

**Minutes from a Meeting of Tatsfield Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held on Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> July 2018, commencing at 20:00 at the Parish Room, Aileen McHugo Building, Westmore Green, Tatsfield**

Present: Martin Allen (MA) – in the Chair, James Barker (JB), Nichola Stokoe (NS), Althea Davies (AD), Ian Mitchell (IM), Ruth Yeeles (RY), Paul Jackson (PJ), Sandy Philibert (SP), Mark Watts (MW), Mike Sarll (MS), Jim Yeeles (JY), Bob David (RD)

In attendance: Samantha Head (SH) – Parish Clerk

And 1 parishioner

The meeting commenced at 20:03

	Action
1. <b>Apologies</b> had been received from Jill Hancock (JH), James Garside (JG)*, Jon Allbutt (JA), Gillian Phillips (GP), Eddie Leeves (EL) and Sue Smale (SS). *James Garside had offered to be available, by email, between now and the next meeting to be held in September.	
2. No members present had anything to add to their Declaration of Interests.	
3. The <b>Minutes of the Meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> June 2018</b> were presented. By resolution, the Minutes were accepted and adopted as a true record of the meeting held on 7 <sup>th</sup> June 2018. The minutes would be passed to the Parish Council (PC) for acceptance at its next meeting.	
4. <b>Dropbox</b> – MA noted that JG had been able to make tracked changes to documents in Dropbox. This had led to some confusion. MA would remind JG to email comments and not make these tracked changes in future.	MA
5. <b>Communication Strategy</b> – JA had sent the following report: Media interest in the plan is poor. He was looking to make contact with BBC Surrey and local newspapers during July and August. JA believed that two further public meetings would be needed before the end of 2018. IM had put the agendas and minutes on the NP website. He confirmed that nothing else had been added and there was no ‘running commentary’. SP suggested that the updates placed in the Parish Magazine should also be put on the website and on Tatsfield Talk. The Scout Fete stall was manned by JA/NS/MS/PJ. Some comments had been received from the public. However, there was very little interest but this could be recorded as another evidence-based exercise (i.e. communication with the public). IM confirmed that no emails from parishioners had been received. PJ had received a letter from a resident in his road regarding restricting development of bungalows. PJ would redact the letter and circulate in due course. Updates on Tatsfield Talk (TT) - NS was requested to always post notices of NPSG meetings. JA had agreed to forward updates for TT to NS.	JA        PJ   NS JA
6. <b>Admin and GDPR</b>	ALL

<p>Reminder from JH - Remember when uploading amended documents to Dropbox, to delete old copies. Dropbox should only hold the most recent version. It was suggested all documents be filed as reduced size PDF.</p> <p><b>GDPR</b> – AD had circulated a footer for NP emails. The wording (GDPR compliant) had been agreed for the surveys. AD had to make amendments and would circulate to all NPSG members. RY would put in Dropbox.</p> <p><b>Logo</b> – the invoice had been received on 25/07/18.  <b>NP/001/0718</b> It was resolved to accept the invoice for £360.00. This was agreed by all members present.</p> <p><b>Grant funds</b> – The Parish Clerk updated members on the process for payments. The grant monies received from Groundworks UK would be held in a PC bank account (administered by cheque book but with no online banking facility) but kept entirely separate from PC monies. Invoices should be itemised on the agenda for NP meetings to be approved by members.  This should then be passed up to the Parish Clerk to be duly authorised at a PC meeting as per PC procedure and regulations.  The Parish Clerk would update JH monthly regarding the remaining balance of NP grant monies.</p> <p>JG invoice – this was agreed by members present but would need to be ratified retrospectively at the next meeting (in September).</p> <p>MA read through the breakdown of grant monies. SP questioned whether unused funds from one area could be spent on another. The Clerk advised that this was outside of the conditions stipulated by the provider but advised that if this situation arose, a request could be made to Groundworks UK.</p>	<p>AD</p> <p>RY</p>
--	---------------------

**7. Update of Topic Groups:**

**The NP Chairman chose to defer item a) Housing/ Planning until  
The other 5 topic groups had been discussed.**

**b. Topic Group 2 – Community Facilities**

The group met on 24/07/18. Several new parishioners attended. Transport was discussed and several suggestions were offered: a shopping bus, assistance with online shopping, local delivery from the new shop for those unable to get about easily. A footpath to the church was also mentioned.

Therefore, some amendments /additions are needed to the topic paper.

NPSG members questioned whether the introduction of a shopping bus be detrimental to the future of the village shop.

**c. Topic Group 3 - Local Economy**

The business survey is as per the version in Dropbox. Planning to send as an email (to all contacts currently held on file) in early September. SS to change the GDPR message to incorporate new GDPR regulations.

It was agreed that this would be further reviewed and agreed at the September meeting.

**d. Topic Group 4 – Built Environment**

MA commented that PJ had produced an excellent article for the Parish Magazine. PJ noted that he was awaiting responses and would then finalise the group's topic paper.

**e. Topic Group 5 – Transport and Infrastructure**

MA confirmed that he would request the addition of a footpath to the church. KJ Rhee had already been approached.

**f. Topic Group 6 – Natural Environment**

JB has been working on the draft topic paper. Comments had been received questioning whether it was appropriate to include photographs of private driveways / houses in a public document. This needed amending. JB noted he hoped to have a topic group meeting in August.

JA has been walking the local footpaths and had confirmed that they were in poor condition.

Playing fields – there appeared to be a willingness to operate under better management. PFA was interested in buying Furze Corner for sports facilities for the community.

It was again mentioned that the natural and built environment groups may still at some point merge.

**a. Housing / Planning**

MA enquired if there was anyone interested in being the chair of this topic group. No-one volunteered, so it was agreed that the members of the group would continue to share the chairmanship.

The Housing Group held a meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> July to discuss the AECOM survey. At the meeting, the group went through the report and MA collated the comments and forwarded these to the report writer (Guillaume Rey). Many of the comments were accepted and amended accordingly.

The AECOM survey had been circulated to all. MA noted that the following points had been queried:  
P7.2 – it had been agreed to keep to 34% and not amend to 40% as there would be a knock-on effect to the other figures.  
P7.4 – The District Council has stated nothing is planned for Tatsfield therefore no action needed.

The entry level properties prices were queried as very high. P23.97 Land Registry figures were used and based on the lowest quarter of 2017. £391,000 was the figure AECOM arrived at but, in fact, it should have been closer to £439,000.

NS consulted the Land Registry and confirmed that 20 homes were sold in Tatsfield in 2017.

P24.101 – ONS figure – housing income to affordability.

P27.115 – TDC and HNS figures derived from the same source.

P28 table 5-9 – Concealed families = young people aged over 18 and living with their parents.

It was noted that the figures are for TN16 which also includes Westerham and Biggin Hill and so is not representative of Tatsfield.

P33.146 Figures for 8 and 9 rooms – queried whether this had been wrongly filled out in the census.

P34.147 table 6-2 stated that in 2011 all 1-bedroom properties were lost. This seems incorrect.

P43.189 table 6-15 – stated ‘required number of bedrooms’ but should have read ‘required number of houses’.

P43 – the percentages will rebalance.

P51 figure 7-2 was queried.

P51 table 8-1 – parishioners working in Tandridge – 25%, Bromley – 18%, Croydon – 10%, Westminster – 9%.

P67 dwelling types – 51% of future demand will be for flats (recommended figure was 35%). MA had renegotiated this to: 10% - flats, 45% - terraced houses, 29% - semi-detached houses, 16% - detached houses).

It was suggested that the NPSG say to JG that there lies a bit of a conundrum – how to persuade the inspector that the proposed figures are impossible. JG has already stated:

*I've had a good read through the housing needs report. I haven't cross referenced the data for obvious reasons but the overall target of 167 is an average of various standard methodologies and so I believe is appropriate. I must add that whilst the figure might appear high, it is a demand led figure and so does not factor into account supply constraints such as green belt restrictions or other environmental constraints which are of the relevance to Tatsfield.*

MA noted that he had taken the TNP HNS to TDC. Officers had commented to say they did not think it necessary as NPSG already had the 2016 PC commissioned survey and the AECOM report. IM noted that the 2016 survey was in fact based on data collected in March 2015 and so is over three years old and it primarily focussed on affordable housing needs. The AECOM report is a desktop exercise which derived much of its conclusions from the 2011 census.

What is the negative impact of the NPSG undertaking an HNS? An HNS would collect data from homeowners also.

**NP/002/0718** It was resolved to issue the HNS in early September. SP would update the GDPR wording and finalise the Survey Monkey

SP

<p>link. It was further agreed that a 21-day deadline was appropriate. SP to forward to Parish Clerk for PC approval at next meeting.</p> <p>It was further suggested that Sarah Thompson at TDC should be asked to clarify why TDC felt no HNS was needed.</p> <p>MA further noted that upon reading the PC email of 17<sup>th</sup> July, Sarah Thompson questioned whether the PC actually wished to proceed with a NP.</p> <p>IM countered that the 167 dwellings proposed in the AECOM report was no fully representative of the housing needs in Tatsfield and the PC response was simply that it was premature to put figures on the table until an HNS had been carried out.</p> <p>IM then read the TPC email to the members of NPSG – nb this was available to all in the minutes from the TPC extraordinary meeting held on 16/07/18. MA noted that it was the PC's responsibility for communicating with Sarah Thompson at TDC in regard to her earlier criticism that the PC seemed not to want to build any houses in Tatsfield.</p> <p>The new version of NPPF was in Dropbox.</p> <p>MA also noted an email which had been circulated by PJ on 20<sup>th</sup> July evidencing how important a NP could be. It detailed a scheme for 95 houses on a field on the edge of a large village in Oxfordshire on the edge of an AONB which failed to secure planning permission after an inspector backed the NP.</p> <p>Finally, the Draft Local Plan appeared to propose nothing to affect Tatsfield and Titsey.</p>	
<p><b>8. Discuss and prepare for the 'Call for sites'</b>  Draft call for sites document was reviewed.  The first paragraph was approved.  The second paragraph last sentence was removed.  The fourth paragraph was amended to contact the parish clerk.  The amendments were approved by the members present. It was agreed that the amended call for sites notice would be put on the agenda for the September meeting for approval.</p>	
<p><b>9. Update re: Strategic Environmental Assessment Plan</b>  MA confirmed that AECOM would assist as part of the grant and technical support package.</p>	
<p><b>10. What do we do next?</b>  MA consulted the schedule JG had set out and considered that the NPSG was on schedule.</p>	
<p><b>11. Date of next meeting</b> – It was agreed that the next meeting would be held on Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> September at 8pm. <b>There would be no meeting in August.</b></p>	
<p><b>12. Any other business which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.</b>  None</p>	

<b>13. Matters for reporting or inclusion in a future agenda</b> None	
The meeting closed at 10.28pm	