



*Minutes of the LNP Committee meeting held on Tuesday, December 3rd 2019 at TVA Offices, 1st Floor Library Building, 14 Gresham Road, Oxted RH8 0BQ at 7:30pm.*

## MINUTES

1. **APOLOGIES** for absence.  
Philip Bailey, John Thompson
2. **DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST:** *To receive any disclosure by members of personal interest in matters on the agenda, the nature of any interests, and whether the member regards the interest to be prejudicial under the terms of the Code of Conduct. Members are reminded of the need to repeat their declaration immediately prior to the commencement of the item in question. Anyone with a prejudicial interest must unless an exception applies, or a dispensation has been issued, withdraw from the meeting.*

3. **MINUTES OF LAST MEETING** - *with feedback on actions shown in yellow*

*Dorothy's Cottage – Mark updated re potential planning application for parking. Grade II listed status for the site. No details are known and planning application has not been seen.*

4. **LNP PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSAL** - Draft 2 ( attached )
5. **FEEDBACK ON THIS YEAR'S ACTIVITY** – *led by project leaders*

- 5.1 **Conservation area assessment** – Mark Wilson explains outcome of the meeting with Sarah Thompson:

TDC would be supportive of the assessment but not pay for it. They would oversee and advise on what we needed to put forward for it to be accepted. Sarah Thompson questioned estimated costs from Martin Higgins, but came back with a view that it was fair (slightly top end). If we use Martin Higgins (SCC) normal procurement rules may not apply – as it's procuring from our own council so there may not need to be a tender. With Martin Higgins, we would be getting him at a better rate than we would with an external consultant.

TBK: need for clarification on whether we need to get more quotes.

TB: raised need to clarify the invoicing process and who is responsible if anything is not correct.

We will be supported by both SCC and TDC in this respect, because the onus falls on them to make sure it is done properly.

Priority because the area needs to be properly defined.

MW: can we get broad approval for Martin Higgins, pending clarification of the employment and procurement process.

**Action: MW to contact the Monitoring Officer at TDC to clarify above points.**

Re. extension of the boundary, MH says to look at inconsistencies in terms of boundary lines (through people's garden etc) which will tidy up the boundary as opposed to "expanding" it... In



order to extend the boundary, there would need to be good grounds for it. Extension of Detillens Lane and Sylvan Close.

***NB: There needs to be a consultation that we may need to allocate funds for.***

Within the conservation area, there are Grade I and Grade II listed buildings. But there are buildings that aren't listed or protected. TB – what is the point of this exercise? To look at any gaps that need to be filled. 1972 document doesn't specify the reasons for the conservation area. It just gives its boundary and generic rationale for it being such. The assessment goes into more detail and defines it better, giving more strength in terms of planning and protection.

Registered assets of community value. Carpenters Arms done and to be circulated for Monday's meeting.

To confirm address. Brook Field and Memorial Stores to be done next. £150 is for the Land Registry Costs.

***Action: MW to do applications for above.***

## **5.2 Footpaths**

Lots of posts already put in. Kissing Gates to be done in January. Idea to replace stiles with kissing gates. East Surrey Walkers have said they're going to put in 4 kissing gates. Good progress being made. £3500 approved, plus up to £200 for aggregate. We may not have to spend all the allocated budget.

Need to check on insurance for personal liability if anyone's injured clearing paths! SCC allowed to do up to a metre of public footpaths. Vegetation will be discussed next year.

## **5.3 Multi-purpose way**

- Looked at the original report for the cycle way. Although it's a good idea, do we have enough evidence to spend the money.
- Chart to village, Chart to Oxted and Circular (to be put together)
- Proposing that we tidy up the existing pathways and add to it to create the Limpsfield Way.
- Sponsorship potential with local businesses.
- Rob O'Donovan: Can we make the Limpsfield Way circular?
- The walks then become the online guides.
- Walking guide to be produced – aim by April (within this financial way)
- Budget for next year for the works - £5K.
- TBK suggests that next year we try to have more of a look on cycle ways in general in the entire area. Don't lose the concept of cycling but allow more time to look at it.
- NB re bikes, National Trust is putting in a proper mountain bike track to try to get bikes away from the pathways/bridleways.

**5.4 Speedwatch in Bluehouse Lane** – is happening.



## 6. LNP FUNDING PROPOSAL FOR 2020/21

**Shop Watch** – part of the LNP as something that could be looked at. Complicated because most of the shops would be in Oxted PC.

**Value for local businesses:** TBK – where could we have the best influence? Where could we put some money in? 1. Issue of safety and security – the whole of Oxted town centre (cameras?). 2. Environmental improvements for the area? 3. Parking and parking enforcement.

**Action:** *TB to do some research in to this (SM has already asked a few questions. To be followed up).*

### **Playground:**

LT: Parking by the church hall is also an issue around that area. Could you put parking matting along the edge of the Glebe Meadow? Any proposal that we make should incorporate parking.

TBK: We need to look at the project in totality and the long-term impact/facilities for the playground.

AO: We need to start somewhere and put a proposal forward to get people looking at the possibility.

Other possibilities in terms of location: Stanhopes? Residents would have objection. Grub Street?

MW: Concerned that if we start putting anything on Glebe Meadow it could have impact further down the line in terms of future development. Do we need to evaluate the site vs Stanhopes? Also, how would it work in terms of managing our asset (the playground) that is on the Church's leased land. And we would need to look at decommissioning costs. Who will do the CIL proposal? Would need to come from Church. TBK says it must be possible for a third party to be involved in a CIL proposal. **(to be looked into at upcoming CIL meeting)**

Should there be a consultation with Limpsfield for more specifics on what is needed and wanted? We need to scope out all options for play and recreation facilities (adult and children).

**Action:** *LT will project lead and bring proposal of next steps to the main meeting.*

### **Parking enforcement:**

Proposal for new parking enforcement contract. Awaiting decision from SCC to see who is the new contractor and what their responsibility is and if we are able to give them direction in terms of where we want them to patrol in their allocated hours.

TBK: Best to work with them in terms of an understanding than pay for patrol which has a lot of implications.

### **Parking:**

One of the key issues of the LNP. But where?

May get some guidance out of the conservation area in terms of ideas and locations to pursue.

To look further into potential sites (e.g. Glebe, Hookwood, behind Limpsfield Ceramics).

### **Additional ideas for potential CIL:**

- **Priest Hill re-surfacing** - to look into it ownership and potential for any surfacing. AO to look into it.



- **Noticeboard** – costs have been sourced for £1900 ish plus planning permission and fee. Would fall under Parish Council general rather than LNP.
- **Pelican crossing** at Limpsfield School. TB had response from SCC with quote of £400,000 for the work. Need to have a conversation with Cameron in terms of how this works.
- **Bluehouse lane** – currently at a standstill due to residents not having completed a survey yet.
- **Detillens lane** – replacement of VAS sign £2100. Speedwatch has made a difference. The Residents did fund the original one. SCC will not replace it. Will LPC agree to part fund a replacement if Cameron McIntosh can put some money in? **TB/MW**: Agree that LPC should put the money in. TB questioned any viability for Speed Cameras, but not possible to enforce/manage and maintain.

7. **DISCUSSION OF NEXT YEAR'S ACTIVITY** - (*shown in budget in green*) – led by relevant project leader

8. **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

- Bus shelter outside TDC offices. Should we do repairs /refurbish the bus shelter.
- AF & TB to undertake on a voluntary basis.
- Phonebox opposite Church in very bad shape. Could we do something with it? BT still owns it. Who to talk to at BT and who will clean it/maintain it.

**Action: AF to try to talk to BT to do something in it.**

9. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING** Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> March. 7.30 pm. TVA.