

**PeMinutes of the meeting of the West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum committee
Held on Thursday 28th July 2016 at West Byfleet Social Club at 7.30pm.**

Present

Penny Hoskyn (Chair)
Emma Davis (taking minutes in absence of the secretary)
Ross Goodman
Sally Cantello
David Fisher
Phil Wilson
Nasrin Shahbazi – (Treasurer)
Cllr Mary Bridgeman
Cllr Graham Christie

Apologies for Absence

Received from John Banks, Richard Thomas, Pauline Hedges (Chair), Wade Pollard, Stewart Dick, Beverley Tourle, Chris Dougherty (Secretary) Roland Nevett

1.Minutes of last Meeting

Minor adjustment needs to be made as Councillor John Bond is no longer a committee member of the RA.

2.Welcome to Cllr Mary Bridgman who is a counsellor for Byfleet and West Byfleet. The forum introduced themselves to her.

3.Updates for the Chair

Children's Play Area – Emma Slaymaker has applied for 30k Grant

4. CIL money

Supplementary Questions on CIL money asked by the West Byfleet Forum at the Joint Committee meeting held on 29th June 2016

- 1. Community element of CIL – We believe that as well as the 123 list maintained by WBC, there should be a second separate list covering the community elements of CIL. This would ensure that community groups such as WBNF have full visibility of CIL and what is allocated to their area. Will WBC maintain a separate list of community CIL funds?*

Answer

The Council has a responsibility to publish in its Annual Monitoring report (AMR) the amount of CIL income it has received and how the income has been used. This will include how much has been given to local communities to deliver local community projects. There will be a ring-fenced budget for this purpose with detailed classification of what amount is earmarked for what area. The AMR will be published by 31 December of each year, and this information will be in the public domain. The identification of a list of local community projects similar to the Regulation 123 list to use the community element of the CIL income to deliver is a matter for the local community working closely with their Ward Councillors. National guidance encourages this to be community led rather than Council led projects.

Officers have in the past advised the West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum how this could be achieved.

2. *What happens to the 75%/85% of CIL – Apart from the community element of CIL, there is still considerable concern that the larger amount might not be spent in the immediate area. In the case of West Byfleet, we have two major developments due to take place over the next few years. These will result in fundamental changes to all aspects of village, population, infrastructure etc. In these circumstances we believe that the whole of the CIL generated from both Broadoaks and Sheer House developments should be allocated to the immediate area.*

Answer

The Council has the responsibility to decide how the 75% or 85% of the CIL income should be used. The Council has a Core Strategy to address development needs across the Borough. This element of the CIL income is intended to help deliver the necessary infrastructure to support the future growth of the Borough. The Council has been transparent in publishing the Regulation 123 list to demonstrate how the 75% or 85% will be used. It has also set up a Joint Committee to make sure that the CIL income is used on projects that will have maximum benefits to the community as a whole. In this regard, it is not intended that the whole of the CIL income secured in a particular area will be used to deliver projects solely in that particular area

It appears to us that there as there is no order of priority on the 123 list therefore lobbying will be required.

GC commented that the Borough was estimating a 40-50% greater amount of CIL to be received than they now think they will get.

CIL is a very big issue and he is going to ask Jonathan Lord MP to take this up.

Discussion was had regarding the possible use of CIL for improving the recreation ground however it is a complex subject due to the amount of stakeholders involved.

Also discussed was issue of how money is spent and its felt Highways works should in the main be paid for by developers rather than coming out of CIL and in particular out of the 15 % or 25% that should be ring fenced for the forum.

5. United Learning

Notes on meeting have been circulated and also sent to the RA.

No contact received from United Learning since meeting

PH to send follow up email.

5. Altitude

Thanks were given to PW for writing a letter to S.Tillman [see below]

Discussion was had about Altitude having preapplication meetings with WBC re Sheer House and the fact that these are confidential. Its felt this gives them and developers in general an advantage where as residents have little time in comparison to comment on planning applications once they have been submitted and validated.

Stephen Tillman Altitude Real Estate Ltd
Sent via email

21 July 2016

Dear Stephen,

Many thanks for giving the Forum an opportunity to review your latest thinking regarding the centre of West Byfleet. We certainly welcome this type of engagement and hope that it can continue throughout the planning and construction phases.

As you have heard from us on a number of occasions, the community of West Byfleet both residents and businesses, want to see the village centre transformed from its current somewhat dated condition into a modern, vibrant shopping and residential development with better public space for all to enjoy. We recognise the enormous challenge that you are facing and hope that our feedback is helping to shape your thinking before any planning application is submitted.

We were pleased to see that further design options are still being considered. However the community remain very concerned about the 'marker building' both in terms of its proposed location and height.

One fundamental issue that confuses many is the fact that Woking Borough Council's Design SPD goes into some detail about how it sees the centre of West Byfleet being re-developed. On page 61 it states that, "...The height of Sheer House in West Byfleet is inappropriate for the centre. New proposals should accommodate medium scale buildings (c.5-6 storeys) in a clear block structure with good public space...".

Our understanding is that such adopted policies must be complied with by anyone re-developing this or any other site. In fact our Built Environment policies within the West Byfleet Neighbourhood Plan have to fall in line with the Design SPD otherwise they will not be approved by WBC.

In terms of the residential aspects of the development, we would like to understand how you intend to encourage owner occupiers, who are more likely to become permanent members of our community, rather than 'buy-to-let'. Do you have a view yet on the size, quality and mix of flats/apartments that will be offered to the market?

Turning to car parking, we were pleased to hear that the number of parking spaces would be slightly higher than those already available on the site. Are you able to indicate how many residential car parking spaces are being proposed?

We are all keen to see more detailed proposals on the entry/exit and goods delivery schemes and how pedestrians will move between the car park, the shops and public spaces. As you know, West Byfleet is very crowded with vehicles a lot of the time, and we do recognise that this is not just Altitudes problem to solve. The Forum will continue to lobby county and borough councillors on this issue as we all want to see a 'joined up', long term solution to this problem throughout the village centre.

At our meeting you suggested that the next public consultation would take place after you have submitted an outline planning application. The Forum wonders if there is any possibility of some form of exhibition being held before then? That would provide a final opportunity to present your proposals and explain in more detail the reasoning behind the final design.

On behalf of Penny Hoskyn and Pauline Hedges Joint Chair WBNF.

Reply from ST.

Thank you very much for your response from the WBNF

We note your comments and views on the marker building (in any location) and will explore the further option of spreading across.

With regard the parking I am fairly sure I said we will replicate what is currently provided rather than anymore . In terms of residential parking until the massing form is finalised and the car park layout for the basement solution, which everyone is keen to see, I can't tell you ratio's or exact numbers. The same detail applies to unit size etc. However details will flow through in any application we progress.

Again many thanks for your input

Kind Regards Stephen

7. Roxburgh House

GC was asked why he didn't vote at the recent planning meeting. His answer was that there was no point as it couldn't be won because it would have meant the vote would have been tied at 4-4.

GC said he objected strongly on car parking grounds as it has sub standard parking. Had it been a tied vote the decision would have gone with the officer's recommendation which was to approve the planning application.

GC said he could not vote on CS21 as had received a direct warning from Chris Dale it would cause a cost order against council and such a warning cannot be ignored.

Altitude were expected to put in a strong objection to the application but didn't.

It was voiced that residents are feeling disappointed that GC didn't vote and that he should have voted to send the right message to residents. GC felt he couldn't have done more; its not a normal case and there is no president for such circumstances which have been born out of the legislation for change of use under permitted development rights.

It's felt that permission being granted for the extra 2 storeys to be added onto Roxburgh House will set a precedent and as such impact on what happens with the Sheer House Complex Development.

Phone mast and other equipment have not been applied for to go on top and it would require a separate application to be made.

7. Draft Plan Update

PH has collected public copies that in were libraries, Churches etc for viewing during the consultation period. She also emailed Octagon to say we hadn't received a response and they replied saying they had no comment; 'it was a very good document'.

Plan subcommittee met this morning to look at responses received, general feeling is we shouldn't change the policies but a vote will be taken on specifics at the next meeting.

PH reminded the committee we can put any questions to our members to vote on if we feel it's necessary.

The draft Plan (5 copies) will be submitted to WBC on the 1st August as planned for Environmental screening etc.

Two documents being completed by Stewart Dick and PH will be finished by September / October.

Nigel [Planning Consultant] needs to do a health check on the Plan after any amendments have been made.

8. RA and public meeting re Sheer House

The RA have agreed in principle to organise and fund a public meeting re Sheer House once the planning application has been submitted to WBC.

Purpose of the meeting should be to inform and encourage residents to submit comments on the planning application to WBC.

RA need help with organisation, leaflet / poster, speakers

SC offered to help with organisation

ED offered to help with leaflet / poster.

PH and RT[for the RA] will also assist.

Suggestion was made that the meeting should be used to inform people about how they can respond.

9 Any Other Business

Councillors John Bond, AmandaBoote and Mary Bridgeman are going to be holding a monthly surgery for residents on the first Wednesday of every month 4pm-5.30pm. First one takes place on 3rd August at the Cornerstone Centre. They will feed back to us any relevant info those crops up.

Pauline Hedges has resigned as Joint Chair of the Forum as she is moving to Basinstoke, to live near her family. Pauline will continue to head up West Byfleet Li:ve event for 2017 when the Parish of West Byfleet will be 100 years old.

Next committee meeting, Wed.21st Sepetember at West Byfleet Social Club at 7.30.pm