



MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 29 SEPTEMBER 2020

ONLINE VIA MS TEAMS.

Attending:

Ann Osborn (Chair), Ashley Fosdike, Bob Harvey, John Thompson, Rob O'Donovan, Philip Bailey, Mark Wilson, Laila Turner, Ted Beresford-Knox.

Sophie Martin (Clerk)

1. **MINUTES OF LAST MEETING – update on actions**

- 1.1 Priest Hill pathway to Padbrook. Likely to be very expensive, but AO will find out more cost. Looking at resin bonded surface. AF asked if the construction up Priest Hill would impact this surface, but it would not.
- 1.2 Noticeboard at St Peter's being built as we speak.
- 1.3 Phone Box – BT going to repair it, but hasn't repaired all of it. AO will trim back foliage when the noticeboard is being installed. BH offers to wash it down and clean it.

2. **APOLOGIES** for absence.

Tom Briggs

3. **DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST - none**

4. **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION** - Review of project implementation plan and budgets (attached budget) – leaders to update

4.1 Planning & Management of New Development (Conservation Area Assessment and ACVs) – TDC meeting to kick off and working group to be held on Friday. Sarah Thompson handing over to Helen Bloore (sp?). AF & CR walked the boundary. Boundaries will most likely change to allow for some anomalies. More information, clarification of process and feedback after Friday's meeting. Re. payment, SCC will be paid 20% up front then the rest will be 2021. There may be some incidental expenses for communication – leaflets to parishioners etc.

4.2 Assets of Community Value – Memorial Stores and Carpenters are through. Brook Field still to be finalised. New staff member in charge of ACVs at TDC – SM liaising with her regarding Brook Field and confirmation of The Bull's status.

4.3 Open Spaces, Countryside and The Natural Environment (Footpaths & The Limpsfield Way)

4.3.1 Footpath improvements have started back up again though volunteers are still not working in terms of installation of gates etc, AO advises we will need to hire contractors to do the work. PB agrees with contractors being used to make sure the paths are maintained especially as volunteers are off and paths being used more. AO/AF ask all to please feed back regarding any issues with any footpaths they come across so any repairs or maintenance can be noted. JT asks to confirm the budget for the 3-yr period. 2019/20 - £3500 for 2020/1 - £5000. Proposed £5000 for 2021/2 but AO will follow up on budget and confirm.

4.3.2 Local guides and walking groups – communication with ROD who has noted there is a loop walk around Limpsfield via SCC.

AF would like to get parishioners using the paths as much as possible and won't be as long. AF and AO to walk the proposed Limpsfield Way on Friday to establish the route and need for any maintenance. ROD notes the number of walkers has greatly increased and that most seem to use apps and online maps/GPS. Can we do something on an apps/online? Do we need a printed guide? Also notes that in some areas there is almost overkill in terms of number of walks.



AF has costed a double-sided illustrated map of Limpsfield at £2000. Local businesses could advertise on there.

JT can we put a budget item for 2021 for the walking guide.

AO will establish budget for this.

- 4.3.3 Wildlife Strategy – ROD. Not got very far with this however has contacted Mike Weight regarding help looking at local wildlife study and how a parish council. Cuckfield had done a lot of research into where the wildlife is and what it is that we have in the Parish. Possible idea of a survey to residents is suggested.

JT asks if we should we take £5000 out of the budget?

PB notes that he had dealings with the Surrey Wildlife Trust on a planning application for Honeypot Lane. If we did have local information, it would help on the planning side of things.

PB does therefore think it's an important activity.

AO agrees to rephrase activity and adjust the budget.

Laila Turner and Ted Beresford Knox joined 16.34

4.4 Supporting Local Business (Shopwatch/Local Business Group)

Christmas fete at The Limpsfield Cookery School. AO suggests we support this with communication and have a stand there – to sell our Limpsfield maps, provide information on the CAAMP and give parishioners an opportunity to talk to councillors. All agree to support this.

Light Up Limpsfield – come December, it would be a good thing to Light up Limpsfield. AO proposes budget of £250 for additional lights and Christmas tree. PB notes need for tasteful decorations and agrees with support for the cookery school's Christmas Fete to assist in supporting local businesses. LPC could have a Christmas Tree. Suspects that £250 may not be enough.

AO believes the Limpsfield Traders Association (now disbanded) have some money left over but not sure if we can access it. She/SM is looking into this.

AO will come up with more detailed budget on Christmas Trees and lighting if everyone is in agreement with this as an idea.

The Church is looking at putting the trees on the drive up to the Lychgate this year as there will not be services. PB suggests we fund a tree and notes issue of electricity supply.

Regarding a tree on the green up by Kiwi Cottage, Bob Harvey suggests asking permission for the tree from Kiwi Cottage owners and for supply of electricity to come from the café.

For the Chart – BH believes potential focal point is an issue. Bob will ask Carpenters about their Christmas plans and look at any potential site for a tree.

In terms of general support for local business, JT notes there is no leadership on this area.

PB notes that the centre of business in Limpsfield is in fact Station Road East and the shops and businesses at the southern end that are in the LP. What can we be doing with them?

AO / JT to have discussion with TB (absent) who was designated project lead.

4.5 Community Services, Facilities & Assets (St Peters/Church Hall/Glebe).

AO/MW/SM believe Legion Playground is not likely to go ahead as the Legion committee has many reservations. They will present it to AGM in January. Likelihood is we will need to look for another site.

LT – proposes to have a meeting with Church Hall Committee and Jon Rayner regarding replacement noticeboard with one that is flexible in terms of being able to change with changing businesses at the Church Hall and Glebe Meadow. Joh Rayner proposed idea with a business sign where business titles can be swapped in and out.

AO notes about potential for benches or picnic tables to go on the Glebe? LT can also include this into her discussions with the Church and Glebe businesses. There are other potential activities or facilities that could also be discussed.



LT to report back on progress and details/quote for replacement business noticeboard which LPC could contribute to.

4.6 Connecting the Parish (Cycle Way, Broadband, Bus Routes)

- *Broadband connectivity.* We have provided information already and can run this information again. Not much we can do until there is superfast broadband available, but people can apply for grants to get this.
SM to re-publicise SCC's information on the gigabit voucher scheme.
- *Cycleways* – TBK we should push back to SCC / Highways on cycleway issues and development. There are existing cycle routes that could be improved.
PB questions the budget in terms of what we can do with £5000 budget, when there is no actual plan at the moment.
AO will look into this issue further but can take the existing allocation out of the budget.
- *Buses* – JT hasn't made much progress on this. Discussion over potential re-routing of buses due to congestion on the high street. BH concerned if buses do not go up the high street, it will be difficult for older residents.
AO and SM will look into some communication with the bus company as background into whether bus routes can be re-rerouted or changed and process for this.

4.7 Road Safety, Congestion & Parking (Speedwatch, Parking, HGVs).

- 4.7.1 *VAS sign for Bluehouse Lane* is going ahead. Awaiting date and location from local Highways via Cameron McIntosh.
SM to confirm with Cameron what the signage will be.
LT will talk to Annabel and Tony with regards to any need for budget for 2021/22 but it is felt that we should see how the first one works.
- 4.7.2 *Parking Enforcement* – the parking wardens are covering the Limpsfield area, but the High Street has not yet received any tickets. PB notes, that it's not necessarily illegal as there aren't double yellow lines. It's more to do with volume and size of vehicles. We need to encourage parking wardens.
AO – should we have more double yellow lines on Limpsfield High Street?
LT could the bus re-route back down Detillens Lane? MW notes there has also been parking on Hookwood Corner. No yellow line but it is a footpath. We need to look at signage to stop people parking as it's illegal to park on a footpath – but who would deal with it?
PB believes we need to ease off a little and not get too strict on this matter.
- 4.7.3 **HGVs** – BH notes that the signs on the A25 are useless – in wrong position and do not deter HGV drivers at all. Blockade lorries regularly use the high street as do many other HGVs. What else can we do?
AO should we do something about the signage? Positioning could be better. Can we have a sign saying NO HGVs? How do we designate the high street as not suitable or closed to HGVs?
PB believes we can't do anything unless we re-route the B road. SCC needs an alternative to that road. It could be investigated, and this is potentially what we should be investing into. It is a big big project.
TBK – this issue will rear its head anyway via the Conservation Area Assessment and Management Plan. This could give impetus in how best we could take this forward. Could give SCC a steer in terms of thinking.
PB suggests we call this item Traffic Management and that something is put in the budget for 21/22 as potential project for traffic management.

5. PAVEMENT CONSULTATION (BH)

- 5.1 *Parking on pavements* – this is a national initiative in terms of a proposal to make it illegal to park on pavements. BH believes we don't have a huge problem in Limpsfield. If they can't park on the



pavement, where can they park? Is it worth commenting on? PB – used to be a problem opposite The Bull Inn, but doesn't seem to be any more. Detillens Lane can also be an issue opposite the tennis club.

BH – believes it is irresponsible and morally wrong (if not illegal) to park on the pavement. People shouldn't have to walk into the road to pass a car.

AO - Any comments gratefully received. TBK – it does also feed into the need to facilitate walking and cycling. Could we put something in the newsletter and social media to try to dissuade people from doing it (for safety reasons).

6. CRIME PREVENTION (JT)

Crime prevention. To revisit this when we have talked to the various parties (Police, TDC etc) **SM has met with TDC and liaised with local police / prevention team and will circulate document already prepared from her meeting with the TDC community safety officer.**

7. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

7.1 **CIL** - JT – we need to do more and look at the projects we could potentially allocated to CIL. We should be deciding which projects are CIL eligible and come up with a plan to actually spend this money.

SM to circulate the CIL criteria information sheet. AO will look at potential CIL eligible projects.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING to be agreed