

## Ashtead Neighbourhood Forum

### Minutes of the Meeting held on Saturday November 14th 2015

<b>Place</b>	The Ralli Room, Ashtead Peace Memorial Hall 10.00 - 12.00 pm
<b>Present</b>	Jean Bradley, Ray Cane (RC), Gordon Chilton, Tony Cooper (TC), Andy Ellis (AE), Roy Guy (RG), Paula Hancock (PH), Paul Hancock, David Harper (DH), David Hawksworth (PDH), Nigel Herbert (NH Elizabeth Hrywniak, John Longstaff (JL), John Morgan (JM), Allan Mornement (AM), Glynis Peterkin (GP), Marie Pigden, Peter Smith, Sue Stansfield (SS), Di Stirling (DS), Alex Tombs (AT), Chris Townsend (CT), Tony Tuley, Pam Ventham-Smith (PV-S), Sofia Welsby (SW) and Patricia Wiltshire (PW)
<b>In attendance</b>	Jane Smith (JS) MVDC
<b>Apologies</b>	Mary Cooper (MC), Mark Everett, Kate Henderson, James Millar Craig,
<b>Non attendees</b>	Bob Cane,

Topic	Action
<p><b>1, 2 and 3 Introduction and Minutes of the Last Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The apologies were read out.</li> <li>• The minutes of the October meeting were agreed and signed and it was stated that all the action points would be addressed and confirmed as part of the review of the remaining policies.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4.</b> No alternative names had been put forward for the posts of Chairman and Secretary and it was agreed that TT and DS would continue to perform these duties.</p>	
<p><b>5. Infrastructure Policies and CIL List</b></p> <p>AS-lfn1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first policy makes reference to CS 17 of the MVDC Core Strategy. JS explained that this states “The Council will resist the loss of key services and facilities (including community facilities), unless an appropriate alternative is provided or, evidence is presented that the facility is no longer required and suitable alternative uses have been considered. This will require the developer to provide evidence that they have consulted with an appropriate range of service providers and the community where relevant”.</li> <li>• The Cricket Pavilion on Ottways Lane was put forward to be added to the asset list.</li> <li>• DH asked if carparks could be listed as an asset. After a short discussion it was agreed that the APMH, Grove Road and station carparks should be added. In the case of those attached to the churches they are to be added to the names of the specific churches.</li> <li>• It was asked if there could be a formula to safeguard the parking if the church wished to expand. JS thought that it would need a very careful balancing act to secure them.</li> </ul> <p>AS-Inf2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The words “if possible” are to be taken out.</li> </ul> <p>AS-Inf3</p>	<p><b>JL</b></p> <p><b>TT</b></p>

## Ashtead Neighbourhood Forum

### Minutes of the Meeting held on Saturday November 14th 2015

Topic	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH was concerned if care facilities were proposed north of the railway line because of difficulty with the level crossing. GP pointed out that the policy referred to 'primary care' not care homes.</li> </ul>	TT
AS-Inf4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was pointed out that there is no obvious space for new sports and recreation facilities within the built up area of the village. Outdoor sports pitches are already acceptable so there is no need for the policy.</li> </ul>	TT
CIL Projects	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The creation of a pedestrian crossing on the A24 had been added to the CIL list since the last meeting and following a short discussion about the possible safe location. CT advised that someone had set up a petition to request one. Once sufficient support for such a crossing is shown it should be sent to SCC to consider.</li> </ul>	TT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The suggested pedestrian crossing at the library was thought unnecessary.</li> </ul>	JL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JS advised against putting anything on the CIL list that didn't have sufficient support.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RG asked how the Ashtead Forum list matched with the MVDC's list of plans being requested. JS said that she didn't know but would look into it.</li> </ul>	JS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After a short discussion it was agreed that the request for cycle racks would be taken out. It is also to be taken out of the transport section of the report.</li> </ul>	TT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH expressed his concern about the state of the footbridge over the railway line linking Woodfield and Links Road. CT replied that Network Rail was aware of the problem and should be dealing with it.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6. Economy Policies</b></p> <p>At the last meeting it was asked whether Ashtead Village Club should be included in the list of village assets. PV-S was able to report that it was a private club and only for the use of the members and only members could hire the rooms for events.</p>	
<p><b>7. Environment Policies</b></p> <p>The proposed new wording of A-En 1 was accepted but the final word "village" is to be replaced with 'Ashtead Neighbourhood Boundary' ( See Appendix 1)</p>	TT

## Ashtead Neighbourhood Forum

### Minutes of the Meeting held on Saturday November 14th 2015

Topic	Action
<p><b>8.NDP</b></p> <p>TT showed a timeline of the progress of the NDP and said that he was concerned that the process was falling behind. JS stated that she would like colleagues at MVDC look at the document before it goes out for consultation. The alternative would be for MVDC look at it at the same time as the village as part of the public consultation. TT said that if the meeting wished to approve the document before it goes out it could delay the process by a couple of months. A second draft NDP could be sent out by the end of next week.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PV-S commented that, as it stands, the document didn't hold together. It read like four or five different linked documents.</li> <li>• PW raised the necessity for the inclusion and proposed nature of cycling provision in the report. JS advised that if it is needed, leave it in. The Forum doesn't have to know how a problem can be solved before including it.</li> <li>• In the case of CIL money being used for cycling or any project, MVDC would consult Ashtead Residents' Association so that the money wouldn't be wasted.</li> <li>• It was asked of the CIL projects should be prioritised and it was thought not. It was suggested rather than being numbered they should have bullet points.</li> </ul>	<p>TT</p>
<p><b>9. Off Street Parking</b></p> <p>AE thanked SS for her comments regarding the parking situation at Parsons Mead that he had reported on. As a resident, EH was able to add further information as to the use of the parking spaces which suggested that a lack of flexibility in the system left certain residents' spaces unused whilst other residents were forced to park in the road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was put forward that stating a number of spaces per residence was not enough. The system needed a formula such as residents' parking permits. This was not thought to be the answer.</li> <li>• DH, who is concerned with the lack of adequate parking provision at the proposed Churchill development on the A24 suggested that retirement developments should adopt a car-share policy or car club to be run by the resident warden. This of course would need to be negotiated with the developers.</li> <li>• CT put forward that the policy should include provision for both situations.</li> <li>• Following the fairly lengthy discussion, AE suggested that the policy for larger developments should be based on the SCC guidance for suburban spaces ie 1-2 bed flats = 1 space per unit, 1-2 bed houses = 1+ spaces per unit, 3 bed houses = 2+ spaces per unit, 4+ bed houses = 2+ spaces per unit. These numbers are to be added to the draft policy as seen.</li> </ul>	<p>TT</p> <p>TT</p>
<p><b>10. Dates for the 2016 meetings at APMH are as follows:</b></p> <p>12<sup>th</sup> March, 21<sup>st</sup> May, 10<sup>th</sup> September and 12 November</p>	<p>ALL</p>