

## **MINUTES OF TRG AGM (held virtually) at 7.30pm on 15 June 2021**

**ATTENDEES: COMMITTEE:** Nick Thrupp (chair), Alan Wright, Dave Arnold, Greg Popper, Ferdi Fischer

**RESIDENTS:** Andrew & Sarah Ritchie, Spencer & Anita Needs, Brendan Sandiford,

Chris Wroe & Jacky Sander, Anne Wright

**APOLOGIES:** Gerry Dobson

The chair welcomed those present and summarised TRG activities since the last AGM:

1. Planning Applications: TRG did well on traditional ones, not well on permitted developments. Alan has drafted detailed responses on 20 applications: 4 were granted (prior approval / permitted dev't), 11 were refused (helped by objections from residents), 1 was a compromise (St George's Place) and 4 remain under consideration. There were 7 appeal submissions (all drafted by Alan), 6 of which were successful, 1 not.

2. Nick had a meeting 3 days earlier with residents of South Road in connection with the developer's intention to build 2 cottages on the Cafe Rouge parking area (without parking provision) for which he wants the support of residents: if not forthcoming, the threat is to change the use of the current building to a nursery. Nick advised them to agree only if parking is provided – residents have yet to decide.

3. There have been a flurry of applications regarding Clive House. An application for a 3<sup>rd</sup> storey of 9 apartments has been rejected but an appeal is likely. An extra floor is highly contentious.

4. Government Housing Target: based on outdated 2014 figures, the target translates into 633 houses per year to be built in Elmbridge for 15 years. This can only be achieved by building on the greenbelt, intensification in urban areas or a combination. TRG have expressed concern on the Government White Paper which reduces residents' democratic voice and is likely to be exploited by developers. TRG have also given their input to the Local Plan (the timetable for which is uncertain).

5. PARKING: (TRG's latest parking survey is on the website). The problems are long term and the issues depend on where you live: Princes Road – parking / Pine Grove – traffic. All localised solutions have a knock-on effect elsewhere and a holistic approach is needed with input from all users, including business. SCC have commissioned an independent survey to be carried out this summer by Atkins to cover all of Weybridge but including specifically the Triangle.

6. 20 MPH Speed Limit: TRG will have a Zoom meeting with Tim Oliver and a senior officer of the SCC Highways department in 2 days' time to discuss how to make what has been implemented more effective and also what else could be done in a Phase 2

7. CRICKET GREEN CARPARK: Residents' feedback was relayed to Cllr Harman but it turns out that, legally, there should not even be a carpark! Mr Jenrick will be asked to legitimise it. It is likely that eventually there will be a limitation on the length of time parking is permitted.

8. TRG NEWSLETTER: 16 were circulated in the review period.

9. FINANCES: TRG have £20 in cash (since augmented by a generous £50 donation from Chris Wroe)

## 9. QUESTIONS

CHRIS WROE highlighted the continuing health and safety risk represented by the bend in Pine Grove with (unpopular) speed bumps being the only way to keep speeds down. Nick mentioned that SCC had mooted the possibility of blocking off both Pine Grove and Princes Road (a la Baker Street) but this would need very careful consultations with a number of parties.

## 10. GERRY DOBSON'S WRITTEN QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

More properties are being built or converted for domestic accommodation within the immediate area with minimal or even zero parking. This development is applying more pressure on the limited parking availability within the Triangle which in turn is beginning to impact on residents' driveways often causing obstruction and making visibility difficult and unsafe for when backing out into the road.

*TRG always considers parking provision in response to both applications and appeals and makes representations accordingly.*

*The Inspector's decision in respect of the Wessex House appeal in South Road, effectively negated parking as an issue, contending that spaces would be available in The Triangle. This was quoted frequently by EBC Officers as a justification to override EBC's own norms, as established in DM7, relating to minimum off street parking.*

*Fortunately, a subsequent appeal subsequently came out with a different conclusion. Residents may recall that the Inspector made some very helpful comments in respect of the relevance of DM7 in his refusal of 2020/0265, which was for the change of use of part ground floor and first and second floors of 85 Queens Road to provide 5 flats and single storey rear extension. (Appeal reference: APP/K3605/W/20/3259759).*

Q. The Inspector's comments with respect to parking in APP/K3605/W/20/3259759 (see paragraphs 5-13 and 23-24) were particularly helpful to residents and particularly unhelpful to the developer, not only in respect of applications for 85 Queens Road but also any others he, or others, may have in mind for the area wherever inadequate /no off- street parking provision is proposed.

*A. Unfortunately, that is only half the story. The Government introduced Prior Approval/Permitted Development routes to speed up the creation of new homes. ( Approval to redevelop the two existing storeys of Clive House fell into these categories) Applications under these headings are not reviewed by the Planning Committee but are decided by the EBC Officers. Grounds for objection are restricted. While parking could be considered by EBC Officers as a reasonable basis for refusal, Officers have declined to do so, continuing to rely on the Wessex House Appeal decision as a precedent.*

*TRG continues to argue the case for off street parking provision, and is now able to cite the arguments made by the Inspector in Appeal reference: APP/K3605/W/20/3259759*

Q. The 20mph limit within the Triangle is a welcome introduction but having minimal effect with drivers continuing to drive at excess speeds. Several observations suggest that the 20mph signs when entering the area are set much too high and are not seen by drivers as they negotiate the

turns. Also, surely more repeater signs are needed along the route as are painted signs on the roadway entrances.

*A. Both of these points have been raised with Surrey CC. The issue has been recognised and we have been promised improved signalisation by the Leader of Surrey CC*

Q. The York Road/Princes Road junction opposite the JF is a strong candidate for a refuge to enable pedestrians to cross the road safely, also to reduce the corner cutting by drivers. Wasn't this a consideration within earlier road layout plans?

*A. This idea was discussed, along with others at the time the 20mph/HGV restrictions were agreed but, against a backdrop of restricted resources/finance, priority was given to those changes that were made. TRG only saw that as phase 1 and will shortly be entering discussions with the Leader of SCC and representatives of the County Highways Authority as to what more far-reaching improvements, including further road layout changes such as this refuge, can be made. We will keep residents apprised of developments.*