There are also the smaller developments likely for Byfleet over the next ten years, but I think that these only add up to a few hundred new residents."

You may disagree with the above.

8, **Our Local Hospitals.** What are the current waiting lists? We must not ignore all the planned housing developments in Woking and say Wisley that will place a heavy additional burden on our hospital services.

9. **SADPD.** It was and remains totally unclear as to what conversations have been held and with whom or what as to the ability of local health services to cope with population growth and ageing. The conclusion appeared to be that it could cope but based on what?

10. **Message.** Do not get ill in Surrey!

So is there a strategy in place? If so who has done the planning and who is responsible for the implementation? What is the timing? Where is the ownership? We need to know.

I stress that this is a discussion document only and all views are very welcome.

Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents' Association



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 their 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 Pyrford 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.

Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents' Association



**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN
BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET AND PYRFORD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION ("RA")
AND
PYRFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM ("PNF")
IN REGARD TO
THE ANNUAL GRANT FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS**

**Residents' Association Committee Meeting
21 October 2020**

BACKGROUND

As the Committee is aware the RA makes an annual grant available to both PNF and West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum ("WBNF"). The position as regards Byfleet Residents Neighbourhood Forum is different as they have yet to finalise their Plan, submit the draft to Woking Borough Council, proceed to its referendum and then final adoption.

The Annual Grant is to be used to fund the basic operations of the Forums as described in the respective Constitutions. The system for calculating the Annual Grant for the individual Forums will remain as at present and as set out by Keith Creswell on the 17th July 2017. The RA subsequently amended one aspect of this arrangement on 21st June 2019. The maximum formula driven Annual Grant to any one Forum will remain at the level of £2,000.

As the Committee is aware the most recent Annual Grant has yet to be paid to PNF in view of a misunderstanding on certain administrative issues. Conversations have been on going for several months and it really is time to resolve and conclude this matter.

PNF through their Finance Sub Committee have made a proposal that is certainly within the spirit of our recent discussions.

This will mean that there are different systems in place for PNF and WBNF. However the logistics will not be demanding and as separate independent associations there is no reason why they should not have their individual arrangements as long as no Forum is disadvantaged.

THE PROPOSAL

1. PNF agree the current Grant calculation formula.
2. PNF confirm that it will be happy to receive the Annual Grant in whatever tranches are convenient to the RA
3. PNF commit to the use of the Annual Grant on operating expenses only. For the avoidance of doubt operating expenses are defined as the on-going and recurring costs of running the forum. They do not include one-off project, capital or campaign costs that are incurred on Pyrford specific business.
4. PNF specifically account for the RA Annual Grant and will continue to present a summarised account of how it was spent, accompanied by a certificate of accuracy signed by the Treasurer and the Chair of the PNF at the end of each Grant year.
5. Any underspend of the Annual Grant will be returned by PNF with the presentation of the summarised Annual Grant account at the end of each Grant year.
6. Any PNF overspend on operating expenses will be met from separate PNF fundraising. If there is any query about any PNF expenditure utilising the RA Annual Grant the RA Treasurer or Examiner are welcome to review the RA account file of bills, invoices and receipts at a place and time to be agreed with the PNF Treasurer.

OTHER PNF STATEMENTS

1. For the avoidance of doubt copy invoices will not be produced by PNF and the account file will not be released from Treasurers custody.

In view of the above this is agreed

2. Also for the avoidance of doubt and practical management of an independent organisation, suggestions that surplus grant might be 'banked and accumulated' with a Forum and then possibly 'clawed back' at some unspecified future date are viewed as totally unpractical and will not be entertained. PNF require that the grant for each year be fully accounted for, any unspent grant returned and closure of the account for that grant period

The RA position was that it reserved the right to "claw back" but understands the position of PNF and is happy to accept return of any unspent balance of the Annual Grant. For the avoidance of doubt this decision by the PNF to return unspent Annual Grant money will not affect the agreement with WBNF.

STATEMENT BY PNF

The Community and the PNF value the relationship with the RA and the solid progress made together over the last few years since the inception of the PNF, continuing to believe that the RA and PNF by working in

close association are stronger together than apart. Against that background and of equal importance is the independence of PNF.

1. The PNF Finance Sub Committee recommends this Annual Grant solution as a practical and realistic process that recognises and incorporates sound governance principles for independent organisation. It provides protection for the interests of both the RA and PNF and for the integrity of their independent status.

2. If for whatever reason at some stage in the future the Annual Grant is declined then it should be stressed that PNF is simply declining the grant and is NOT terminating association with the RA and the other Forums.

3. The PNF continues believes we should all work together to our mutual benefit and show residents we are stronger together than apart.

The RA is in agreement with the above

MEMBERSHIP REPORT OCTOBER 2020 (20 OCTOBER 2020)

KEY POINTS 2020 YEAR

Membership subscriptions of **£8054** have been entered into the membership database and subscriptions of **£50** have been banked but have yet to be entered and attributed to individual household members.

	Cash held by VRs	Banked not entered	In Membership Database	Totals
		£	£	£
Byfleet		10	1329	
West Byfleet		40	3139	
Pyrford		0	3586	
TOTAL		50	8054	

Email addresses:

The number of email addresses is **51.6% of total membership**, having grown from 35% at December 2018.

Distribution of the Flyer

7500 copies of the flyer were distributed at the end of September, according to the distributor – Barreldfield Distribution. However due to the high number of Street Reps who reported non-delivery, an agreement was reached with Barreldfield for an additional 1500 copies to be printed and distributed at its expense to those toads where non-delivery had been confirmed by the Street Rep.

Barreldfield was chosen because it was recommended by Octagon, (who had used them previously) and because it was based in Byfleet with a local knowledge of the area. Octagon have been kept informed about the failures and assisted with the agreement for re-delivery.

The re-printed copies (1500) are due to be delivered by the printers to Barreldfield on Wednesday 21 October and delivered shortly thereafter.

Response from the flyer (?)

The following individuals had made contact via members@the-residents.org since the flyer had been distributed

Byfleet	West Byfleet	Pyrford

There have also been a few enquiries from members who had not been receiving emails, and consequently their details have been added to the database.

BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET & PYRFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION
October 2020

MEMBERSHIP DETAIL 2020 YEAR

As at 20 October 2020 the membership numbers by village are shown below: -

Village	Dec-19	Apr-20	May-20	Jun-20	Jul-20	Aug-20	Sept-20	Oct-20	Month Change
Byfleet	576	548	INFORMATION NOT PROVIDED	547	547	547	547	550	+3
West Byfleet	793	768		778	779	780	778	782	+4
Pyrford	1,089	1,029		1032	1035	1036	1037	1036	-1
Other	11	14		15	13	13	11	16	0
	2,469	2359		2372	2374	2376	2377	2384	+7
Movement	(381)	17		13	2	2	1	7	

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

Village	Dec-19	Apr-20	May-20	June-20	Jul-20	Aug-20	Sept-20	Oct-20	Month Change
Byfleet	2,740	263		504	963	963	1084	1329	+245
West Byfleet	4,822	1,337		2,254	2854	2854	3144	3139	-5
Pyrford	4,598	306		3,186	3331	3331	3536	3586	+50
	12,160	1,906		5944	7148	7148	7764	8054	290

BYFLEET, WEST BYFLEET & PYRFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION
October 2020

Byfleet West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents Association
October 2020
Village Representative Report West Byfleet
For Committee and Street Reps

Admin

Not too much to report this month as still shielding.

Had a few new members sign in on line. Pleasingly, it includes a couple who are moving into Broadoaks who well may become street reps. The Treasurer and Membership Secretary will provide details of latest membership status.

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. Any potential volunteer contact addresses would be welcome.

Local issues

Work with WB Neighbourhood Forum (WBNF) continues to be excellent. Much of the following also heavily involves WBNF.

Sheer House.

A WB Village Centre Liaison Group has been created by WBNF, Stewart Dick and I represent the RA. A schedule of topics has been agreed for the next few meetings including looking at impact on local roads during demolition and construction. The Retirement Village Group have submitted plans (Plan/2020/0801) broadly within the scope of the outline permission granted previously but with separate residents and public car parking accesses in Madeira Road and also balcony provision for the apartments (that will no doubt make the blocks more humane). Further details of the development and Liaison Group will be given in the WBNF report.

Broadoaks development

The impact on Parvis Road is almost completed so the disruption of partial road closures should mostly be over. Construction continues on site.

Active Travel

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. It has now attracted 270 signatures. This petition is being supported by WBNF, Byfleet Residents Forum and Cllr 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. Amanda has volunteered to try to use some of her 2021 transport funds to ensure this is completed for which we are very grateful.

There has been no further news on any local improvements to be provided under the emergency Active Travel funding provided to SCC by the Government.

Recreation Ground

The WBNF have asked Keith Creswell and Sally Cantello to lead on developing a Concept Plan for the development of the Rec. including the Pavilion, and Community Centre. They will be basing this on the responses to the questionnaire responses used as part of the formulation of the Neighbourhood Plan and consulting with numerous stakeholders, including neighbours, sports teams, schools, Guides and Scouts as well as the WBC recreation grounds team.

SADPD

West Hall, this is dealt with in the Planning report. The petition asking WBC to withhold and redraft based on up to date information and the declared national policy of protecting green belt has reached 1481 signatures at the time of writing. There is still time to make representations on the Modifications, but readers are reminded that representations can only be made on the Modifications themselves not any unmodified statements, which the Inspector has allowed through.

Camphill Tip, Based on a discussion with Planning Policy Officer, representations have been made to amend the Modifications to recognise the access issues covered in the Modifications and to move away from light industrial use which would create significant extra traffic and to allow development of a photovoltaic (solar) farm. This would be in compliance with one of Woking's core strategies. The Camphill Tip PV Farm is being pursued separately from the SADPD by WBC's Climate Change Committee and we are very grateful to Cllr Mary Bridgeman for this.

The WB Community Gardening Group

There has been further planting of trees, hedgerows and bulbs on Birch Green and further planting will take place on the Recreation Ground. Discussions are continuing with SWR and through them Network Rail about planting up the Station and this is looking very hopeful. Members of the RA Committee have promised (and delivered) individual donations and this is much appreciated.

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

Library

SCC are operating a click and collect service for the library allowing for collection and returns only at limited times. There is no browsing or other services or access to the building. Further information at <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/libraries/news-and-events/news/coronavirus>

Other

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

- 1 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. We hope the Joint Committee will take note of our Active Travel Vision.
- 2 WBNF Community Infrastructure Levy (see WBNF report)
- 3 The West Byfleet Community Festival (West Byfleet Live) (although a date for 2021 has now been published)
- 4 Youth project
- 5 Highways England Walking and Cycling strategy for areas impacted by the M25 J10 proposals.
- 6 Highways England J10 proposals impact on Painshill junction from traffic congestion and non-motorised user perspectives.
- 7 The traffic pollution monitoring from the Parvis Road, positioning of detectors at relevant places is still outstanding.

Businesses:

Note Sheer House report above.

James Lowe the Butcher has initiated a dialogue with RVG to sponsor the West Byfleet Village Christmas Lights this year, Fran Nevett did all the work last year and James has passed all the contractors details etc. to RVG, so looking very good. As always, we also hope that WBBA members and their respective businesses will again be ordering small lit Christmas trees to display outside their premises.

RVG have made very positive noises about trying to ensure two of their retail units is taken by a Post Office and a Chemist. Alternative provision is being sought for the provision of a pharmacist and a post office before then but appropriate space is short.

Thanks to Gary for Business input.

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

Keith Creswell 18/10/2020

BWBPRA Committee Written Update 21.10.2020

Byfleet Report 21.10.2020 v1.0

Village Representative and Deputy (Byfleet): Eleanor Grady and Jean-Pierre Frossard

RA Subscriptions/ Street Reps/Drop-in

Coverage of village: (Stats / blue type-face untouched since last report)

Total number of roads in Byfleet: 93

Number of roads with Street Rep: 72 (77%)

Number of active Street Reps: 29

Of which number stepped down since last report: 1

Of which new since the last report: 0

Association matters:

AMO Role

We would like to record our thanks to Mrs Chris Flux, our Byfleet AMO who is stepping down from the role this month. Chris very kindly continued in this role over lockdown longer than originally expected. We look forward to staying in contact from time to time.

We hope that this role may be inherited by one of our RA Street Reps Grahame Osborn.

Grahame is a long-standing and active Byfleet resident. He is on the committee of the Friends of Byfleet Parish Day and also works hard on the Byfleet Amenities Group. He is also involved in the delivery of the Byfleet Community News publication.

Street Reps:

New Street Reps needed for 21 roads some of which were listed in Issue 165.

Subscriptions

Our current AMO is not in a position to process and bank any subs I receive. I will hold on to these for the foreseeable future. I currently have GBP 108 to process and bank.

SRs have **not** been asked to actively resume subscription collection.

The feeling from the majority of SR who replied to our survey regarding physical delivery of paper copies of The Resident in the spring of 2021 was that they would be happy to deliver should the pandemic situation be as it was when we surveyed.

The Resident -Issue 165

Many thanks to the editor for bringing round a handful of paper-copies. One will be lodged at the library for public viewing (along with a copy of Issue 164- missed during Lockdown). The remaining handful will be offered to SRs for a few of their residents who are housebound and offline on a first come, first served basis.

Village Matters :

RA Garden Seed Share Scheme pilot:

We have posted the following wording on the 'Byfleet Represents' Facebook page:

'Garden Seed Share Scheme: Hello everyone, The Residents' Association is piloting a Garden Seed Share Scheme in Byfleet. The intention is that anyone who collects spare seeds from their garden each autumn can share them with others for free the following spring. If you have any spare seeds, you can drop them off in the box in the porch of 53 Rectory Lane. Please leave us a note of which seeds they are. We hope to have a stall on Byfleet Village Green on 6th March 2021 10am-12am. Feel free to come along in the spring and take a few envelopes of seeds! There is a little more info in the latest free online issue of 'The Resident' magazine www.the-residents.org. Thank you.'

VRB and DEPVRB do not want residents of West Byfleet and Pyrford to feel excluded so we will of course welcome them to donate or collect seeds as VRWB and VRP see fit.

We are approaching Byfleet Community Library to see whether they would be willing to hold a box of seed envelopes for us on an ongoing basis. This would make seeds left over from or March 2021 stall more accessible during library opening times.

Toby Coombs' Memorial Bench – Has been erected on the Village Green facing the Comodore/Boots parade of restaurants/shops. There has been 'communication' on 'Byfleet Represents' regarding a group of young people who threw around/damaged the beautiful floral tributes which have been admired, for days, by villagers on the bench.

Events and expenditure:
Nothing to report.

A.O.B. None

Many thanks and regards

Eleanor Grady and Jean-Pierre Froissard - EMG/JPF 21.10.2020

PYRFORD VR REPORT - 21 October 2020 (as of 17 October 2020)

A) PYRFORD STREET REPS

Total monies received from members via Street Reps this year to date is £3,586 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.

B) MARSHAL PARADE DEVELOPMENT SAGA

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

C) 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.

D) 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 was approved at the Planning Committee on 29th September 2020 meeting.

E) PYRFORD EVENTS

E.1) PRUDENTIAL CYCLE RIDE 2021 ONWARDS

A paper to the Surrey County Council Cabinet meeting on 27th October 2020 recommends that SCC will support the shorter May 2021 ride event but not the 100-mile event after 2021.

PNF Report October 2020

MEETINGS

The Committee held its first face to face meeting in September.

CONSERVATION VIDEO

Various interviews have been undertaken and short trailers and the first episode are available on PNF Website .

SITE ALLOCATIONS MAIN MODIFICATION DPD

The Site Allocation DPD was issued on 18th September with 8 weeks consultation until 5pm 16th November. The PNF Committee discussed both the DPD and the local petition and the Committee agreed not to make any comments on either.

RE-DESIGNATION OF FORUM

The consultation started on 25th September for 8 weeks closing at 5pm on 23 November 2020.

HERITAGE CONSERVATION ASSESSMENT

Work continues on the assessment. A small sub committee has considered what should be changed from the status quo in the 2000 WBC Heritage Report.

Fundraising for the £13,000 cost has generated c£11,500 so there is a shortfall of £1,500. So far £262 has been raised by selling the Heritage Video.

SIGNIFICANT PYRFORD PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Three significant applications have been decided since the last report:-.

153 Old Woking Road

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

Approved

Church Farm House Church Hill

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

Approved

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.

Approved

The following are still under consideration.

Green Belt

Pyrford Place Farm Pyrford Road (Land north of Bennets Farm)

Erection a single storey dwelling and formation of a vehicular access onto Lock Lane following demolition of existing stables and field shelter

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.

Green Belt & Conservation Area

1 Lady Place Cottages Church Hill

Erection of a two-storey rear extension

Andy Grimshaw
PNF Chair