

## HEADLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 31<sup>st</sup> July 2017

### **Present:**

Cllr. David Preedy (Chairman)

Cllr. Jon Laverty

Cllr. Suzanne Lewis (part time)

Cllr. Erin Sheridan (part time)

Cllr. Vivienne Williams

Cllr. Paul Furr

District Councillor Ladell

Clerk Tracy Hamer

### **1. MVDC PRESENTATION – FUTURE MOLE VALLEY**

Guy Davies, Planning Policy Manager for Mole Valley District Council, attended the meeting to explain the consultation in full detail. The complete presentation can be found at [www.futuremolevalley.org](http://www.futuremolevalley.org). Twenty-four members of the public were in attendance and a question and answer session followed the presentation.

### **2. CHURCH LANE NURSERY SITE**

Cllr. Preedy explained the background to the situation concerning the land on the old Church Lane Nursery Site. There is a proposal for a new scheme of homes to be built on the site and the landowners have new advisors who Cllr. Preedy has met with recently to discuss any prospective plans. Cllr. Preedy gave reassurance that any scheme would be presented via an Open Forum before Headley Parish Council would offer any support or agreement. A new assessment of housing needs is required, especially in light of the uncertainty of the situation regarding Headley Court. Agreement to commence the assessment and to sign the proposed Memorandum of Understanding proposed by Cllr. Laverty and seconded by Cllr. Sheridan.

**Cllr. Preedy to action.**

### **3. APOLOGIES**

Cllr. Jane Pickard

### **3. OPEN PUBLIC FORUM**

Cllr. Preedy explained areas of concern for Headley in direct relation to the Future Mole Valley Plan as follows. The following points will be submitted to MVDC in response to the public consultation:

#### *1. Basis for overall housing demand figures.*

There is a detailed paper which outlines the approach used (in conjunction with Elmbridge, Epsom & Ewell & Kingston) to reach an overall housing demand figures. Whilst Mole Valley is assumed to have a ‘gradually increasing decline in population’ there is still found to be a demand over the 15 years for 5,900 new dwellings in Mole Valley. Doubtless some of this will be for people taking up work in Mole Valley; however, there is concern that Mole Valley may be being asked merely to compensate for overspill from other areas.

2. *Estimated supply from Brownfield sites.*

In assuming that all the proposed sites (including Headley Court) are acceptable for development, the Plan appears to prejudice planning decisions that may be taken. In the case of Headley Court with its complex planning restrictions and history, this would seem to be premature and dangerous.

3. *Lack of infrastructure.*

Applying a 'brownfield first' policy may force residential development into locations which lack the necessary infrastructure or be otherwise unsuitable. In the case of Headley Court, Headley is currently regarded as a 'smaller settlement' where any form of infill development is unacceptable; the proposed scale of development on Headley Court (90 new dwellings) would completely conflict with its current status.

4. *Accessibility.*

This is an important issue but the map on P10 of the main document is over-simplistic; it takes no account of the frequency of public transport (and hence the likely associated waiting times). Moreover, the time chosen (8am-9am) is absolutely right for school access but not for rail commuters, most of whom would be going to London and need to leave earlier; likewise they need a 'late-ish' bus home from the station after work. This overstates the accessibility of Headley to railways for commuters.

5. *Type of housing required.*

The profile of those forming the new demand for housing should be a key factor in determining the best locations for new housing. For example, if the predominance is for commuting to London, then good access to railway stations should be key; if it is young adults leaving home, then probably town-centre flats may be appropriate, etc.

6. *Headley Court as a brownfield site.*

- There is concern that large figures for potential new dwellings are included without any local consultation especially given the complex planning history of the site. This sets an expectation and appears to pre-judge any planning decisions.
- The inclusion of 'hard-standing areas' as developable, since this presumably would include the new car park – development here would markedly affect the open-ness of the Green Belt.
- Development on the scale proposed conflicts with the current policy of avoiding development in smaller settlements without the requisite infrastructure.
- The current bus service (infrequent with no evening or Sunday service) will oblige residents to have private transport, placing more stress on the narrow local roads;
- The Drive is a private road and as such cannot be regarded as an access route; the owners have the right to close it and have recently installed a gate to allow them to do this.
- Consideration should be given to the unique national priorities at the time when many of the planning permissions were granted – notable the most recent 2 blocks at the Northern end of the site; without the pressing national need, these would never have been granted and the local community expects them to be removed now that they no longer will serve the national need.

*7. Other Headley-specific issues:*

*a. Infrastructure.*

Headley's current status as a "smaller settlement" reflects the poor accessibility and limited services in the community. Notably the 65 properties in Dale View and Cunliffe Close do not generate commuting traffic (other than school-children) as they house people who walk to work. Therefore even the conversion of the existing dwellings to non-service accommodation will create more traffic, placing more demands on local roads.

*b. Village character.*

Whilst the document points out the need to recognise town-centre conservation areas, it does not do the same for villages. It recognises the landscape character, but should also pay regard to village character. In the case of Headley the village centre is characterised by the open countryside coming right to the heart of the village and policies should be put in place to preserve this key characteristic of the village.

*c. Strategic Noise Assessment*

This appears to pre-select 3 areas adjoining the M25 for potential development. Even when the study finds that the noise levels are unacceptably high, the document proceeds to assess how buildings could be adapted to allow development on these locations. One of these sites is between Leatherhead and Headley and this would mark a major loss of Green Belt separation of the communities – especially if significant development is permitted at Headley Court. It is concerning that this option appears to be under consideration without any consultation. A pre-condition for any development close to the M25 should be the installation of low-noise surfacing on the M25.

*d. Traffic capacity.*

Any assessment of road capacity should take account of the extensive use of the roads in the area for cycling and equestrianism.

There was broad consensus that these were the key points to be raised at this stage in response to the consultation.

**4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

**5. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING**

Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2017 proposed by Cllr. Lavery and seconded by Cllr. Williams. Also of 6<sup>th</sup> June 2017 proposed by Cllr. Preedy and seconded by Cllr. Lavery. Agreed unanimously.

**6. MATTERS ARISING**

**Fundraising for new ramp at Village Store** – In the absence of Cllr. Pickard, Cllr. Preedy explained that fundraising efforts are still ongoing but are unlikely to reach the full amount required. After viewing the current Financial Position of the Parish Council, it was suggested that any shortfall up to the amount of £1,000 would be provided by Headley Parish Council. Proposed by Cllr. Sheridan and seconded by Cllr. Furr and unanimously agreed.

**Strimming contract** – The current 3 years strimming contract currently agreed with NJ Birch Garden Services comes to an end this year. The Parish Council will ask for 3 companies to tender for a new contract. Cllr. Preedy suggested that within the new contract, a new requirement be added to clear the mud from the footpath on the eastern side of Church Lane. New contracts to be reviewed at the September HPC meeting.

**TH to action.**

**Changes to Rural Cutting services provided by MVDC** - Cllr. Preedy explained that MVDC are requesting that Parish Councils now pay for one rural cut per year due to funding cuts. The potential cost to Headley Parish Council would be £500 per annum. As it is unclear of the actual impact due to the loss of one cut and the difficulty identifying National Trust land which is exempt from the cuts, Cllr. Williams suggested reviewing the situation in September 2018 to measure any impact and decide whether HPC should therefore fund an extra cut.

**Cllr. Preedy to feedback to MVDC.**

**Traffic Calming Schemes** – Tracy Hamer explained that as yet no further information has been made available from the Clerk at Charlwood Parish Council regarding potential extra traffic calming schemes and will report back again in due course.

## FINANCE

i) The Financial Statement was reviewed. The following items were noted:

- An amount of £36 from May 2016 (a cheque which has not been presented for payment by the payee) has been cancelled and re-issued.
- Cllr. Furr reported that the new playground netting is now in place and will forward all related invoices to the Clerk for payment. Headley Parish Council formally thanked Cllr. Furr for his help in completing the work.

ii) Cllr. Laverty reported that he had checked the reconciliation of the bank accounts dated 13<sup>th</sup> June 2017 on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2017.

### Payments

The Clerk reported the following payments had been made since the last meeting:

Date	Cheque No.	Payee	Service	Amount
16/06/17	647	NJ Birch	Strimming	858.00
16/06/17	649	NJ Birch	Strimming	186.00
16/06/17	650	NJ Birch	Strimming	186.00
20/06/17	Direct Debit	Surrey Community Action	Clerk's June Salary	336.80
07/07/17	651	MVDC	Playgroud rent	50.00
20/07/17	Direct Debit	Surrey Community Action	Clerk's July Salary	336.80

The Clerk requested approval for the following payments:

Date	Cheque No.	Payee	Service	Amount
31/07/17	652	Headley Village Hall	July PC Meeting Village Hall Hire	36.00
31/07/17	653	Headley Village Stores	July PC Meeting Tea/Coffee	12.00
31/07/17	654	Tracy Hamer	June/July 2017 Clerks Expenses	122.70
31/07/17	655	Headley Village Hall	May 2016 Village Hall Hire – re-issued cheque	36.00
31/07/17	656	SSALC	New Clerks Training	90.00
31/07/17	657	NJ Birch	July Strimming	186.00

Approval for the above expenditure was agreed - proposed by Cllr. Preedy and seconded by Cllr. Lavery.

## 7. MAINTENANCE

### i) Playground

- Netting: This is now complete.

### ii) Footpaths

Cllr. Lavery to provide the Clerk with details of land owners regarding the hedges which currently restricts the access via the Tar Path.

**TH to action.**

### iii) Highways

Cllr Furr commented on the potential danger of the junction between Pebble Hill and Headley Common Road. It was decided to contact the other 2 local authorities concerned and proposing they collaborate on a long-term plan to improve the junction.

**Cllr. Preedy to action.**

## 8. HEADLEY COURT

Cllr. Preedy and District Councillor Ladell are due to meet with Tony Stables, chairman of the Headley Court Charity, for an update. Cllr. Preedy will brief the other Councillors on the result of the meeting.

## 9. PLANNING

There is widespread concern regarding the application at Villans Wyk (MO/2017/1072/OUT). Several members of the community stayed at the meeting to discuss this in more detail. Cllr. Preedy explained that Headley Parish Council has already submitted a response to MVDC which reflects the feelings of local residents. A decision is expected by 21st August 2017.

**MO/2017/0985/PLAH** – The Nower, Tilley Lane, Headley KT18 6EE – Erection of side extension with accommodation in roof space and two roof lights to front and rear roof elevations.

**MO/2017/0978/PLAH** – The Holme, Clay Lane, Leatherhead KT18 6JS – Demolition of single storey additions and outbuildings, and erection of single and two storey extensions and detached double garage.

**MO/2017/1072/OUT** – Villans Wyk, Church Lane, Headley KT18 6LX – Outline planning application with some matters reserved, for consideration of access and layout in respect of erection of one 2 storey detached house and garage block at rear of Villans Wyk.

**Decisions considered between meetings:**

**MO/2017/0631/PCL** – Old Court, The Drive, Leatherhead KT22 8QW – Proposed certificate of law-fulness in respect of construction of detached leisure building and indoor swimming pool. Refused.

**MO/2017/0633/PCL** – Old Court, The Drive, Leatherhead KT22 8QW – Certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development in respect of the erection of a single storey gym and garden room. Refused.

**MO/2017/1008** – Oyster Hill Forge, Clay Lane, Headley KT18 6JX – Remove large limb overhang-ing building from horse chestnut tree and reduce overhang by 1.5 metres. Reduce back overhang of two sycamore trees by 1.5 metres. Approved with conditions.

**MO/2017/0521/PLA** – Woodstock, Tot Hill, Headley KT18 6PU – AMENDED PLANS: Erection of one dwelling with associated parking following demolition of existing commercial buildings. Approved with conditions.

**9. OTHER PARISH COUNCIL ACTIVITIES**

None to be discussed.

**10. CONSULTATIONS**

None to be discussed.

**11. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

Closure of Community Recycling Centres – Concern was raised with the potential rise of fly-tipping should the reduction of services go ahead. Headley Parish Council will submit a response outlining these concerns. **Cllr. Preedy to action.**

The meeting closed at 10:15pm.

The next meeting will be held on Monday 25<sup>th</sup> September 2017 at 7:30pm in the Village Hall

Signed.....Chairman

Dated.....