



## Shrewsbury Park Residents' Association

Minutes of the committee meeting held in Room 5, Shrewsbury House  
at 19.30 on the 4<sup>th</sup> December 2012

**Present:**

Robert Million (RM) Chair,  
Liz McDermott (LMD) Vice Chair,  
Alex Hayesmore (AH) Secretary,  
Ralph Million (RHM) Treasurer,  
Len Newland (LN), NW Area Co-ordinator,  
Simon Heywood (SH),  
Chris Higgs (CH),  
Clive Inglis (CI),  
Martyn Kither (MK),  
Leslie Smith (LS),  
Tania Smith (TS),  
George Tetheridge (GT),  
Michael Wood (MW)

Item	Action
<b>1      Welcome and apologies for absence</b>	
	<p>Apologies had been received from John Field. Robert Million (RM) began by welcoming everyone to the meeting and being the last meeting before Christmas wished all the compliments of the season. Tania Smith (TS) asked as she was absent from the last meeting, which was the first of the new committee, that everyone introduce themselves. All obliged.</p>
<b>2      Minutes of last meeting held 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2012</b>	
	<p>Simon Heywood had a list of suggested amendments to the minutes that were presented to the Chair and Secretary. SH was unsure how the meeting should address his comments, so Alex Hayesmore (AH) suggested he (AH) read them out and the committee could then discuss each point in turn.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Replace 'that communications regarding Resident's Association matters are only issued by the Chair or Secretary.' With 'communications to committee members regarding the committee agenda are only issued by the chair or secretary.' This was overturned by the committee on the grounds that this would have been an inaccurate representation of the chair's statement.</li></ol>



### **Minutes of last meeting (continued)**

2. Item 7 be renumbered as Item 6, this was an error by AH and all agreed to the amendment.
3. Item 6, Replace 'to the ones currently growing 'with 'to maintain variety of planting. Acknowledging the need for variety'. The committee agreed to the amendment 'to maintain variety of planting', but rejected any further alteration.
4. Item 7, First Paragraph, To replace the penultimate sentence beginning 'SH read out' with 'SH suggested that the phrase 'accurately replicate the original design' on page 36 of the draft appeared to imply a more rigorous requirement than the council had applied previously, but others felt this was no different from the current requirement. SH stated that the Association's newsletter should outline the key proposals in the draft management strategy that residents would consider important, because the councils letter had not done so RM stated that it was the council's responsibility as the local planning authority to carry out the consultation. However, the Association had advised residents by newsletter of the consultation and the ways in which they could comment. This amendment was rejected by the committee, but it was agreed that SH's objection to this paragraph be placed in the next minutes.
5. Item 7, Add sentence. 'SH referred to the planning finder website that showed more applications, and agreed to send the link to members of the committee, so that it could be used at least as a check upon the council's notifications' This was agreed.
6. Item 11, Fourth paragraph, in third line replace SH, with CH. AH could find no reference to this having come from CH in his notes, but the change was agreed.

Michael Wood (MW) asked for clarification of the address of the resident who had applied to remove a Eucalyptus tree, RM confirmed that it was 54 Mereworth Drive

RM asked for an amendment to the cost of the Oak posts, this was agreed.

Taking into consideration the ratified amendments, it was agreed that the minutes of the previous meeting were a true record and were signed by the Chair.

### **3      Matters arising**

There were no matters arising not covered by the agenda.



#### **4 Christmas Greetings Event**

Liz McDermott (LMD) reported that plans for this social event were well advanced and thanked TS and Len Newland (LN) for their help. The final decision on this event proceeding was to be taken on Friday (7<sup>th</sup> December). TS asked how many tickets had been sold. LMD replied 10, and that this level of sales was not enough to make the event viable. RM asked if any of the tickets sold had been brought by committee members. LMD explained none were. LMD raised the point that during the festive season residents are usually very busy with families etc. and do not always want to participate in estate wide social occasions, she went on to surmise that the reason the 'Strawberry Tea' had been so successful was largely due to all the other events taking place over the summer months, Jubilee and Olympics etc.

#### **5 Neighbourhood Watch Update**

LN reported that the size of the 'Safer Neighbourhood' area had been reduced, but that the same number of officers would be maintained for the area. He explained that we may not see the local police often, but they are there working for us and we are grateful. He also reported that 5 people had contacted him regarding the latest telephone scam.

RM thanked LN for all he does with Neighbourhood Watch.

#### **6 Association Vision**

##### **Plum Lane project.**

The larger shrub beds were now complete. RM had had outline discussion with residents about installing another bed between 221 Plum Lane and the Fire Station to complete this phase. TS asked RM if he intended to consult officially on this matter. RM said he would formally consult 221 Plum Lane.

##### **Oak post Estate entry treatment and plaques**

At the time of the meeting RM had been in negotiations with suppliers for oak posts in Plum Lane.

##### **Succession tree planting.**

The Association had been in negotiation with The Royal Borough in relation to tree planting using the £350 that had been agreed for this. RM was hoping to conclude these discussions and would inform the committee of the outcome. CH felt it would be a good idea to plant a tree in each road. RM explained that tree planting is on an as needed basis and positions are determined by The Royal Borough. Clive Inglis (CI) asked if this was succession planting after lost trees.



### **Succession Tree planting (continued)**

RM confirmed that it was, although since the process had begun, other trees had subsequently been lost.

### **Succession shrub planting.**

RM had agreed in principle with Cleansweep some shrub planting; he would be discussing this with Leslie Smith (LS) who was keen to be involved.

### **Street name plates**

LN had met with Tony Sheridan from The Royal Borough. The policy is not to replace street name plates unless they are damaged or unreadable.

It had therefore been agreed that six street name plates on the Estate would be replaced. These to be:-

Bushmoor Crescent,

Kinlet Road,

Mereworth Drive.

This will leave nine signs on the Estate to replace. LN reported that costs were £300 for a freestanding sign and £230 for a sign on a lamp post. LN felt that Association would have to fund any further replacements.

CH asked if the dangerous signs were to be replaced. LN confirmed they were.

Martyn Kither (MK) suggested we wait to see the new signs before considering funding our own replacements.

TS said any future replacements would have to be a phased project. This was agreed by the committee.

LN informed the committee that he believed there were grants available for schemes such as this and asked if he should investigate. It was agreed he should.

It was confirmed that the new signs will be standard Royal Borough signs.

**7**

### **Planning matters.**

[REDACTED]-demolition of original garage and construction of side extension-objections raised to demolition of garage, but some other aspects of the application were acceptable. There had been no decision from The Royal Borough at the time of the meeting.

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1,  
Highlight

[REDACTED] – Prune a sycamore and fell a goat-willow-comments only. RM felt this should be the other way round.

**Formatted:** Highlight

[REDACTED]-removal of existing conservatory, erection of an equally unattractive building on the side and a large extension across the back of the property (including enclosing the bay)-objections raised.

**Formatted:** Highlight



## 7 Planning matters (continued)

[REDACTED]-replica curved double-glazing in UPVC, setting garage back to original line, replace up and over garage doors with wooden etc-supported.

Formatted: Highlight

LS asked how the Associations responses were formulated. RM explained that each application was discussed between the officers and Martyn Kither and that this system had been agreed when he became chair to avoid such discussions becoming too cumbersome. After some discussion it was decided that LS and TS would be added to the planning consultation group within the committee.

TS spoke about the apparent inconsistencies in The Royal Borough's planning process and some of the questionable decisions. RM explained that the Association sent in detailed comments on each planning application as a way of helping to achieve consistency. RM felt that another reason for the inconsistency was the dated Planning Guidelines. This was one of the main reasons the Association had requested the CAMS to be in place so that an update to the Planning Guidelines could take place.

RM reported that the Association had not responded to Bristol regarding [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

CI asked about work on the driveway at [REDACTED]. RM replied that he thought The Royal Borough were aware that this work had commenced. He had spoken to the owner and work had stopped. TS asked if enforcement had visited. RM replied that he believed enforcement had been in contact with the owner.

Formatted: Highlight

Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy

RM explained the history of this matter again, for the benefit of those who were absent from the previous meeting. A CAMS was being produced for each of the borough's 20 conservation areas. The CAMS was not superseding the Planning Guidelines nor proposing any changes to the Article 4 Direction. The Royal Borough was obliged to consult on it again as the 2007 consultation had not completed with adoption of the document as it was believed that some properties in Eaglesfield Road had not received a notification. The Association had requested the CAMS for the Shrewsbury Park Estate be re-prioritised as a first step towards updating the current Planning Guidelines. Updating of the Planning Guidelines would be subject to its own consultation process in the future. RM thought the Royal Borough was working to a new template for the CAMS provided by English Heritage which was in a different format to the 1996 Planning Guidelines.



The Royal Borough was trying to achieve consistency in describing the controls being applied. The Royal Borough had clarified there were no changes to the Article 4. RM explained that residents should respond to the consultation and notify the Royal Borough of any issues that concerned them and the Royal Borough would update the draft as appropriate. This being the point of the consultation. The consultation period ended on 30<sup>th</sup> November. At the last meeting RM had asked those present for comments on the CAMS as members of the Association and he would pass them to the Royal Borough. No comments had been received. RM had fed back the Association's comments.

RM reported that there had been some leafleting occurring on the Estate that did not have the approval of the committee. He believed at least one of these had originated with SH and felt that some of the information contained in them was misleading and was likely to cause confusion amongst residents. RM explained again that the CAMS did not propose changes to the Article 4 Direction or Conservation Area rules and that the CAMS did not supersede the 1996 guidance and when it was updated it would have its own separate consultation.

LN thought that the current guidelines were contributing to the inconsistencies in planning decisions.

MK said that was why we need to get the CAMS adopted, so that the 1996 guidelines could be updated. RM explained that the 1996 guidelines only refer to two of the house styles on the Estate and that not all aspects were well defined in the document and it is this fact that is one of the key reasons for the planning inconsistencies, hence the Associations request to have the updated CAMS adopted first. TS felt we shouldn't wait for any future consultation on updating the planning guidelines and should be getting involved now. RM said that he had offered The Royal Borough the Associations assistance with any future update to the guidelines. TS spoke about the need to balance conservation with modern standards and needs.

George Tetheridge (GT) remarked that many people need more space these days, modern appliances, technology etc. RM asked if he had made this comment to The Royal Borough. GT and Michael Wood (MW) said they had. RM said this was good and was what the consultation process was for; he explained again the procedures he had asked to be put in place to allow residents to comment as easily as possible.

TS asked SH how he felt the Association could have better served the residents of the Estate in relation to the CAMS



consultation. SH felt that the initial letter from the council hadn't made clear the full implications of the consultation. There was some debate on this point, but it was generally felt that the update to the CAMS did not propose anything more onerous than was already contained in the current appraisal. TS wanted to get to the bottom of why SH felt he had to 'go it alone'. RM said that after the previous year's unpleasantness he hoped we could work together and move forward as a committee and it was his strong view that it was The Royal Borough's responsibility to undertake the CAMS consultation, not the Associations.

LN asked SH how many residents had responded to the petition that followed the leaflets. SH refused to give an answer.

RM re-iterated that the problem was the misleading information contained in the leaflets. RM highlighted two examples of SH's misleading statements: That the Royal Borough was proposing to "prevent the installation of letter boxes that meet the current British Standard for size of opening", and "Prevent installation of front drives wide enough for a parked car and for pedestrians". SH eventually admitted his error regarding these two points.

There was also debate on the nature and purpose of the CAMS and the meaning of planning guidance as opposed to edict. In her professional capacity as a town planner, TS explained the appraisal and management strategy of Conservation Areas was not to replace the current planning guidelines.

CH felt the process was very complicated and that they were trying to get residents to engage with it. CI asked why they hadn't gone through the committee. LN, LMD, MK, agreed. CH said that everyone was entitled to act as individuals. LN said that splinter groups were being formed again by the same individuals as BRAG, Re-energise and now SPESHIG, and as committee members their actions should be sanctioned by the committee. RM felt that the actions of such splinter groups had deliberately set out to cause confusion and disrupt or scupper the consultation process. He also felt it was the intention to take an opposing view to the Association.

In summary RM felt that CH and SH were criticising the Association and that as Chair he had done all he could to help residents involve themselves with the consultation process. He was unhappy about leaflets and petitions being published that contained misleading information. He read out a letter written by SH to Councillor Denise Hyland, criticising both the Royal Borough's consultation process



and the Association Committee. SH also criticised RM in particular as he had endorsed the document on the Association's behalf at a council meeting. RM explained that he had not endorsed the document as the finished article, but had endorsed it go out for public consultation; the difference between SH's interpretation of this and the facts being crucial on this point. LN said SH should have consulted with RM first and it was wrong to use his name in this manner. TS agreed. RM said he hoped this wouldn't cause the update of the CAMS to be postponed for another six years.

LMD said SH didn't seem to be a 'team player' and felt that he was continuing to pursue a personal vendetta against RM, and that his actions were incompatible with his position as a member of the committee. LN thought that SH should apologise. RM reminded the meeting of the consensus amongst those attending the AGM that divisive and counter-productive behaviour was not acceptable to them as residents and members of the Association and that working together was the basis of joining the committee. LN added that if SH wished to continue pursuing his own agenda he should resign from the committee. SH replied that *they* were committed to pressing ahead with the petition. CI asked who '*they*' were. SH answered that he was not yet in a position to divulge that information. RM felt this was unacceptable and created conflict of interest. RM said that committee direction is on the basis of consensus and that the current situation was a re-run of 'BRAG' and 'Re-Energise', splintering off when not personally in agreement with the majority position of the committee.

TS agreed with LN regarding the apology, and thought it was a great shame that SH's efforts couldn't be channelled positively and suggested he share his results with the rest of the committee. SH would not offer to do this. There was further debate regarding the validity and accuracy of the petition. CI was concerned that any results from the leafleting and petition would be based on misleading information. SH was adamant that his petition was the way forward. MK said there was a general issue with CH & SH criticising the committee's decisions and actions. CH thought that SH could apologise. TS said that SH could reflect on his actions and make an apology outside of the meeting.



### **Planning matters (continued)**

LN suggested RM give SH clarifications and corrections for SH to distribute to the Estate. RM said he would be happy to do that and the consensus amongst the committee was that this would be an acceptable way to resolve this difficulty. Time dictated that the meeting progress to the next agenda item.

#### **8 Shrewsbury House Grade II Listing**

Ralph Million (RHM) left the meeting to avoid a potential conflict of interest. There had been no new information forthcoming about 28 Mereworth Drive, so the matter was closed with English Heritage. RM had asked The Royal Borough to consider local listing of this building in the Association's comments on the CAMS

#### **9 Former fire station telecommunications mast**

RHM returned to the meeting. RM was proposing to write to The Royal Borough stating the Association's objection to the retention of the equipment installed for the Olympics and requesting its removal. All agreed. RM explained some of the history of the mast and the Association to CI. CH offered an update. He had written a letter objecting to the proposed equipment retention on the grounds of the mast being in a Conservation Area. He detailed his recent correspondence relating to the matter.

#### **10 Car parking outside Shooters Hill Lawn Tennis Club**

SHLTC had applied to construct two new tennis courts. This would have implications for parking. All felt that there was no issue with the courts, but parking on Eaglesfield Road may become a problem. LN had written to SHLTC asking for their thoughts on managing the parking problem. TS thought that the Association should object on the grounds of potential parking problems, so that SHLTC could re-apply with an application that dealt with the parking. There was some debate and it was decided the Association would support the application in principle but would highlight concerns over parking.

#### **11 Any other business.**

TS raised concerns over street sweeping. RM will pursue.

LMD asked for clarification on the resolution of the petition matter. From his notes AH explained that RM would issue clarifications and corrections to SH for distribution. SH at this point refused to accept this. There was further debate over how to resolve the matter. LMD suggested the next scheduled meeting be brought forward. AH suggested Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> February at 19.30. All agreed.

RM wished everyone a Merry Christmas.



There being no other business the meeting closed at 22.04.

**Date of next meeting Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> February 2013 at 19.30.  
AH to arrange.**

Signed: (Chair)

Date: