1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR 2018/19 MUNICIPAL YEAR

Neighbourhood Chairs and Vice Chairs are appointed annually by the relevant Neighbourhood Committee at the beginning of the new Municipal Year.

Resolved that Councillor Lorraine Dunstone be appointed Chair of the Neighbourhood Committee and Councillor Andreas Kirsch be appointed Vice Chair of the Neighbourhood Committee for the 2018/19 municipal year.

Voting - unanimous

2. NEIGHBOURHOOD WORKING ARRANGEMENTS

At the beginning of each four year Municipal term, it is customary for each Neighbourhood Committee to review its working arrangements. Within the constitutional framework, Neighbourhood Committees decide their own arrangements for chairing, public participation at meetings and determine how they deal with regulatory functions within their responsibilities – eg street café and sexual entertainment licences. The aim of the arrangements is to enable Committees to work effectively, enable public participation and avoid overly long agendas and meetings.

Participation by residents and other members of the public is encouraged. Public participation procedures include:

- at the start of the meeting, a 30 minute question and answer session. (Whilst advance notice of questions is encouraged, questions can be raised on the night but not necessarily answered at the meeting.)
- at the discretion of the Chair of the meeting, contributions by the public during debate on agenda items.
- the opportunity for the public to present petitions at the start of the meeting

Appendix A
at least once during the year, a ‘Neighbourhood Conversation’ (or ‘Community Forum’) will be held which will be open to all and at which there will be no formal public participation arrangements.

- separate arrangements for speaking on planning applications - which are explained in paragraph 11 of the report.

Resolved that -

1. the arrangements for public participation set out in paragraphs 6 - 12 (summarised above) of the report be agreed;
2. licensing matters (within the remit of the Neighbourhood Committees) be dealt with at the Neighbourhood Committee meeting wherever possible but, when necessary, a Licensing Sub-Committee is established by the Neighbourhood Committee to deal with particular cases which arise; and
3. arrangements for appointment of new community advisers and establishment of a Community Plan Steering Group are considered, as set out in accompanying reports in this agenda.

Voting – unanimous

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Thay Thayalan (on official duties as Mayor) and Councillor Margaret Thompson.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest from members of the Committee on any of the agenda items.

[As Chair of Development Control Committee, Councillor Patricia Bamford reserved her right to speak on the applications for 174 Hook Rise North (The Cap in Hand) and 1 Hook Rise South) at Development Control Committee and did not speak or vote on these items. Councillor Lorraine Dunstone as a members of Development Control Committee reserved her right to speak on the application for 1 Hook Rise South at Development Control Committee and did not speak or vote on this item.]

5. MINUTES

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2018 are agreed as a correct record.

6. PLANNING CONSULTATION (18/10123/FUL): 174 (THE CAP IN HAND) HOOK RISE NORTH

The Committee considered an application for demolition of an existing Public House and provision of 38 x one, two and three bed units (16 x one-bed, 18 x two-bed & 4 x three-bed) up to 7 storeys in height together with 14 off street car parking spaces, 145 sqm of Class A1 retail space, new access/ egress arrangements and hard and soft landscaping.

The application site at 174 Hook Rise North is 0.29 hectares in size and is located
by the Hook underpass to the north on the A309, south of Surbiton and is occupied by the Cap in Hand public house (PH). The building is detached and has four storeys including a basement and accommodation in the roofspace. The PH occupies the ground floor and basement, with ancillary accommodation within the upper floors. There is a large existing car park for the PH to the west of the building. The area to the north of the site is characterised by two storey terraced residential development.

Resolved that the comments of the Committee be referred to the Development Control Committee (or for consideration, if under delegated decision-making):

- insufficient carparking space is provided in the proposed development (14 for 38 flats), especially given that the location has a poor PTAL rating (eg it is not near a railway station) and parking from residents from the development would overflow onto adjoining roads which already have insufficient parking space eg on Haycroft Road and Gladstone Road and cause further obstructions – obstructive parking is already causing problems for access (eg of emergency vehicles) in this locality
- the air quality is very poor in this area and this would, for example, mean that the limited amenity space and balconies which are provided would not be healthy for children to play in – existing properties in the vicinity are set back with back gardens – this development would be right on top of a pollution hotspot – likewise the location will suffer from noise pollution – the effect on residents’ wellbeing of being in cramped accommodation without healthy outdoor space needs to be considered
- the density of the proposed development is based on a classification of the location as ‘urban’ but adjoining properties are classified as ‘suburban’ and residents at the meeting considered it should be classified as ‘suburban’ to avoid too high a density of development on the site — the maximum density for suburban housing is 95 units per hectare, the maximum density for urban housing is 170 units per hectare – (the proposed development is 130 units per hectare)
- adjoining properties are two storeys high – so there is a sudden increase across the site boundary from two to seven storeys height for this development - there is no other 7 storey property nearby so this would set a precedent
- the development will cause shadowing and reduction in sunlight for neighbouring properties and loss of privacy
- the design is out of character for the adjoining area and was considered ‘ugly’ and ‘gross’ – for example it has flat rooves whereas adjoining properties have pitched rooves - it was questioned whether the flat rooves would be a sustainable design
- more detailed comments are required from Thames Water as their comments do not address potential flooding in this area
- it was questioned whether the mix of the units met RBK planning policy for 30% of properties being three- bedroom properties (there are only four 3-bed units ie 11%)
- will sufficient places be available in nurseries and schools for the children from this development?– the places in local schools are already constrained
- the report suggested that 50%-70% of the units would be ‘affordable’ but the applicant’s submission indicated that 100% of the units would be affordable –
it was questioned what ‘affordable’ meant in this location as it was recognised that many people cannot afford affordable

- It is recognised that the Council needs to provide for more affordable housing – it was questioned whether, if the development goes ahead, a condition could be added that the affordable housing in this proposed development would be earmarked for RBK residents rather than for those who are outside the borough
- There will be loss of a valued community asset (the public house had been popular for local people and, for example, provided a child-friendly restaurant)
- The gap between the back of the development and the boundary of the back gardens of adjoining properties should be 7.5m but the plans suggest that the proposed distance is less than that

Voting – unanimous

[Councillor Patricia Bamford as the Chair of Development Control Committee reserved her right to speak on this application at that Committee and did not speak or vote on this item. Councillor Stephanie Archer did not participate in this action pending her training in planning decision-making]

7. PLANNING CONSULTATION (16/10482/FUL): DEVELOPMENT LAND AT 1 HOOK RISE SOUTH

The Committee considered a part detailed/ part outline application for a site at 1 Hook Rise South which is 4.4 hectares in size and located to the south-west of Tolworth roundabout, to the west of Kingston Road (A240) and to the south of Hook Rise South and the A3 trunk road. The site is located approximately 35 metres north of Tolworth Railway Station and less than 100 metres south of Tolworth District Centre.

The application is for a total of 950 residential dwellings and other uses consisting of:

1) Detailed: Erection of 211 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated ground floor uses including Class D1 (Nursery) and Community Uses; (Class A1/A3) Restaurant/Café and 60 car parking spaces, bus layover and driver facilities; landscaping and ancillary works;

2) Outline: Erection of 739 residential units (Use Class C3) with associated other ground floor uses (Class D1) Doctor Surgery; (Class A1) Retail; Cycle Hub and 328 car parking spaces.

Resolved that the following views of the Committee on the application are reported to the Development Control Committee to consider when it determines this planning application:

- The application is too dense – an application for 705 has already been turned down on the site but this application is for 950 (30% increase) – theoretically the development could result in a total of 2375 people living on the site
- Insufficient infrastructure has been provided for the development - a single person GP surgery would not be sufficient; not enough school
places will be provided and it will also cause strain on hospital provision; to have a nursery on the site itself is questionable given the likely poor air quality at this location

- The design is considered to be incongruous for the site – the character of the area is more defined by the semi-detached houses (Hook Rise North, Hamilton Avenue, Princes Avenue, St George’s Gardens) than by Tolworth Tower – 10 storeys is too high for this area – needs to be brought down to 5-6 storeys at the front - the towers will cause a wind tunnel effect and shadowing
- The new residents will not want the noise from the concrete depot which adjoins the site
- It was considered surprising that Thames Water had not commented on the drainage issues on this site – the area suffers from flooding
- It is accepted that some housing on this site is acceptable, especially if plenty of green screening is added to reduce air pollution and noise from the A3 – the provision of robust living screening and its ongoing maintenance should be part of a legal agreement for the site to provide a permanent solution for maintenance
- There was a query about how the emergency services would access all parts of the proposed development
- The cumulative effect of all the different developments in the Tolworth area have not been considered sufficiently in a Tolworth strategy, particularly with respect to the effect on the road infrastructure - the Tolworth roundabout is already too congested and will not be able to cope with the additional traffic – given the amount of carparking on the site
- There was a concern that the stated site area is incorrect

Voting – unanimous

[Councillor Patricia Bamford as the Chair of Development Control Committee and Councillor Lorraine Dunstone as a member of Development Control Committee reserved their right to speak on this application at that Committee and did not speak or vote on this item. Councillor Stephanie Archer did not participate in this action pending her training in planning decision-making]

8. INFORMATION SECTION - TFL UPDATE

Jasmit Jabbal, Community Partnerships Specialist in the Public Affairs & External Relations team at Transport for London (TfL), attended the meeting to present the TfL Traffic Schemes Update. The Committee agreed to bring forward this information item so that Jasmit would not be required to wait until the end of the meeting.

Mr Robb thanked Jasmit for having attended a meeting organised by the Chessington District Residents Association and Malden Rushett Residents Association to discuss the traffic problems in Malden Rushett.

Residents and the Committee noted that there had been a high turnover of TfL officers which had meant that it was more difficult to maintain liaison with a named officer who knew the local issues. It was hoped that the TfL Budget deficit would not
lead to further reorganisation in the near future, to allow Mr Jabbal more time to strengthen communications and feedback to resolve issues.

A recent major cause of concern had been traffic gridlock in Chessington and Hook stretching back to the Ace of Spades roundabout caused by emergency road works. Councillors had been inundated with calls but could not provide any useful update because there had been no prior alert to Ward councillors about this, nor any ongoing communication with them about progress. Councillors asked Jasmit to establish a protocol or procedure for keeping Ward members in touch in future with TfL Traffic communications. Ian Price suggested that Jasmit could be put in touch with the RBK traffic bulletins which are sent to councillors so that TfL could use this method.

Councillors expressed concern that the traffic cones and traffic lights had been left in place on the Wednesday morning even though the works had been completed on Tuesday night thus causing unnecessary delays to drivers and frustration to local residents.

Another concern for residents in Chessington and Hook was that the 71 bus had stopped running at the Bridge Road roundabout during emergency works at Moor Lane – this meant that the bus had missed the Gilders Estate altogether and the public had been left waiting at approximately 10 bus stops in one direction and 11 bus stops in the other direction with no information as to when a bus would be arriving. Councillors and residents asked Mr Jabbal to liaise with colleagues at TfL to try to provide better communication should this problem happen again and in particular to consider a solution recommended by residents for taking the bus a route which would involve turning at Copt Gilders roundabout. (Post meeting note: this suggested route suggested by Mr Ian Hogben has been forwarded to Mr Jabbal to forward to relevant TfL colleagues.)

The Chair, Councillor Dunstone, thanked Jasmit for attending and hoped he would be able to attend the Neighbourhood Committee meetings regularly to keep in touch.

9. COMMUNITY MANAGER’S REPORT

The Community Manager, Richard Dean, gave a verbal report on various issues of interest in the Neighbourhood including:

- 31 May Celebrating Chessington Fun Day – this had been very successful – more community volunteers are sought for next year’s event
- There has been a traveller incursion in the King Edwards recreation ground, Chessington, the debris from which is now being cleared – the Community Manager will be liaising with the new Neighbourhood Police Inspector about the new terms of engagement on traveller incursions which will also be being discussed at a strategic level between both organisations
- PS Baxter of Chessington South Police is in discussions with the landlord of the Lucky Rover PH in Hook about holding a public fun day
- A Defibrillator will be located outside the Hook Centre (this has been Ward-funded by former Councillor Clive Chase and Councillor Margaret Thompson)
10. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

For 30 minutes, the Committee dealt with questions and other matters raised by residents. A summary of the questions and answers is attached as an Annex but does not form part of the Minutes of the meeting.

11. PETITIONS

Two petitions were submitted by Members at the meeting:

(1) Hunters Road petition -. The petition which was submitted by Councillor Dennis Goodship and signed by 28 residents (mainly of Hunters Road) requested: ‘We the residents of Hunters Road request that the Council look at the situation in our road in respect of the on-street parking and safety of through-traffic. Hunters Road has become dangerous for residents and road users.’

(2) Ashcroft Road petition – The petition which was submitted by Cllr Lorraine Dunstone and signed by 9 residents of Ashcroft Road, requested: ‘We the residents of Ashcroft Road request that the Council consider installing yellow lines outside the properties of 4, 6 and 8 Ashcroft Road to ensure safety on the bend of the road.’

The petitions would be submitted to the Highways and Transport department to arrange for responses to be provided.

12. INFORMATION SECTION - URGENT ACTION TAKEN UNDER STANDING ORDER 32 (FIELD 3680 MALDEN RUSHETT ENFORCEMENT ACTION) Appendix I (2)

The Committee agreed to bring forward this information item so that the Planning Officer could respond to any questions on it before he left the meeting.

The Committee noted an information item about urgent enforcement action taken under Standing Order 32 relating to Field 3680 (also known as Rushett Stables) in Malden Rushett. Standing Order 32 requires that any urgent action taken by an officer in consultation with the Committee Chair is reported to the next meeting of the Committee for information.

On 22 March 2018, urgent action under the provisions of Standing Order 32 was authorised in consultation with the former Chair of the Neighbourhood Committee (former Councillor Rachel Reid) in relation to unauthorised use of land for the stationing of a mobile home in residential use by a gypsy traveller family at Field 3680 (aka Rushett Stables) as follows: the Head of Planning was authorised, in conjunction with the South London Legal Partnership (SLLP), to:

1. pursue action as necessary to enforce the existing undertakings given to the Court by Mr xxx, owner of Field 3680 (aka Rushett Stables), Leatherhead Road, Chessington (the Land), to remove the mobile home from the Land and cease all residential occupation, including by the committal of Mr xxx; and
2. make an application in the present proceedings for an injunction against persons unknown to prohibit the use of Field 3680 (aka Rushett Stables), Leatherhead Road, Chessington (the Land) for the stationing of Mobile Homes and/or Caravans for residential purposes, the importation of hard core, the creation of hard surfaces or any other works to facilitate occupation of the land, and to take action against any person who breaches the Injunction including bringing of committal proceedings.

-both pursuant to Section 187B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended) (the 1990 Act).

The matter was urgent because a decision was required before the meeting of the Neighbourhood Committee on 7 June, as the Council needed authority to:

1. enforce, by way of committal proceedings, the undertaking Mr xxx gave to the Court, in lieu of an injunction, whereby he promised that, if all his attempts to secure permission for his residential use of the Land were unsuccessful, he and his family would cease residential occupation of the Land and remove any mobile home and/or caravans stationed on the Land etc. within 3 months of the final disposal of his challenges. The final challenge was dismissed on 25th October 2017 and he therefore had until 25th January 2018 to honour his undertaking. An application by Mr xxx to be released from the undertaking was dismissed by the High Court on 15th March 2918. Mr xxx has therefore been in breach of his undertaking since 25th January 2018 and is in contempt of court; and

2. apply to the Court in the existing proceedings for an injunction against persons unknown to prohibit such persons from using the Land for stationing of mobile homes and/or caravans for residential purposes, importing hard core, creating hard surfaces or any other works to facilitate occupation of the Land in the event that Mr xxx and his family vacate the Land thereby complying with his undertaking to the Court, whether voluntarily or after committal proceedings have been commenced, and/or he sells or parts with possession all or any part of the Land.

13. SANGER AVENUE AND DURBIN ROAD PETITIONS

The Committee considered a report responding to two petitions which had been submitted relating to parking and traffic issues:

- A petition had been received from 33 residents in Durbin Road requesting the Council 'to implement a Residents only parking scheme, to a distinct area of unrestricted on-street parking in Durbin Road.' The petition had cited a number of reasons for requesting this action, which were related to the level of non-resident parking in the area, which they reported was caused by a local car garage and local businesses from Chessington Industrial Estate, and commuters for Chessington North Railway Station.

- The other petition was received at the Neighbourhood Committee meeting on 24 January 2018, signed by 61 residents of Sanger Avenue, Durbin Road, Coutts Avenue and one from Gosbury Hill, which requested that 'the Council investigate and address the problems caused by speeding and safety issues in our roads.'
In relation to the first petition, the report indicated that, when considering parking restrictions, Officers do not recommend isolated resident permit schemes but that the impact of the level of remaining on-street parking on safety and accessibility needs to be considered. Officers recommended that a wider residential area around Chessington North Railway Station and Chessington Industrial Estate could be investigated and that options for sections of ‘No Waiting’ restrictions that can operate for short periods during the day could be considered to reduce all day commuter parking. As LIP funding cannot be used for resident parking schemes, a Kingston Capital Bid could be submitted to cover this area.

In relation to the second petition, the report advised that assessments of the on-street parking conditions and existing parking restrictions are already underway in this area, and a package of proposals to address the safety and visibility at junctions and access issues along the roads can be drawn up for public consultation to report back to the 6 September meeting of the Committee. This may include the extension of the 20 mph speed restriction measures on Sanger Avenue, with associated traffic management measures.

Resolved that a public consultation is undertaken, outlining the suggestions made in paragraphs 14 to 20 of the report (summarised above), to be distributed in June/July 2018, and the results reported back to the next meeting of this Committee for consideration.

Voting - unanimous

14. GILDERS ROAD ROUNDABOUT - PEDESTRIAN ACCESSIBILITY  Appendix E REVIEW

The Committee considered a report which set out issues which have been raised on several occasions by residents, businesses and councillors. The primary focus of investigations relates to accessibility across and around the Copt Gilders area, which was audited using the Pedestrian Environment Review System (PERS). Other issues investigated were around crossing safety, parking and overrunning of kerbs.

The PERS audit had looked at the two paths across the centre island of the roundabout, the adjacent informal crossings and pedestrian routes across the roads adjoining the roundabout, including Gilders Road. Many of the crossing points give access to adjacent bus stops serving route 71, local shops and businesses.

A longstanding objective of the Council is to provide accessible routes to public transport, which is also a requirement of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA). The audit has identified that the layout, alignment and location of pedestrian facilities providing access to the bus stops do not meet the DDA requirements. Crossing points giving access to adjacent side roads have also been identified as requiring basic improvements to alignment and layout.

In addition to the above, the audit has indicated that visibility can be affected by indiscriminate parking at crossing points where there are no yellow lines. This is a particular problem at the junction with Billockby Close. The Council has received a request to improve safety by upgrading the informal crossings to the centre island to zebra crossings. This was not identified as an issue during the PERS audit and the
Officer view is that there are a number of disadvantages to upgrading the crossing to a zebra crossing and the number of vehicle and pedestrian movements would not justify it.

Other parking issues include a lack of turnover of parking on the north-west side of the roundabout. Requests have been received for time limited parking to match that on the south-east side of the roundabout. Following comments received from residents that the parking may be leading to large vehicles overrunning the kerbs, an investigation has confirmed the presence of ruts, worn patches and broken paving on areas of the centre island along with damage to footways on the approaches.

The proposals set out in the report include: realignment of paths and crossing points to meet DDA requirements, and reduce the likelihood of obstruction by parked vehicles; additional restrictions to protect visibility splays and access to crossings, and time limited parking controls on the northwest side of the roundabout to increase parking turnover. Subject to meeting the relevant design criteria, proposals will also seek to reduce damage caused due to overrunning by altering kerb alignments or installing measures to protect the centre island and footways.

Prior to the Neighbourhood Committee meeting, Officers had met with Ward councillors to review the area and discuss some of the proposals.

At the Neighbourhood Committee meeting, Ms Towner, an owner of one of the businesses at this location, expressed concern about the potential impact on the businesses on the Green of increased parking restrictions and emphasised that these local businesses should be consulted on the proposals.

Concern was also expressed about cyclists from the Green speeding down Filby Road and trying to turn right, contrary to one-way traffic flow.

In relation to the extended length of the bus-stand, Mr Hogben reminded the Committee of the importance for wheelchair users of dropped kerbs for buses to put their ramps down for wheelchair users to disembark.

Residents commented that improvements were needed to the type of bins provided at the Green and the regularity with which they are emptied as they are frequently overflowing. Councillor Bamford hoped that the opportunity would be taken to improve the appearance of the Green, for example with bulbs planted and possibly new benches to replace those which were vandalised.

Resolved that -

1. the Team Leader Strategy & Commissioning (Highways & Transport) is authorised to investigate and develop the proposals set out in paragraphs 5 to 8 of the report (as summarised above) to detailed design stage, for consultation with Ward councillors; and

2. in consultation with Ward councillors, the Team Leader Strategy & Commissioning (Highways & Transport) is authorised to determine and undertake appropriate stakeholder engagement, review the proposals in the light of the outcome of the consultation, and progress the developed proposals to implementation.

Voting - unanimous
The Committee considered the reviewed and updated Neighbourhood Community Plan, which is based on the priorities identified by residents through the Neighbourhood Conversation held on 21 February 2018.

The updated Community Plan document (attached at Annex 1 to the report) is divided into five key areas: Sustainable Travel; Safety and Anti-Social Behaviour; Planning and Development Control; Traffic; and Parks and Open Spaces.

In addition, a list of 21 new topics (on the last page of the Plan) reflects comments from the Neighbourhood Conversation - the Neighbourhood Committee was invited to consider whether any of these new topics should be added to the Plan.

Previously the development of the Community Plan has been undertaken in consultation with a Community Steering Group. The report proposed that the Steering Group is re-established to prioritise actions in the Plan. The Steering Group will be convened by the Community Manager, chaired by the Neighbourhood Committee Chair and include Member representatives from the three Neighbourhood Wards. Anyone who works, lives or plays in the Neighbourhood and is interested in being part of the Steering Group should contact the Community Manager. The remit of the Steering Group is to:

- develop relationships with key stakeholders.
- develop, and coordinate the production of a South of the Borough Community Plan, derived from the local community.
- monitor the implementation of the Action Plan.
- facilitate and coordinate consultation with the wider community through the use of the South of the Borough Community Panel.
- keep the South of the Borough Neighbourhood Committee updated on issues and Progress.
- maintain good communication with the Kingston Strategic Partnership through the Neighbourhood Management team.

The Community Plan is a living document that will be updated throughout the year, as priorities are identified via ongoing community engagement. The Neighbourhood Committee will receive regular verbal updates on progress of identified priorities and a report back later in the year.

**Resolved** that -

1. the updated Neighbourhood Community Plan set out in Annex 1 of the report be noted; and
2. a Community Plan Steering Group is re-established (ref. paragraphs 2 and 4 of the report) to prioritise actions contained within the Plan.

Voting - unanimous
16. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES (TOLWORTH HOSPITAL COMMUNITY FORUM)

The Committee considered appointments to two outside bodies the work of which is relevant to the local area:

The Tolworth Hospital Community Forum is convened by South West London and St George’s Mental Health NHS Trust to support and contribute to effective communication and community engagement relating to the Trust’s estate modernisation programme at Tolworth Hospital. The terms of reference for this community forum are attached at Annex 1 to the report. The group will meet quarterly in July, November, January and April. Local councillors from the wards neighbouring the site (ie Tolworth & Hook Rise Ward and Surbiton Hill Ward) are invited to membership of this Forum. (The Chair of the RBK Health Overview Panel and the RBK Portfolio Holder for Adults Social Care are also likely to be invited to membership.)

The Henry Smith’s Charity administers local endowments and distributes funds locally, mainly to elderly people in Parishes specified by the Charity, has four local trustees (two appointed by this Council and two by Elmbridge Council) who meet annually. Although nationally The Henry Smith Charity is a large charity ([www.henrysmithcharity.org.uk/](http://www.henrysmithcharity.org.uk/)), locally it has around just £2,500 to distribute. Trustee appointments are limited to five years and do not need to be elected Members. This Neighbourhood Committee appoints a trustee representing the ‘Parish of Long Ditton and Tolworth’ - former Councillor Andrew Day was appointed to this role by the South of the Borough Neighbourhood Committee in June 2014 for a 5 year period expiring in June 2019. (The Council’s other appointed trustee was former Councillor David Fraser representing the ‘Parish of Old Malden’ who was appointed by Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood Committee on 25 September 2013 – any re-appointment of this trustee would lie for consideration by Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood Committee).

Resolved that -

1. the three Ward members for Tolworth and Hook Rise (Councillors Dunstone, Goodship and Thayalan) be appointed onto the Tolworth Hospital Community Forum; and
2. further consideration be given at the next meeting to the appointment to the Henry Smith’s Charity for which the current Neighbourhood representative is the former Councillor Andrew Day (appointed to serve until June 2019 - the trustee does not need to be an Elected Member).

Voting - unanimous

17. APPOINTMENT PROCESS FOR COMMUNITY ADVISERS

Since 2015 this Neighbourhood Committee has annually appointed Community Advisers to sit on the Committee, bringing a fresh perspective and helping the Committee to develop its community leadership role. Prior to the appointment process, invitations for nominations for the role are publicly advertised.
An applicant:

- must live, work or study in the Neighbourhood
- must be able to attend all the evening meetings of the Neighbourhood Committee in different venues across the Neighbourhood
- should be someone who brings a fresh perspective to the Committee
- can be a member of a political party as long as the role is not used for political party activism

The role will be publicised and nominations sought via Chessington Chat and the Neighbourhood social media in the June/July period. Responses will be considered by the Community Manager, in consultation with the Neighbourhood Committee Chair, who will report recommendations to the Committee for appointment at its meeting on 6 September. When considering the nominations, the Committee can re-appoint a community adviser who has served previously.

Given that the Adviser appointed in September would not be able to join the Committee until the October meeting and would therefore sit for only 3 meetings, it is proposed that the post be for a two-year, rather than one year, period (2018-19 and 2019-20) ie up to and including June 2020.

**Resolved** that the process set out in paragraphs 3-4 and 8-10 of the report (as summarised above) is agreed for appointment of a Community Adviser for the 2018-19 and 2019/20 municipal years.

Voting - unanimous

18. INFORMATION ITEMS

The Committee considered the following remaining information items which had not been considered earlier in the meeting:

- Dates and potential venues of future meetings of the Committee
- RBK Traffic Schemes update (the TfL Traffic Schemes update had been considered earlier in the meeting)

Signed…………………………………………………….Date…………………

Chair
Public Questions

Two questions from the Chessington and District Residents Association were asked by Mrs Diane Brannan as follows:

1. Processing Planning Applications

Very few planning applications are now heard by Councillors at Neighbourhood Committee. Most are decided as ‘delegated decisions’. Are such planning applications decided by RBK officers or are they contracted out to external companies for processing? If so is there any supervision by RBK planning officers? Would you please explain the process and if our Councillors have any role in the process?

Toby Feltham, Lead Planning Officer for Maldens and Coombe and South of the Borough Neighbourhoods, responded to this question as follows:

All delegated decisions are decided by RBK Officers. All case officers, who assess each application, are RBK employees. There is no contracting out to external companies for processing of applications or deciding planning applications. Each case officer puts a report together with a recommendation. This is then checked and the decision issued by those with delegated authority, which is currently Barry Lomax (Head of Development Management), Toby Feltham (Lead Officer), Anthony Knight (Lead Officer- Enforcement). The Council's delegated authority requires reference to the Chair/ Vice Chair if an application is recommended for approval and 10 or more objections are received or if there is an objection from the Conservation Area Advisory Committee. If all 3 ward Councillors request that an application is heard at the Neighbourhood Committee, it will not be a delegated decision if recommended for approval and will be determined by the Neighbourhood Committee. All Major planning applications (ie. 11 or more residential units or 1000sqm of commercial floorspace) are determined at Development Control Committee. Large Major developments will sometimes be reported to Neighbourhood Committees for comments prior to Development Control Committee.

2. Elmcroft Road: Process for designating as a Local Area of Special Character

The Kingston Society has reported that a conservation officer, Elizabetta Tonazzi has not had her contract renewed and left the employment of RBK. Elizabetta was organising the procedure of getting Elmcroft Road in Chessington the Local Areas of Special Character (LASC) conservation status. We were told that it was being proposed for her report to be considered at June’s Neighbourhood Committee meeting. Is the process still ongoing? If so when will it come to neighbourhood?

A reply has been provided by Lisa Fairmainer, Acting Assistant Director, Strategic Planning & Infrastructure, as follows:

‘We apologise that there has been a delay in submitting this item. We are currently recruiting the right expertise into the team to manage Kingston's heritage assets. Once we have someone in post, we can progress the formal assessment of Elmcroft Drive against the LASC (Local Area of Special Character) criteria and make a decision. We are satisfied that there is no immediate threat to the character of the street through inappropriate development.’
3. **PA Housing Association landlord tenant issue**

Mr Richard Ware, Chair of the Chantry Road Residents Association, asked the following question:

‘My question relates to untoward or antisocial behaviour by Social Housing tenants that effects the quality of living to surrounding home owners.

I have been advised previously by the actual HA (PA Housing) if there are any issues with their tenants these are to be raised through the HA and not with the tenant direct. When I do this by letter or emails they are totally ignored. Thus taken at its face value it appears as an individual here is nothing that can be done about this matter.

Is there any pressure the Council can bring to bear on such issues? For information I attach the email/letter sent to PA Housing over a month ago. I have received an acknowledgement and that is all and from my previous experiences in dealing with Paragon (Richmond Church Houses) I do not expect to get anything. Paragon in the past appeared to have a "do nothing" policy on the basis it will eventually go away and they seemed to have maintained this mind set despite their re-birth as PA Housing.’

A response by Fiona Meads, Residential Team Leader, Regulatory Services, Kingston & Sutton Shared Environment Service, was provided as follows:

‘The Council have a statutory duty to investigate complaints of nuisance arising in their borough. This would include noise, accumulations etc and if residents wish to report it they can via the council's website or by telephoning the contact centre. If the complaints were in relation to a tenant of a residential social landlord we would work with the landlord to try and resolve. The Council can only deal with statutory nuisance which is wide ranging and persistent so may not cover the details described in the query. More details can be found here: [https://www.kingston.gov.uk/info/200193/environmental_health/196/noise/3](https://www.kingston.gov.uk/info/200193/environmental_health/196/noise/3)

If the issue is around any anti-social criminal behaviour then these should be reported to the local Safer Neighbourhoods Team [https://www.kingston.gov.uk/info/200234/policing_crime_and_community_safety/468/local_police_and_community_safety](https://www.kingston.gov.uk/info/200234/policing_crime_and_community_safety/468/local_police_and_community_safety)

4. **Cyclists Speeding on Filby Road**

Mr Ian Hogben asked if there was any progress on the matter he had brought up at the last Neighbourhood Committee meeting on the problem of high speed pavement cycling on Filby Road which is illegal, antisocial and dangerous.

Ian Price, Team Leader Strategy & Commissioning, Highways & Transport replied that there was not yet any progress on speed-reducing designs but that the proposals for Gilders Road roundabout may assist with this.

5. **Tolworth Greenway traders**

Mr Michael Hope asked whether Councillors would follow up with Streetscene officers enforcement against traders on Tolworth Greenway who illegally display goods on the footway. He had written to the Council about this problem but not got any response. Councillor Dunstone responded that both she and Councillor Thayalan would look into this.