

THURSLEY PARISH COUNCIL
Minutes of Meeting

Tuesday 4th April 2017 at 7.30 pm
Thursley Village Hall, Thursley

Attendees: Cllr J. Mendelssohn (Chair) Cllr S. Edwards
Cllr P. Hunter Cllr J. Luff Mrs E. Felton (Clerk)

Also attending were: Cllr D. Harmer (SCC) Cllr D. Else (WBC) Mrs N. Bates
Mr B. Welch Mr & Mrs Thorogood
Ms S. Langdale Ms G. Harvey
Mr N. Chandler (from 8.00 pm) Mr A. Froggatt (from 8.00 pm)

1.0 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Clerk reported that apologies had been received Cllr Jackie Malton, Cllr Tricia Horwood and Cllr John Swift who were absent due to personal commitments. These apologies were accepted by the Council.

2.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Peter Hunter declared an interest in agenda item 6) ii – WA/2017/0430

No other members disclosed any (a) Personal, (b) Prejudicial interests which they are required to disclose by section 94(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 and in accordance with The Parish Council (Model Code of Conduct) Order 2007.

3.0 APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the Parish Council meeting on 7th March 2017 were approved by the Council and signed by the Chairman.

4.0 MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES

(4.1) It was confirmed that the 'No Horse' signs had been erected. It was noted that a query had been received from a parishioner about whether these were a permanent fixture. Cllr Mendelssohn said that it was hoped that placement of the signs was a temporary arrangement and that they could be removed in due course. It was agreed to monitor the situation.

(4.2) It was noted that there had been recent communications from the Neighbourhood Watch Coordinators as the Surrey Police site was now working.

(4.3) Cllr Mendelssohn advised that he had spoken to the Surrey Hunt who advised that they were not able to publicise their activities following advice received from Surrey Police but he had been assured that Hunt Members were sensitive to users of the common during an event.

(4.4) Cllr Mendelssohn advised that the planned Triadventure event due to take place in June had been cancelled. The Clerk was asked to include an item on the agenda for the May meeting so that discussion could take place regarding commercial use of the recreation ground facilities.

5.0 COUNTY COUNCILLOR AND BOROUGH COUNCILLOR REPORTS

(5.1) It was agreed that Cllr David Else be allowed to take part in discussions regarding the Hindhead Hill Farm appeal which was included as a later agenda item.

(5.2) Cllr David Harmer advised that due to the forthcoming County Council elections on 4th May, the Council were in purdah.

(5.3) Cllr Harmer advised that following the budget agreement which took place in February, a Surrey Cabinet meeting had taken place to agree the distribution of the funding. He advised that some funding had been taken from reserves and cuts had been made in some areas. It was noted that discussions regarding the continuation of funds to support Highways work agreed by the Local Committees was ongoing.

6.0 PLANNING

(6.1) WA/2017/0356 – Old Post Office, Dye House Road, GU8 6QA
Erection of first floor extension and alterations including dormer windows following demolition of existing single storey rear extension, erection of front porch, construction of new vehicular access, front boundary wall and associated works.

Mr & Mrs Thorogood were invited to speak regarding their application. It was noted that they were keen to ensure that the building work complied with the Village Design Statement. They confirmed that the building materials would match the existing property and that the hedging would remain to limit visibility of the car parking area.

Following review of the plans it was resolved that the Parish Council had no comment regarding the application.

(6.2) WA/2017/0430 – Dell Cottage, Pitch Place, GU8 6QW
Installation of black cladding to rear extension

As per agenda item 2.0) Cllr Hunter did not participate in discussions regarding this item.

Cllr Mendelssohn advised that the retrospective application for consideration was for the addition of black cladding to the extension on the original dwelling. It was noted that the application was as a result of the Parish Council raising a concern with WBC and subsequent discussions which WBC had had with the homeowner.

Mr Brian Welch was invited to comment on the application prior to consideration by Councillors. He stated that the design of cladding on the garden studio had been drawn by the architects and replicated on the plans for the main dwelling. He advised that following discussion with WBC, he had been asked to submit a retrospective application in order to rectify the issue.

Discussion took place regarding the planning consultants' comments in documentation accompanying the application.

It was resolved that the Parish Council objected to the application.

The Clerk was asked to include a comment along with the objection that the Parish Council did not believe the cladding complied with the Village Design Statement in that it was not in keeping with the rural environment and does not confirm with the original application for the use of the same materials to the existing dwelling.

Mr & Mrs Thorogood and Mr Welch left the meeting at 8.05 pm.

The Planning Agenda item was suspended to allow for Public Question Time.

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Mr Nigel Chandler raised a question regarding the permanency of the 'No Horse' signs. Cllr Mendelssohn advised that discussion regarding this matter had taken place under the 'Matters Arising' agenda item. He advised that it was hoped that the siting of the signs was a temporary arrangement and that they could be removed in due course.

Mr Chandler also commented on the article in the Parish Magazine regarding the possible land swap arrangement with the Parish field. Cllr Mendelssohn explained that the purpose of the article was to prompt discussion so that a decision could be made based on parishioner feedback. Mr Chandler advised that he did not want the Parish field to be lost.

Discussion took place regarding the pressure on WBC and all local authorities to provide housing and the suggestion was that if the Parish Council were asked to identify suitable development sites, it would be better to have something to offer rather than other sites within the village.

Discussion took place regarding the site for the possible land swap being outside of the settlement area. It was noted that although Thursley does not appear to be vulnerable to development at the moment, this may change in the future. It was also noted that currently it is not possible to develop common land but planning laws may change in the future.

It was suggested that if the land swap should go ahead, then security of the site would need to be considered.

It was agreed that the topic would be highlighted at the Annual Assembly meeting to prompt further discussion and feedback so that the Parish Council could consider further at their May meeting.

Mrs Nicki Bates advised that the works to the recreation ground had been completed and that the new surface material was good. She suggested that it may be appropriate to replace the sign at the entrance. It was agreed to consider the wording of the sign at the next Parish Council meeting following discussion regarding the commercial use of the site.

A question was raised regarding strimming of the bank on the recreation ground. It was suggested that this work may have been undertaken as part of the Highways Localism works.

Discussion took place regarding the intimidating manner of sales people knocking on doors within the village. Cllr Edwards agreed to speak to Jacqueline Christmas to see if Trading Standards could offer advice or provide stickers to be adhered to properties. It was noted that door to door canvassing of this type should be reported to the Police.

End of Public Question Time

(6.3) Hindhead Hill Farm Appeal

It was noted that a recent Scoping Opinion for the site had identified that an EIA was not required.

An appeal for the site had been lodged at the beginning of March with comments due by 12th April 2017. It was noted that it had been agreed that written representations be made to avoid the costs associated with a formal hearing.

Mr Froggatt advised that discussions with planning lawyers had suggested that there had still been no effort by the applicant to address the issue of alternative sites or that very special circumstances exist. It was noted that the suggestion that the Longmoor site was being sold was inaccurate and that a dossier was being prepared which provided details of the alternative sites available to the applicant with landowners willing to discuss further if approached. It was also noted that the alternative sites provided much easier access arrangements and were not as close to residential properties.

Following discussion it was agreed that Cllr Hunter slightly amend the letter which he had drafted from the Parish Council, which had been sent to Councillors in advance of the meeting, so that it could be passed to the Clerk by the end of the week latest to ensure receipt by the Inspectorate prior to the deadline date for comments.

All Councillors were asked to encourage parishioners to comment even if they had commented to the original planning application.

Discussion took place regarding the stance of WBC Planning Officers who had originally recommended the application be approved but which was refused at Committee level. Cllr Else confirmed that he had spoken to the relevant WBC staff who were preparing a robust defence to the appeal.

Mr Froggatt, Mr Chandler, Ms Langdale and Ms Harvey left the meeting at 8.50 pm.

(6.4) Mathwall Site Visit

Cllr Mendelssohn advised that Mathwall Ltd had submitted a pre-planning application to WBC for development of the site and that following an invite from Mathwall representatives, Parish Councillors had met to discuss the plans on site during March. It was noted that Mathwall representatives had also consulted with neighbours and all appeared to be happy with the proposal.

The problems associated with the junction at the end of Old Portsmouth Road for vehicles accessing Dye House Road were discussed. It was noted that although white lines had been reinstated it was still a dangerous junction to navigate. Cllr Mendelssohn agreed to speak to Mathwall representatives to suggest that they may want to consider possible improvements to the junction as part of their formal planning application.

It was agreed that the Parish Council would consider any forthcoming planning applications for the site at the appropriate time.

(6.5) WBC Planning Service Review

Cllr Mendelssohn advised that following a recent review of WBC, Ransford Stewart had been appointed by them to undertake a review of the planning service so that an improvement plan could be prepared. He advised that as part of the review, a questionnaire had been sent to Parish Councils and other parties to request feedback to the service. Cllr Mendelssohn explained that at a recent meeting with Mr Stewart and Councillors from the other Western Villages Parish Councils, it was suggested that feedback from the survey was unlikely to be very informative but Councillors were asked to complete it if they wished to do so.

Cllr Mendelssohn advised that minutes from the recent meeting with Mr Stewart had been prepared and would be available in due course.

(6.6) Warren Park Access/Egress

Cllr Luff advised that a very useful meeting had taken place with representatives from Highways England, Cllr Jenny Else, Cllr David Harmer and Cllr Hunter at Warren Park the previous week to discuss the egress/access arrangements at the site. It was noted that WBC were not able to attend the meeting.

Highways England advised that they were in the process of undertaking a survey to determine vehicular access onto the A3 and that they would revert with recommendations upon completion of the project. It was noted that Cllr Hunter had prepared a letter to be sent to Highways England to request feedback.

Cllr Luff explained that there was some confusion regarding the number of additional homes on the site. **Cllr David Else agreed to speak to WBC to clarify the situation as to whether there would be a further three, eleven or fourteen new homes as it would be a material consideration when calculating the number of vehicles accessing the site.** It was agreed that it was important to understand so that an accurate number could be included in the survey on traffic levels being undertaken by Highways England.

Discussion took place regarding the cats eyes which had previously been installed and removed and subsequently reinstalled as they did not appear to be very reflective. Highways England planned to investigate further.

7.0 FINANCE

(7.1) The following financial overview for April was presented, duly authorised and the cheques for payment were approved and signed:

949	Surrey ALC Ltd	200.74	Annual subscription
950	Richard Bates	134.95	Mowing insurance
951	Mrs N. Bates	100.00	Parish Warden fee
952	E. Felton	286.60	Salary & Expenses
953	The Post Office	172.80	HMRC payment
TOTAL		£895.09	

(7.2) The Clerk reported that the Trustees of the Billmeir Trust had agreed to fund the purchase of a defibrillator unit for Pitch Place but the funds were yet to be received.

8.0 HIGHWAYS

(8.1) Discussion took place regarding a meeting which had taken place with Highways England and other interested parties on 3rd April regarding progress to resolve issues associated with closures of the Hindhead tunnel. It was noted that little progress had been made with regards improved signage but that some misleading signs which appeared to direct diverted traffic to Bowlhead Green had been removed.

It was agreed that although the Highways England do not have local knowledge, they are demonstrating co-operation and working to resolve the issues and that some progress has been made. It was agreed to wait until there is further communication from them (before the Annual Assembly meeting) prior to adopting a different approach.

(8.2) Discussion took place regarding the possibility of painting a speed limit on the road instead of requiring engineering works to enforce the limit. Cllr Harmer explained the process by which it was necessary to demonstrate an average speed limit in order for such works to be considered.

9.0 BOATS

Discussion took place regarding the poor condition of land close to the BOAT's. It was noted that unless there was a blockage on the BOAT, it was the responsibility of the land owner to make good the land. **The Clerk was asked to forward the photos which had been provided to show the deterioration to the Head of Countryside at SCC.**

10.0 RECREATION GROUND

It was noted that the works to improve the track were complete. Further discussion regarding the commercial use of the facility would take place at the May Parish Council meeting.

11.0 THURSLEY VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT

Cllr Edwards confirmed that a draft appendix had been prepared by Cllr Swift. **Cllr Hunter agreed to feedback his comments to Cllr Swift by 14th April so that a final draft version could be made available for discussion at the Annual Assembly meeting.**

12.0 WESTERN VILLAGES PARISH COUNCIL MEETING WITH WBC PLANNING SERVICES

Cllr Mendelssohn advised that following a recent meeting of representatives of the Western Villages Parish Councils, a subsequent meeting had taken place with Elizabeth Sims and Peter Cleveland from the WBC Planning Services department. He advised that it was a very informative meeting and Parish Councillors had had the opportunity to discuss their frustrations with Mrs Sims and Mr Cleveland. As a result of the meeting it was hoped that there would be improved communications and information made available. Draft minutes of the meeting would be available in due course.

13.0 HAMMER POND

Cllr Mendelssohn reported that he had spoken with Natural England who advised that a report had been prepared to outline the options to reinstate Hammer Pond and that this was due to be considered by the Senior Leadership Team next week.

He advised that as there was no consultation on the option to be agreed, he had asked that the SLT be made aware of the extent of local feeling for the need to reinstate and maintain the historic pond.

Discussion took place regarding the flooding of Warren Mere and the implications to the homeowner.

14.0 PARISH FIELD

See Public Question Time above.

15.0 ANNUAL ASSEMBLY

Cllr Edwards confirmed that the Army representatives had confirmed their attendance and been asked to speak for twenty minutes maximum. It was agreed that following their presentation would be followed by village organisations who would be given five minutes each and then Cllr Mendelssohn would give his annual report.

Cllr Edwards agreed to speak to the History Society to see if their projector would be available for use.

16.0 HELP IN THURSLEY

Cllr Hunter asked the Parish Council to confirm their previous offer of £250 from the 2016-17 budget towards the cost of DBS checks for volunteers involved in the process. This was confirmed.

17.0 THREE HORSESHOES

Cllr Mendelssohn reported that he had been approached by the Manager of the public house to discuss their plans to redesign the access/egress arrangements. Following discussion it was agreed that the Parish Council would have no objection to the pub erecting a temporary structure at the front of the pub on the understanding that it could be moved if necessary for a village event or something similar. Councillor Harmer indicated that planning permission would not be needed for a temporary structure.

18.0 CORRESPONDENCE

The Clerk advised that the Village Hall Committee had asked the Parish Council to reconfirm their support for them to approach SCC for funding. The Parish Council support for a funding application to SCC was confirmed. **The Clerk was asked to contact Cllr Harmer to ascertain the status of funding availability for 2017-18.**

19.0 MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION AT NEXT MEETING

- Items carried forward from above.

The meeting closed at 10.15 pm

Date of next meeting is Tuesday 2nd May 2017 at 7.30 pm.

Signed

2nd May 2017

