

Ashtead Neighbourhood Forum
Minutes of the Meeting held on Saturday 17th May 2014

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JL asked for the new sentence ‘However, the majority of comments received and the conclusions for each site are largely against development’ to omit the word ‘largely’. This was agreed. 	TT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attention then turned to the diagram showing the results of the consultation relating to each site. It was explained that the table was produced to show the strength of feeling of each ward to the various sites. A long discussion revealed the feelings for and against the final two columns and their use and significance. Following a vote the majority asked for the two columns to be removed. 	TT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JL voiced his disagreement with the final sentence above the ‘General Conclusion’ section. 	TT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the heading ‘General Conclusion’s two amendments were asked for: In the opening sentence the word ‘significant ‘ is to be taken out and the words ‘considered on these sites’ should follow the word ‘development. In the penultimate bullet point the final sentence should read ‘New development on these sites’ will not provide etc... 	TT
<p><u>b) Changes Arising from the Consultations</u></p>	
<p>TT then ran through each of the SAs in turn and the following changes were agreed:</p>	
<p><u>AS03</u></p>	
<p>Page 2. Under ‘Access and Travel Issues’ regarding the footpath, it should say “this issue’ following the word ‘remedying’.</p>	TT
<p>Page 4. Regarding Epsom and Ewell it should state that the Council Officers put forward a report to the council on 10th April 2014 objecting to development on relevant neighbouring SAs being assessed by ACV. Their objections had since been agreed to by the council. Wording explaining this is to be added to each SA in Area J.</p>	TT
<p><u>AS11</u></p>	
<p>Page 9. DH proposed that the final key consideration should be turned around to read as follows:</p>	TT
<p>‘Local infrastructure would be put under considerable strain and needs to be addressed first if the number of homes on this site can deliver was developed’.</p>	
<p><u>AS12</u></p>	
<p>Page 8. The final conclusion to be changed as above.</p>	TT
<p>Page 9. The word ‘and’ is missing against ‘Available’: Subject to clarification regarding access <u>and</u> any covenants on the site.</p>	TT
<p><u>AS14</u></p>	
<p>Page 8. The heading ‘Conclusion’ to be changed to ‘Site Assessment Summary’.</p>	TT
<p>All other changes made to the SAs were approved by the Forum.</p>	
<p>DH acknowledged all the hard work of ACV that had gone into producing the reports.</p>	TT
<p>TT reported that once the reports have been amended they will be sent to MVDC to be included in their Housing and Traveller Site Plan.</p>	TT

Ashtead Neighbourhood Forum
Minutes of the Meeting held on Saturday 17th May 2014

<p>5. Next Steps</p> <p><u>a) NDP Timeline</u></p> <p>TT ran through the NDP timeline as originally published and pointed out the differences. Whereas the MVDC draft Housing and Traveller Site plan was to be published to receive comments between October and December 2014 this has now been moved back to January 2015. This in turn means that the report itself won't be published until January 2016 at which point the Ashtead NDP can then be published and not before.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was asked what would happen in the meantime if a developer approached MVDC with a possible site. JSm replied that as long as the government keeps to its policy the application would be turned down. Once the draft plan has been published and if the application were to fall within a possible allowed site then it might be viewed with a slightly different approach. • TT explained that ACV would now be continuing with their initial task of producing an NDP. At the next meeting the group would consider what still had to be achieved and create a timeline showing when the work would be undertaken and by what date. • JM pointed out the ACV had still to put on paper its vision for the future of the village. <p><u>b) Interested Groups</u></p> <p>The Forum is to be asked to name the groups in the village with which they are connected and by whom information could possibly be circulated within in the future. An email is to be sent to all members asking for this information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After the meeting DH suggested that ACV contact the Leatherhead Historical Society, who maintain an archive of information about Ashtead. 	<p>ACV</p> <p>ACV</p> <p>TT</p>
<p>6. AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JB asked for helpers on the Ashtead Community Vision Stall on Village Day. Any who are able to help on the stall for an hour should contact JB or DS who will forward the message. • PDH announced that he had approached the MVDC Tree Officer regarding Protection Orders on trees which he would like to see safeguarded for the future. He had been told by the officer that he was not able to issue such an order unless the trees were at imminent risk from development. JSm explained that the officer was working according to the policy of MVDC. 	<p>ALL</p>
<p>7. Dates of the Next Forum Meetings</p> <p>The dates of the next Forum meetings are as follows: 9th August and 8th November.</p>	<p>ALL</p>