

Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum



MINUTES OF AGM MEETING

REF: PNFM 07.12.2015

DATE: Monday 7th December 2015

VENUE: 8pm Pyrford Village Hall

PRESENT: Martin Doyle (Chairman), Geoff Geaves, Ian Mills, Brian Dodd, Carole Gale, Andy Grimshaw, Joy Sachak, Ian Whittle, Derek Berriman, Tony Pratt, Ernie Elliot, Peter Ankers, Graham Chrystie (Councillor), Ashley Bowes (Councillor).

All identified by initials

Visitors: Godfrey Chapples (Chairman BWPRA)
Penny Hoskyn and Pauline Hedges (Joint Chairpersons WBNF)
Identified by name in full.

There were a total of 66 persons present.

APOLOGIES: Councillor Liz Bowes, Cliff & Yvette Bolton, Nicholas Aiken, Pauline Newton

MINUTES:

ACTION BY	ITEM	MINUTE
MD	1	<p>Introduction and Welcome</p> <p>The meeting opened at 08:15 and the minutes of the 2014 AGM were distributed at the meeting along with a summary of the accounts. The Chairman welcomed those present, and introduced those who would be presenting.</p>
MD	2	<p>Approval of the Minutes of the 2014 AGM</p> <p>The minutes were distributed at the meeting along with a summary of the accounts.</p> <p>The minutes were approved.</p>
MD	3	<p>Summary of the Previous Year</p> <p>MD explained that the production of the Neighbourhood Plan is not connected to the Site Allocation DPD which was produced by Woking Borough Council and has earmarked two fields either side of Upshot Lane for removal from the Green Belt. The latter topic, he explained, will be addressed by Councillor Graham Christie during the course of the evening.</p> <p>The Plan has been developed during the course of the year through listening to people's views, arranging public meetings and giving information and obtaining feedback via the Forum website. It is expected that the Plan will be formally lodged with the Council in late January 2016.</p> <p>The chairman concluded by saying it was important that we received feedback from the meeting on the direction we were taking and in particular what form the Forum should take once the Plan was adopted. He stressed that the Forum was now working with tight budgetary constraints.</p>
IM	4	<p>Finances</p> <p>IM presented the financial report which covered the years to end of August 2013/14 and 2014/15. The 2013/14 accounts were included as it had not been possible to present them at last year's AGM, as expenses were being covered directly by the 3 Villages Residents' Association (RA). Copies of the Accounts are attached to these minutes.</p>

<p>JS, GC, IM</p>		<p>The main sources of funds had been from central government funding administered by Locality in 2013/14 and Groundwork in 2014/15 and from grants from the Residents' Association. The process for obtaining the former had been difficult resulting in delays which meant that the Forum had been cash constrained for much of the time.</p> <p>Although the accounts showed us with a small balance at the end of August 2015 these did not include around £3,055 of claims or loans that had been held over at the end of the financial year pending receipt of additional funds from the RA. An analysis of the deficit indicated funds that should cover these outstanding commitments.</p> <p>The budget for 2015/16 from Groundwork was then presented. IM stressed that the budget was tightly defined by category and had to be spent by end March 2016. It could not be used to cover the existing commitments.</p> <p>The Forum would therefore continue to be under tight budgetary constraints. In particular Forum funds should not be used for campaigning against the site allocation.</p> <p>Acceptance of the accounts was proposed by PA, seconded by AG and passed without objection.</p> <p>GC further highlighted the current shortage of funds. At this stage there was no indication whether there would be funds from central government for next year. This meant that the Forum might have to raise funds locally to cover the final stages of implementation of the Plan and any further Site Allocation DPD involvement.</p>
<p>MD</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Committee Members</p> <p>The nominees for the 2015/16 committee were listed.</p> <p>Pat Barnes, Cliff Bolton, Graham Chrystie, Pauline De Marco, Brian Dodd, Martin Doyle, Carole Gale, Geoff Geaves, Andy Grimshaw, Kay Hughes, Ian Makowski, Ian Mills, Joy Sachak, Ian Whittle, and Brian Wilson.</p> <p>There being no other proposals from the floor the above were duly elected.</p> <p>Thanks were extended to the 20 people who have contributed to the production of the Plan so far. It was emphasised that all Forum members are welcome to attend any committee meetings.</p> <p>Unfortunately MD reported that he would now like to stand down as Chairman as soon as a replacement is found. Martin has been our Chairman since the Forum was established and we owe him a great debt of gratitude and thanks for all the hard work he has put in during the past 3 years getting us up and running. We wish Martin and his wife Angela all the best and hope he will stay on as a vice-chairman.</p> <p>The election of Chairman, Treasurer, Secretary, and other officers will therefore be held at the next committee meeting in accordance with the constitution.</p>
<p>GG</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plan – Update</p> <p>GG reiterated that the Neighbourhood Plan and The Site Allocation DPD are completely separate. The Neighbourhood Plan has been developed to reflect the priorities that the community believe in. He explained what will happen over the next six months. Between December and April it is expected that the process will be completed. During this time we will need to ensure that any changes do not deviate in any material way from the Plan which received a high approval rating during the Local Consultation. If there are changes, the Plan will need to contain a strong reasoned justification for these. It will also be necessary to show that the Plan is specific to our locality.</p> <p>GG reported on the status of the Neighbourhood Plan and highlighted the gateways that it must pass through to be approved and included in the Woking Council Plan. Currently these are planned as:</p> <p>20 Dec 2015 – submit for final examination by the Forum's consultant</p> <p>31 Jan 2016 - Submit final plan to WBC for final examination</p> <p>1 April 2016 – Submit plan to the Government Examiner (estimated)</p> <p>July/September 2016 – Final Referendum (estimated)</p>

	<p>Currently the plan was undergoing final policy changes and a review to ensure that policies were specific to Pyrford and properly justified. He highlighted the need to justify Pyrford based policies with facts based on the input from the community and the need for conformance with Woking Council's Core Strategy.</p> <p>Question from floor. GG was asked if the public consultation was the point at which we can express support. GG confirmed that this was the case.</p> <p>PA expressed the opinion that the Plan should not be framed to stop development and that the Site Allocation Process is completely separate.</p> <p>GG explained that the Plan does not have policies with regard to the Green Belt as such policies are sufficiently covered elsewhere. The Plan does state that the local community value the Green Belt and the rural nature of the area.</p> <p>Statement from floor It was pointed out that our services including schools, health centre, and water supply are not currently able to support growth in population.</p> <p>GG pointed out that it is difficult to have extensive infrastructure policies because services like utilities do not come under the jurisdiction of the Plan.</p> <p>MD stated that the Neighbourhood Plan has to be a document that developers can use as a guideline.</p> <p>PA stated that we mustn't conflict with Woking Borough Council Plan.</p> <p>MD explained that we have had several meetings with Woking Borough Council. They have already had opportunities to comment on the Plan and we have carefully considered their comments and adjusted the Plan where we believe their recommended changes should be implemented.</p> <p>IM commented that this is why the Plan has taken two years to produce. It has taken this long to encapsulate what people want. He added that he did not believe there was anything in the plan that specifically prevented development.</p> <p>Question from floor. It was asked why the Plan doesn't discuss the best locations for houses and what the village needs in terms of schools.</p> <p>MD said it was beyond the scope of the Plan to specify the size of schools in the area.</p> <p>GG said that the Plan is designed to reflect the values of the community. He pointed out that if the community receive Community Infrastructure levy (CIL) money this will allow us to develop the community in a sustainable way.</p> <p>IM explained that as a result of the consultation we had 550 responses and 98% of residents were in agreement with the Plan.</p> <p>MD added that we have received comments on the Plan and these have been taken into consideration.</p>
<p>GC</p>	<p>7. Site Allocation DPD</p> <p>GC reiterated that people want to maintain the character of the village. The council propose to take two fields, either side of Upshot lane, out of the Green Belt to contribute to future housing need. A substantive response was produced by LDA, a leading planning company, which was financed by a local resident living at Pyrford Court. The council have received a total of 1700 comments; a large number of responses were received from the Pyrford area. There are shortcomings in the process which lead to the selection of the fields – the landscape and heritage setting of the fields was not sufficiently considered and the local school is not planned to increase in size.</p> <p>Current indications are that Woking BC will consider the responses to the Site Allocation and will produce a new Site Allocation DPD for consultation in the Spring (March/April) once they have considered all the responses. The new Allocation will be examined and has to be completed by December 2016.</p> <p>GC pointed out that a fighting fund will be required to continue to provide a robust response to the decisions the council take regarding the allocation of areas for housing.</p> <p>Question AG asked who will run the fighting fund? He emphasised that it will have to be kept distinct from the Forum whose role is to produce the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

		<p>Other questioners asked whether development would affect the value of our houses. It was asked who owned the land. MD explained that Burhill Golf and Leisure (BGL) were the landowners. He also warned that the help of a professional could cost £1000/day. TP stated that the Residents' Association should be involved in protecting the Green Belt. MD asked how many people were members of the Residents' Association and a show of hands showed everyone present to be members.</p>
MD	8	<p>Future of the Forum</p> <p>MD explained that once the Plan is finished and adopted the Forum needs to continue to exist in some form. It needs to be able to receive CIL money and therefore must continue to have a bank account and a committee.</p> <p>MD drew attention to the statement of options which everyone had a copy of. The options are to remain separate from the Residents' Association, to fold once the Plan is submitted to merge with one or all of the local Fora or to become part of the Residents' Association.</p> <p>IM explained that a new Plan will need to be produced at some point in the future and it would involve an enormous amount of effort to constitute a Forum again if this one was wound up.</p> <p>GG pointed out that if the Forum became part of the Residents' Association then manpower and costs of some functions, such as publicity, could be shared.</p> <p>MD asked if people might be willing to pay an extra amount added onto the RA subscription to fund the Forum. A show of hands showed there was willingness to do this.</p> <p>CG stated that the Forum should remain separate from the Residents' Association, so that the work of the Forum can be scrutinised by the Residents' Association. If the two bodies merge, the independent scrutiny would be lost.</p> <p>IM said he believed that until the Plan had been implemented and the role of the Forum post implementation had been decided, the Forum should not be acting as an action group.</p> <p>Several members felt that this discussion was taking place too early, but GG pointed out that WBC had already asked twice what thought we had given to the post implementation phase and how the Forum would then organise.</p> <p>Godfrey Chapples, chair of the three villages Residents' Association was invited to speak. He emphasised that any planning needs to deal with infrastructure and the flood risk before the building of houses is considered. He stressed that the Residents' Association will continue to deal with many issues including health, education and council tax.</p> <p>Penny Hoskyn of West Byfleet Forum was also asked to speak. She pointed out that W. Byfleet Forum has a different emphasis, in that Pyrford has a great deal of open countryside, whilst W. Byfleet is a commercial centre where several major projects are already underway, including Sheer House and West Hall, where there is a proposal to build a new private secondary school. W Byfleet also has a Health Centre with 30,000 patients.</p> <p>A show of hands was requested for the option of staying as we are. Approx 60% of the room voted for this.</p> <p>A show of hands showed that no-one was in favour of disbanding the Forum.</p> <p>Finally a show of hands was requested for the option of compromise – keeping the Forum but working with the RA. 80% of those present voted for this.</p>
	9	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>There being no other business, the Chairman thanked those attending and closed the meeting at 10:15.</p> <p>The raffle to raise funds was then drawn.</p>