



Stoughton Community Association

including the Stoughton Community Centre Project (SCCP)

Financially assisted by



Minutes of SCA committee meeting of 10th September 2004 at Ian's House 19:00 - 23.00 hours

In attendance:

<i>Maureen Bell</i>	<i>(MB)</i>	<i>Chair of steering committee.</i>
<i>Ian Godfrey</i>	<i>(IG)</i>	<i>Steering committee member, secretary for the meeting.</i>
<i>Cllr Pauline Searle</i>	<i>(PS)</i>	<i>Steering committee member.</i>
<i>Peter Gunner</i>	<i>(PG)</i>	<i>Steering committee member.</i>
<i>Nigel Horton</i>	<i>(NH)</i>	<i>Steering committee member.</i>
<i>Dinah Bisdee</i>	<i>(DB)</i>	
<i>Cllr Fiona White</i>	<i>(FW)</i>	
<i>SCC Cllr John Hobrough</i>	<i>(JH)</i>	

Apologies were made for:

<i>John Allford</i>	<i>(JA)</i>	<i>Steering committee member.</i>
<i>Cllr Jayne Marks</i>	<i>(JM)</i>	

1. Meeting started without NH, FW and JH who had forewarned being late.

Introduction of Dinah Bisdee as guest

2. MB introduced DB saying we hoped that DB, a resident of Railton Road, would soon become a co-opted member of the committee.

Chair's address

3. MB explained the previous committee meeting was as far back as 1st March and a lot had happened since which tonight's meeting would cover.

One of the most important things was to prepare for the AGM required before February 2005, as well as inform and involve the whole of Stoughton in what SCA was trying to achieve.

SCA/SCCP had not heard anything useful from the developers or DEPS since the CC application was made 26th April, which GBC had asked to be reconsidered, and the developers had not yet withdrawn. MB is therefore arranging meetings with DEPS and Legal (Richard Lingard) to find out what was happening.

4. FW explained it is rare and therefore SCCP lucky, that DEPS allow a meeting prior to an application being submitted.

Previous minutes

5. IG apologised for not producing the minutes for the meeting on the 1st March.
6. PS explained that the SCA open afternoon on the 25th Apr 2004 was the first real indication from QEP residents that they were not happy about anything being built on the open space/village green.
7. DB asked when SCCP first knew the CC would be built on the village green. Those present (IG, MB, IG and PS) explained how the commercial area developers, Terrace Hill, had excluded the CC from their original detailed planning. DB was handed a copy of STAG's letter of objection to DEPS, dated 18th Sept 2002. On 5th Nov, these objections caused Lang and Linden to offer a larger CC on the corner of the green in exchange for STAG's objections being withdrawn before the end of Nov 2002. The developers told STAG that the alternative was the commercial developers would pull out, with the possibility of high density housing being built instead, and probably no CC.
IG to confirm the notes from the 5th Nov and letters to DEPS are on the SCA web site.

IG web site
[Confirmed]

Dinah Bisdee's role. Process for voting in a co-opted committee member.

8. DB stated she wanted to help move things forward positively and not worry about the history of it all. She did not want to be a go-between, preferring to speak for herself and not on behalf of any QEP group. Since the open meeting [28th June] she was well aware of how much hard work had been put in by SCCP and how passionate we are.
9. A discussion followed in support of DB becoming a co-opted member and how useful her perspective is. Those present agreed we needed to work better with QEP residents. FW stressed nobody wanted separate groups.
MB said DB had already demonstrated her intentions; her letter today [*'please can we move on'*] was brilliant.
10. DB explained she still needed to get someone to second her nomination. It was agreed that someone from QEP would be best but did not need to be formalised by any of the QEP residents groups.
11. DB asked if others could be nominated. MB confirmed the constitution allows a maximum of two until the AGM, and the second place was reserved for a treasurer, if we could find one.

DB to return completed form ASAP

Status update: Meetings with councillors

12. MB asked the two ward councillors how we could work better together and handle overlaps. It was generally agreed things were working much better.

Status update: QEP developers' latest proposals

13. MB said the developers had not responded to any of her emails and her calls were pointless.
MB reported hearsay that the developers were now considering the mixed-use building in the commercial area supposed to be for the doctors. Apparently, one set of plans had been discussed with DEPS involving flats above the CC; this had been rejected and now the developers were considering flats alongside.
14. FW explained that after 5 years the developers can apply to be relieved of their S106 obligations. MB to put this on the list to discuss with Richard Lingard to find out whether the timer starts with the original S106 1st Oct 2001, or the amendment 29th Nov 2002.

MB list for RL 16th

Status update: Response sent 6th Sept to the developers 'poll' letter.

15. MB reported the developers had sent a letter to what we originally thought was all residents but now know not all residents received it.
MB explained we felt obliged to correct some mistakes and misleading statements. SCCP had emailed a draft to the developers giving them a week to apologise and then emailed it to a number of QEP residents, including the QEP residents' committee. MB reported that we had only a few responses.
DB questioned the benefit of 'going over old ground'. It was generally agreed that we should be more 'forward looking'.

Does SCA/SCCP have an opinion on the doctor's surgery?

16. FW said that if no doctors then GBC would seek compensation for Stoughton; that developers and councillors have done as much as possible to secure the doctors. MB agreed to ask RL for his opinion whether the S106 had any bearing.

MB 16th

Does SCA/SCCP have an opinion on the flats?

17. PG said that flats of any kind would be inappropriate because their proximity to the CC would create friction or 'local impact', which would be far greater than other QEP homes.
18. NH asked why extra houses could be contemplated when the outline plan said 525. FW explained that things can always be changed with negotiation and that might result in further planning gain.
19. It was generally agreed that SCA/SCCP could not comment without seeing plans.

Does SCA/SCCP have an opinion on parking?

20. IG reported there are currently 24 unmarked spaces allocated for the mixed-use building; 10 next to the mixed-use site and 14 more on the other side of Budgens. PS reported that Dave Taylor [*SCC Highways*] says 24 car spaces spread around the commercial area is sufficient for both CC and flats.

FW said there were precedents for flats without parking so all the CC could have all 24.

21. IG suggested the result would be less than 24 if some were converted to disabled spaces needed for the CC. Budgens originally had 8 disabled reduced to 3, with the other 5 3 mother+buggy and 2 ordinary spaces.

IG worried that because they are easily accessible, shoppers would use them and proposed that the 10 next to the mixed-use site should be somehow assigned to the CC.

PG asserted parking should not be an issue because the idea is that the CC is for Stoughton residents who will be encouraged to walk the short distance to the CC. Extra parking would encourage car use.

22. DB asked what the likely opening times would be for Budgens. PG said the intention is Budgens is like a local shop not like Tesco. FW agreed and said similar paces stayed open until 9pm.
23. It was generally agreed that although parking directly affects the CC, we do not have any immediate concerns.

Does SCA/SCCP have an opinion on the 2 play areas?

24. DB reported that many QEP residents expected neither play area on the green. She would personally fight against the all-weather pitch. DB asked if there were any alternative locations?

25. PS said the LEAP [*play-ground*] must be on the open space because it was in the outline plan and GBC's newly adopted play-ground strategy meant housing density determines the size and location of play-grounds.

PG reported that recent legislation also meant the LEAP would have to be DDA compliant – fit for disabled users.

26. It was agreed that the all-weather pitch is a separate issue from the LEAP.

A history of the all-weather pitch was discussed at length, and whether the outline plan or S106 stipulated the size and/or location, and why such a facility was important for Stoughton. DB questioned the relevance of this history.

It was generally agreed there was no known planning requirement, other than the outline plan, for the all-weather pitch to be on the open space. This meant location was subject to the planning process, and as residents didn't want it on the green was unlikely to end up there.

27. JH asked if there was a technical solution to the pitch problem? JH reported what was happening elsewhere in Guildford, at St.Peter's, Christ's College and at Riverside Centre.

28. IG proposed asking Northmead if some of their playing field could be used. Various negative comments were made, but it was generally agreed they should be asked.

PG reported that a planning condition existed on the Northmead preventing any further development. JH said that was likely to apply to non-sporting development.

29. JH reported he had asked about Stoughton Grange school site, and learnt it would be sold if not changed back to a school.

IG reported that the small playing field previously part of Stoughton Grange school now belonged to Stoughton Infants school.

30. NH proposed and it was agreed that if no alternative location was found that that the developers should give the equivalent to GBC 'ring-fenced' for sporting use. MB added this should be for Stoughton use.

IG reported that Roger Jones [*GBC Parks & Leisure*] told him last year that a tennis court cost about £50K so the developers would need to contribute at least £100K to compensate for what was in the original outline plan.

**IG to ask
Northmead**

Does SCA/SCCP have an opinion on the bus route?

31. IG proposed that SCCP should be concerned by the bus route because it would improve the viability of the CC.

DB said this was not a good reason and there was no need for the bus route.

32. A history of the bus-route, developers' promises, traffic schemes, and one-way systems was discussed at length.

DB questioned the relevance of this and asked why non-QEP residents should be involved

in the [proposed] poll? PG replied that Grange Road residents were affected and some didn't like the extra buses.

PS said everyone accepts local roads can't cope with car traffic. Buses must take the extra load.

MB asked if there is anything SCCP or STAG can do? JH replied asking that everyone support him in his request for a 'proper analysis'.

33. JH reported that at the recent "Guildford Local" county committee meeting, Anne Milton [PPC Conservative for Guildford] had commented on the bus route problem saying she represented some QEP residents and had presented a number of letters to the chairman. JH had responded that Stoughton deserved a 'united voice' and the problem 'needs a proper analysis'. JH added he intended to write a letter to SCC Highways to try and get an overview and support for a meeting to which all residents in Stoughton would be invited.

Do SCA/SCCP need to be involved in the QEP poll? If so how?

34. It was agreed there was no need for SCA/SCCP involvement at this stage.

Topics for meetings with DEPS Oct 1st and Richard Lingard Sept 16th.

35. Various questions were suggested for Richard Lingard's list. Further questions should be submitted to MB before the 16th.

- a) at what point can L&L get out of their s106 obligation?
- b) how will the developers be allowed to increase the number of residences with the extra flats beyond the agreed 525?
- c) what kind of financial compensation can we, on behalf of Stoughton, negotiate for the loss of the doctors' surgery?
- d) will the developers be obliged to put the two play areas on the Village Green and are there any alternatives?
- e) if another amendment is to be made to the S106, is there any way in which we can ensure an improvement to that dated 29th Nov 2002?
- f) can SCA insist on or expect to have one share in the QEP Residents Company Ltd?

All 16th

36. DB asked what the meeting with DEPS 1st Oct was for and MB replied to find out what was going on. FW said she had requested an agenda from DEPS.

37. DB proposed that a QEP resident should come as observer, and whoever attended was more likely to be 'constructive' than 'anti'. MB expressed concerns about how the meeting would turn out as she had called it to learn what was going on and not have a debate.

Status update: QEP Q&A Meeting at Stoughton Y&CC 28th June

38. IG apologised he had not finished the minutes for this meeting and would do so.

IG ASAP

Revision of CC design brief required?

39. IG stated at the 1st March committee meeting he was actioned to update the design brief with the need to have male, female and disabled toilets on both floors to comply with playgroup regulations.

IG asked if any other updates were required? MB said we needed to add extra space was required for later expansion if we lost the 70sqm underneath the overhang.

**IG update
1st Oct**

40. PS suggested the updated brief is taken to the meeting with DEPS. MB agreed and asked IG to update the brief ASAP.

MB

41. PG proposed that we involve QEP residents.

JH proposed and it was agreed a solution was for QEP Residents committee to be asked to review the brief and send comments to local councillors.

MB

Media campaign for expanding SCA's role; preparation for AGM. Newsletter.

42. MB reported JH had proposed two public meetings, one to prepare for the AGM and then the actual AGM.

JH said he hoped these meetings would help heal or integrate, and suggested dates of 1st November and 15th Nov. JH said if the meetings served this purpose, he would commit some money from his budget for organisation, publicity, booking and refreshments etc.

43. Everyone was actioned to confirm whether they could be there or suggest alternative date(s).

All

44. MB proposed and it was agreed a newsletter is written to announce the meetings.
It was agreed the format should be a very simple 'red-top' style.
It was agreed to produce posters. *[Notices will be required anyway, at least 21 days in advance.]*
It was agreed not to bother with local newspapers.
MB suggested radio.
45. MB proposed the newsletter should be hand-delivered and asked PS to provide updated electoral rolls.
46. NH proposed and it was agreed another committee meeting would be required soon.

PS
MB/NH to arrange

AOB

47. MB reported Edward Tudor has kindly agreed to sign off this year's accounts.
48. MB explained that having taken advice we could proceed with the charity application ASAP.
49. Meeting closed.

MB/IG

Acronyms

QEP – Queen Elizabeth Park. Housing and commercial development of the old WRAC Barracks and Chart Depot in Stoughton, North Guildford.

GBC DEPS – Guildford Borough Council Department of Environmental Planning (one part of which is the planning department who deal with QEP planning matters).

SCC – Surrey County Council.

AGM – Annual General Meeting.

CC – Community Centre.

Minutes prepared by Secretary of the meeting, Ian Godfrey.

Approval of these minutes was:

Proposed by

Seconded by

Approved at a meeting held at

On