

## **ONF SC Meeting 10th Oct 2024 – Ottershaw VH 7.00pm**

# **MINUTES**

**Those present:** Nigel Eastment, Gemma Pickett, Bob Oliver, Julie Last.

**Apologies:** Hannah Lane, Thomas Gundacker, Jane Tilley, Brian Williams.

**Minutes of the previous meeting.** Approved. There were no matters arising not covered in the Agenda.

**Councillor Update (when in attendance) : Cllr Mann.** n/a

**Neighbourhood Plan: BO**

**CPP Update/poss Impacts of new planning laws. ONF strategy.**

JT had attended the Community Planning Panel and circulated very useful overview on WhatsApp. Focus was the 70+ Questions from central government. RBC's reply had now been sent and was awaiting a response. Main focus is on housing supply – 638 pa for RBC. A new method is to be introduced to calculate supply requirements. A 4 year rolling supply is required, managed separately from LP. The housing supply is now reviewed annually and measured on actual completions rather than predicted numbers.

If target is not achieved, the presumption to develop will be enforced. Runnymede's current housing supply runs out in c18 months.

RBC confirmed they do not have enough non-GB land, some 'Grey/Green Belt' will have to be used for development.

BO thinks Ottershaw will be targeted, anything within 200 meters of the village will be at risk and a focus upon land already identified in the SLAA.

RBC had also briefed on CIL status and issues. (see AOB)

Final answers on LP planning will not be until Spring 2025.

We have options. Sit back and hope our design codes offer protection, OR identify all sites and prioritise our preferred order of development. The consensus was on being proactive to ensure we have more control over which sites and what type of

development would be preferred. It would also allow the community to have a bigger say in what infrastructure should accompany it and where.

BO stated that there was only limited time for us to do this work (months) and a course of action for making official would also have to be determined.

JL, we need to consult with the membership and our wider community on this topic. We need to decide on the process to do this.

GP proposed that workshop sessions should be conducted to elicit opinion.

It was agreed that we should keep it in layman's terms and keep it simple. This could include where you could locate, schools, transport facilities, commercial etc in the future.

NE suggested that we may benefit from advice from other RAs/Forums who had addressed the site issue. Cllr Gill (TWRA) was a possible option. It was agreed we should not have council support.

BO suggested that outcomes from workshops should be publicised more widely for the community in order to ensure we inform the community as widely as possible.

**ACTION:** GP to produce a brief outline of how community consultation on Ottershaw's future can best be achieved.

**Spatial Vision.** BO stated that this should be updated to reflect all areas for potential development. Some elements could be used in the workshops.

**Design Code Status.** BO is reviewing our Design Code and is currently about 75%. AECOM are now on contract to support/lead on this (same team) and BO has provided a status to them stating potentially 6 weeks before commencement. JT also to be involved in the DC work.

**Plan Review working party.** JL, JT and BO are making progress. It has been difficult, but has to be done. JT's draft is reduced, but opinion is it still needs more refinement/reduction focussing upon the policies and the justifications. It needs to be an easily useable document for developers and planners. The next working party would be immediately prior to the next SC.

**Info to Members and wider community.** Agreed we need to draft the next note. Options for our draft plan and how the change of government will impact Ottershaw – what do members/residents want?

**ACTION: BO to check what has been published to date.**

AFTERNOTE: Initial info published in August 24. We should now publish the council's response together with any additional information from CPP. ONF should present its perspective on this and possible consequences.

**Communications/Publicity/Social Media: JL/GP**

**JL – Business Survey:**

JL has been distributing questionnaires and trying to get them completed. 17 distributed so far. One or two completed received.

It was agreed we should post the Questionnaire as a Word version on website with a blog, so we can reach as many businesses as possible. This should also be included in newsletter to membership and FB page.

**ACTION:** JL to produce a word version and contact the ONF registered businesses.

### **Planning Apps: JL**

**RU.24/1208. Bungalow at St Merryn's Copse, Chobham Rd.** No specific action identified for the PA. It was general opinion that with an annual review process, windfall sites such as this will be counted in future housing allocation completion numbers.

**66 Brox Rd (UK Site Hoardings).** BO. Now 5 months since planning approval rejection. The case was passed to enforcement 2 months ago. No action evident on-site. BO had contacted RBC planning (Ruth Menezes) regarding status and awaited a response.

**Broxborough Pk. HIF dependency.** BO has not found any dependency of OE on the HIF.

**ACTION:** NE try to find emails on the dependency of development on the A320.

**Field Nursery.** BO, interesting Facebook exchanges. The use of Hawthorn Road and resident dissatisfaction is a fault of the planners.

NE. Can we link with the new residents in Hawthorn Road. It was generally felt this would be a positive move.

**Brockhurst.** BO has read the newly published meeting minutes and the associated planning conditions. Outline approval has been granted. There is no record of the re-addressing of the fenestration/balcony design issue being considered prior to full case submission.

**ACTION:** JL to review the video, take a copy and confirm whether we have an issue to address with SCC.

**Web/IT: TG/BO** Nothing to report.

**Finance: Bob** Nothing to Report.

### **AOB:**

**CIL Allocations by RBC – please review documents as per Bob's email 9<sup>th</sup> Oct.**

BO confirmed we have £371,000 community CIL allocation. He has asked RBC to confirm, what development(s) it is resultant from, other developments and the time frame for

spend. Our draft plan includes a process for engagement and management of community CIL.

JL suggested a Skate Park/BMX track with a review of existing Memorial Field facilities. Agreed we should discuss with Cllr Mann, and consider Palmers Crescent. BO confirmed that one of our major gaps was for older children's activities. We need to check RBCs plans to ensure we are focussing on gaps.

Is the Scout Hut an underused facility?

**ACTION: BO to raise with Cllr Mann.**

**RBC Climate change SPD.** BO reported has now been approved and published.

**Hare Hill SANG.** BO still nothing more back from RBC on SANG, Local Nature Reserve status. BO provided some background and status. He suggested we should soon be considering writing to RBC directly given the many uncertainties and risks.

**ACTION: NE try to open conversation with SANG warden via OWARA contacts.**

**Highways update.** Nothing more from SCC/Project Team. Still no allocation of resource for our case from the Ombudsman.

**Malcolm Cressey.** JL to draft a brief note for the website.

**ACTION: JL**

**Fairoaks Hangar.** NE reported the helicopter hangar on the airfield initially planned for Spring24 had not been started.

**Fairoaks Temporary Studios.** Accommodation reached with the airfield, who would now not object to revised plans. Watching brief.

The meeting closed at 21:30 hrs

**Meeting dates booked for R Room VH :**

**Oct 24<sup>th</sup>**

**Nov 7<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> November**