



Shrewsbury Park Residents' Association

Minutes of the committee meeting held in Room 3, Shrewsbury House
at 19.30 on the 15th October 2013

Present:

Robert Million (RM) Chair,
Alex Hayesmore (AH) Secretary,
Ralph Million (RHM) Treasurer,
Len Newland (LN), NW Area Co-ordinator,
Nicola Dennis (ND),
John Field (JF),
Nick Fry (NF),
Chris Higgs (CH),
Clive Inglis (CI),
George Tutheridge (GT),

Guests

Hilary Hutchinson
Richard Hutchinson
Ian Robert

Item	Action
1	Welcome and apologies for absence.
	Robert Million (RM) began by welcoming everyone to the meeting. Apologies had been received from Martyn Kither and Liz McDermott. RM reminded the committee that the process to fill the vacancy had been agreed by AGM. RM then explained that there was one vacancy to fill on the committee and each of the three candidates had been invited to attend. He would ask each to speak for five minutes about what they thought they could bring to the committee. The committee would then vote by ticking the appropriate box on the ballot papers prepared by Alex Hayesmore, secretary (AH). The candidate with the most votes would be considered elected to the committee.
2	Vacancy: Individual presentations from candidates.
	Each candidate was invited into the meeting in turn and RM explained the procedure.



2 **Vacancy: Individual presentations. (continued)**

Hilary Hutchinson

Hilary felt that the committee was too hard on families moving into the area with regard to planning issues etc. Hilary claimed that a member of the committee had asked a neighbour new to the area to stop work when they had planning permission. Len Newland (LN) explained that he had spoken to the people he assumed Hilary was talking about. But that he had not done it as member of the committee, and that he certainly didn't ask them to stop, merely enquired about the work and the relevant permissions.

Hilary felt that she wanted to be more involved as felt there was a 'them and us' situation developing.

Richard Hutchinson

Richard had lived on the Estate for nine years and had followed the activities of the committee quite closely. He admitted that he had been involved in some of the activities of which the committee did not approve. Richard felt that he could bring an objective view on things like the CAMS to the committee. His job in the past had involved thoroughly checking documents and felt this would be useful. He also felt the committee should better engage with residents.

Ian Robert

Ian had lived in the area for twelve years and thought it was time to get more involved, he wanted to get to know his neighbours better and to help encourage the objectives of the Association. He wanted to help to find ways to resolve some of the differences of opinion in the area. He loved living here and wanted to have a voice and would like to bring new ideas to the committee. Clive Inglis (CI) asked what he had in mind. Ian replied, ways of raising more funds as just one example, but would like to see how the committee worked and would hopefully come up with ideas as time went on.

3 **Vacancy: Vote to fill.**

A vote was held by ballot:

2 votes for Hilary Hutchinson

2 votes for Richard Hutchinson

6 votes for Ian Robert

RM informed the candidates of the outcome and invited Ian Robert (IR) back into the room to formally join the committee. All introduced themselves.

John Field (JF) left the meeting at this point giving his apologies for the remainder.



4 Minutes of last meeting held 22nd May 2013.

The minutes of the meeting held 22nd May 2013 were agreed as a true record and signed by the chair (RM).

5 Matters arising.

Ralph Million (RHM) asked LN about the subscriptions for Bushmoor Crescent. LN replied that he'd asked JF to finish the collection as it was currently beyond his health. RHM was satisfied with this.

CH asked about a link to our website from the SHNHWS website. AH would contact Jenny Penn.

RM had asked CI and AH to lead on completion of the Plum Lane Project. CI and AH asked RM to forward all the contact details to them.

6 Neighbourhood watch update. (Len Newland)

LN had attended a meeting the previous week. Since September 15th things had changed in the organisation of the safer neighbourhood teams. There is now a designated sergeant, one PC and one PCSO although there are additional officers based at Plumstead working in ten hour shifts. Because the boundaries have changed the beat is easier to police. Occasional burglaries and car break ins are still happening with the same modus operandi as six months ago, apart from this all was quiet.

CI asked about regular patrols. LN replied that there are patrols, but they don't have use of a car, although some people preferred to see officers walking a beat.

The local team have stopped drug dealing occurring in the Golf Club car park.

IR asked about anti-social behaviour around the Golf Club. LN believed this had been dealt with.

LN explained that he had been having problems with his email list since changing to Windows 7, but he hoped this was now resolved.

7 Planning matters update.

The front garden walls at 1 & 3 Bushmoor Crescent had now been removed. Work on the drives is still outstanding. RM had not persued, but was happy to send a reminder letter to the Royal Borough. The committee agreed he should do this.

CI asked about the planning applications sent out to committee members. RM confirmed that this was for information and comment. George Tutheridge (GT) asked about the windows at 27 Bushmoor Crescent. RM confirmed they did not comply with guidelines.



7 Planning matters update. (continued)

GT also asked if the Association had written to object to the retention of the temporary 'Olympic' equipment on the Old Fire Station mast. RM said it had, explained the history of the matter to new committee members and asked if we should write again. All agreed we should.

Advisory Feedback

Retention of equipment on OFS mast.-objections raised.

█ single storey extension-supported.

█-replace garage doors-supported.

█-tree work-supported.

█-replacement drive-supported.

█-single storey extension-part supported, but amendments suggested to the design of the roof.

█-tree work-supported.

█-tree removal-supported.

█-replace garage doors-comment only.

█-replacement drive-supported.

█-extension-objections raised.

█-reduce height of hedge and remove holly tree-supported.

RHM remarked he didn't think you needed permission to reduce the height of the hedge.

LN asked about █. They had built a brick parapet above the garage doors. RM said that he thought the planning application was for a rear extension. The breach had not been reported to RBG by the SPRA

LN couldn't understand how the extension at █ had been allowed. RM believed that RBG had refused permission twice, but had been overturned by HM Inspectorate in Bristol, apparently telling RBG it should be allowed.



7 Planning Matters Update. (continued)

Chris Higgs (CH) was concerned that residents would want to undertake similar projects and would increasingly take their cases to appeal and thought that porches were going to become more of an issue.

RM explained that [REDACTED] had recently had a porch built, but, that it was built to the original Laing design for a house type that could have had a porch. This was allowed under the planning guidelines.

Nicola Dennis (ND) felt that planning matters were one of the biggest sources of friction amongst residents, as it was very difficult to grasp just what and what wasn't allowed and suggested that perhaps there could be some help on the website, perhaps by showing examples of what is allowed.

IR suggested a style guide. LN thought ND's idea was a good one. A photo gallery of allowed designs. IR suggested we contact the owners and ask permission to take pictures and if they had them to publish the technical drawings. RM said there would be a lot of work and this and it would take time.

IR commented that it is increasingly difficult to make do and mend with buildings that are now more than seventy years old. A distinction should be made between new work and everyday maintenance. RM thought that repair work did not generally require consent, but replacement did.

8 Any other business.

Nick Fry (NF) pointed out that clause 10 of the Association Rules referred to the 1984 Data Protection Act, he reported that this Act had been updated several times since 1984. The committee agreed that the wording should be amended to 'current Data Protection Act'.

NF was also concerned about personal liability as a member of the Association committee and questioned what legislation allowed such an Association to be set up.

LN felt that as posts were honorary there was no liability. There was some discussion on this question. The consensus was that the Association committee was just a gathering of residents with no legislative or executive powers. IR thought that it was just an association of people rather than a legal entity. RM felt said that the Associations comments pertaining to planning applications had no more weight than any individuals comments and as everyone was entitled to have their say this wasn't an issue. As an example of the legal status RM explained that RBG refer to the Association as a 'utility group'.



8 Any other business. (continued)

LN had received an email post AGM regarding transparency and saying it wasn't the Association's place to challenge planning decisions. LN spoke about how the committee deal with planning applications and this was where problems arose. ND disagreed and thought the committee was dealing with this matter correctly. Further discussion on this matter.

LN wondered if it would be helpful if the applicant was involved in the Association's comments. RM said he had asked RBG to give his contact details to applicants if they wished to contact him. So far this seemed to be working.

CH said that points raised at the AGM should be on the agenda for committee meetings and that the AGM minutes should be available for approval at the next committee meeting. RM stated that this meeting was unusual as the vote was the main item. Meeting agenda's cover all the main heading raised at the AGM. AH reminded the meeting that AGM had agreed that AGM minutes should be posted at Shrewsbury House two weeks before the next AGM.

IR said the committee needed to be clear about what it had achieved and what it hadn't. He suggested a surgery.

CH again requested that the position statement on kerb side maintenance be reconsidered.

RM was not proposing to revisit previous decisions or to make any changes to this statement as it resulted from two years of debate on the matter.

RM asked AH to read an email from Liz McDermott outlining her proposals for a gardening event to be held in May 2013 and requesting preliminary agreement from the committee. This was agreed.

RM read out a letter from the Mayor of Greenwich thanking the Association for its donation.

RM had reported the pot holes in Eaglesfield Road.



8 Any other business. (continued)

Kenny Earl had contacted RM regarding the the deterioration of the speed humps in Plum Lane.

RM had at the time of the meeting had no reply from residents regarding the topping up of soils levels in the shrub beds.

GT spoke about the parking situation near the tennis courts.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 21.25

Date of next meeting, Tuesday 3rd December at 19.30.

Signed (Chair):

Date: