



STOKE BISHOP NEIGHBOURHOOD OPEN FORUM
Wednesday 23rd April 2014

Present: Councillor Peter Abraham (PA). Officers:, Andrew McGrath, PC Sean Brean, PCSO Claire Fisher. Ward Representatives: Alan Preece (Chairman), Gay Huggins and Wendy Hull. Stephanie French (Tree Champion)(SF), David Mayer (WOT Rep)(DM). Alan Aburrow (WOT Rep) and approximately 30 members of the public.

Apologies:, Councillor John Goulandris, Gerry Arnold, Mark Baker.

Welcome: Alan Preece (AP) welcomed everyone and made introductions. PC Seal Brean was standing in temporarily until a new PC is appointed, following PC Paul White's promotion to Sergeant. We asked for congratulations to be passed to Paul. AP explained why the date had been changed due to a school function, and felt this was reflected in the low turnout.

He explained that two Ward Representatives were due to stand down at this time, and they were Wendy Hull and Mark Baker. As there were no other nominations and both were prepared to stand for election, they were automatically re-elected. AP pointed out that next year Gay and himself were due to stand down, and although there has been a change in the Constitution to enable those who have done their full term to be re-elected if no one else comes forward, it would be a shame if new people did not step up to take over as this could result in the collapse of our NP, after all the achievements..

Updates:

a) Playground on Stoke Lodge – DM reported that, despite previous promises, no action had taken place and everyone was shocked to receive notification via Cllr John Goulandris on Good Friday that no work was planned for the summer and the playground would not be available until September or even later. Action was taken and the Officers were presented with our views on their return to work after the Easter break. Thanks to Andrew McGrath, Gary Brentnall, Di Robinson and Tracey Morgan (head of Leisure Services) and particularly Simon Westbrook (Leisure Services Manager) who all responded and pulled our project back on track. We therefore look forward to having the play facilities available for the summer holidays as previously promised. Gary further advised us that work was starting **TOMORROW!** DM was still very concerned by the part Officer Richard Trantham had played in this latest potential delay and will be pursuing this and calling for a disciplinary investigation.

b) Town & Village Green (TVG) – DM brought us all up to date with the present situation. Anxieties raised by Cotham about dog fouling and “attacks” needed to be proved by them. PCSO Claire Fisher said no reports of any attacks had been reported over the last six years and Cotham had not accepted invitations to meet her. They had also been invited to a meeting of the SLPWG but had failed to attend.

Judy Preston mentioned a letter from Government stating that Health & Safety was being used far too often. . PA advised us to be careful not to get too involved in this issue, or to raise spectres and problems that are better left unsaid.

The TVG was now on hold until the outcome of an Appeal at Newhaven, the core of which is the impact that Health and safety might have on ability to carry out “statutory duty”.

c) 20mph – Following complaints from two people regarding speeds on Coombe Lane, despite the majority of the attendees of the relevant Open Forum voting that it stays at 30mph, Coombe Lane was

added to the list of roads to be reduced to 20mph. The final consultation was due to go out to residents any time now, when there would be a chance to challenge the process by which the decisions were reached (update: the consultation starts on May 7th, and concludes at end of May).

d) Mark Baker was unavailable to give a report on the Flood management plans, but AP felt Stoke Bishop was less likely to be affected than WOT or Henleaze. See Wessex Water website for plans.

Local Developments & Projects:

Roger Gamlin, Co-convenor, Stoke Bishop Residents' Planning Group : –

1.The Hiatt Baker site – They were behind but are now back on schedule and the accommodation for the additional 332 students should be ready for September. The road entrance of the bus hub had suffered sinkage which was being rectified during holiday periods. The University were working with the Council on improving access onto Parrys Lane, but the Council had turned down an island with bollards near the entrance. Improved cycle lane, restricted road width, improved signage and better road markings were all being considered. SF saw one bus reverse out of the entrance onto Parrys Lane, which was totally illegal and dangerous. The Shaplads residents and the University have agreed yellow lining which is now with the Council's Planning Department, and hopefully will be completed in about six months. It was felt the University wanted the least amount of land to be used for the buses, and SF felt we should be very aware that the University could apply for more development in the future on this site.

2.Dairy Crest site – At previous Open Forums, the unanimous decision was that the 3 houses by the entrance should face Parrys Lane, but the Council had turned this down. Shepperton Homes went to Appeal and 3 members of the SBRPG attended and were able to give the Inspector the wishes of the NP. The Inspector also visited the site. He upheld the Appeal and agreed the houses would improve the visibility of Parrys Lane... Work has now started on site. The lane is at present closed for six months but it will re-open.

Tree Issues – SF had produced a report and had also written an additional report following a meeting of the Tree Forum, as attached.. She outlined the situation and asked the NP for approval to ensure the University is not given permission to plant trees away from the affected sites. This was agreed unanimously and will be taken forward to the next Neighbourhood Forum to ask for official support for this embargo.

Well Being Fund: Gay Huggins had written a report which was attached to the paperwork, and advised that another £10,000 had been granted to each Ward for the 2014/15 period. We had “loaned” Henleaze £355, and borrowed £500 from WOT at the end of the last financial period, but we still have over £9,500 for this financial year, so please think about projects this money can be spent on. There were no questions.

Feedback and Priorities:

a) **Police/PCSO Feedback** - PC Sean Brean reported that there had been 12 thefts from motor vehicles, though it was suspected that there were more that had not been reported. The police are finding people leaving cars unlocked on the road or on their drives, and this was not a good idea. He was happy to advise us that one lad had been arrested for 50 offences, and two others for similar offences. There had been 4 burglaries on dwellings in Bell Barn Road, Rockleaze, Druid Hill and Glenavon Park. There had been 6 non-dwelling burglaries, mainly sheds, in Coombe Bridge Avenue, Avon Way, Church Road, Druid Hill and Parrys Lane. Offenders were using the local lanes to make their escape. He warned us of a device which was available to buy on line for about £10 which could block the locking system on a car if they are close enough. Please ensure your car is locked by confirming that locking has happened, and report any thefts to ensure police figures are accurate.

PCSO Claire Fisher reported on speedwatch which had been carried out on the Portway, Old Sneed Avenue and Charlton Road. The mobile vans have also been in the area. No one had been arrested for the robbery in Sea Mills and they are waiting for forensic evidence. We were advised to be aware of fraud, particularly from telephone callers who sound very believable. Try to get the number or go to the actionfraud website. Door to door traders were still around.

- b) **NP Working Groups** – Reports were attached to the minutes. AP mentioned that money was still available from the Section 106 money from Hiatt Baker and a bid from the Sneyd Park Nature Reserve will be discussed at the next Environment meeting on the 1st May. Wendy Hull mentioned that the leaflet which the Working Group for Older People had been working on with LinkAge was now available and copies had been circulated to various outlets. A trip was organised to Chew Valley on the 7th May and it was fully booked.
- c) **Community actions & priorities** –
 - a) Problems were still occurring from cyclists on the Downs and PA suggested we invite the new Downs Ranger (when appointed) to an Open Forum. Gay Huggins suggested dividing the wide pavement across the Downs by lineage for cyclists one side and pedestrians the other. This could be raised with the Ranger. Keith Bonham mentioned that cycling in Clifton Village, and particularly Upper Belgrave Road, was very bad. PA said The Promenade was meant for pedestrians, and not cyclists. The proposed bridge over Bridge Valley Road had been given approval by the Downs Committee.
 - b) The Transport WG were now restricted to one scheme per year so they would try to amalgamate various schemes. Officers' time was being taken up by Government Funded schemes, and the NP were at the bottom of the pile!
 - c) You said, we did – 1) PA had taken up the matter of the bullion van parking on the pavement (raised at the last Open Forum by M Huggins), and he was now taking it up with the banking ombudsman. It has become a complete farce but he is continuing to pursue the matter.
 - 2) Jenny Hodges mentioned parking on pavements was still a problem, particularly for those with disabilities, and was worse in WOT, The police do not take action unless the vehicle is preventing access to pushchairs.
 - 3) Tony Hoare raised the matter of parked cars being sold from streets. Gay Huggins was able to elaborate on this problem which was being caused by a company called Hazelwood Cars, trading from Towerleaze, Sneyd Park, and letters were being written by S.P.R.A. to Planning, Trading Standards and Highways, to try and stop this business. A copy of this letter was given to the police to follow up.

Neighbourhood Priorities: Andrew McGrath had received an update from Hayley Ash. Dog fouling was being targeted in WOT and Henleaze, but no roads in Stoke Bishop had been highlighted. If anyone had a problem, please let her know. Leaflets were available. Keith Bonham mentioned that there was a significant problem along the footpath from Coombe Dingle to Blaise. SF asked when Hayley would be moving on to deal with litter issues, and it was suggested she emailed her.

Any other Business: 1) SF asked if the Bristol & West Sportsground site had been sold and it was confirmed that this was the case and it was sold to the Avon Wildlife Trust. Gay Huggins mentioned that Bevis Watts would be giving a presentation at the SPRA AGM on the 20th May, 7.30pm, at St Mary Magdalene Church Hall, for all who would like to learn of the plans for this site.

2) Morris Husbands thanked the NP for the double yellow lines by the Village Hall, but wished they had been longer. He was angry at the 20mph idea and all the street furniture it would entail.

Date of Next Meeting: TBA – September/October 2014. The meeting closed at 9.00pm.

Working Group Reports

WORKING GROUP FOR OLDER PEOPLE (WGOP)

The sudden serious illness of our Chairman, Sue Boyd, was a big shock for the group, particularly as Gay and Sue had spent a lovely day at Chew Valley only two days before working out the next trip on offer to the elderly of the NP3 area. However, we have duly carried on, and the trip is full.

Unfortunately, Social Access, previously known as Dial-A-Ride, due to finance cuts, have only been able to allocate two small buses to us this time for the trip on Wednesday 7th May. We do have a waiting list in case they are able to provide another bus and we are hoping we might be able to train a couple of husbands as drivers in due course, if not for this trip, for the future.

However, we are delighted to say the leaflet which we have been working on since our successful Festival of Age has now come to fruition and copies are being circulated to libraries, doctors' surgeries, church halls, etc to reach people over 55 who might be new to the area and want to discover what is available to them to keep them active and meet people and make new friendships. This leaflet has been sponsored by Wiltshire Farm Foods. This is Issue 1, and we hope we will be able to update approximately every six months.

We withdrew our application for funding from the previous round of Well Being Grants as there were sufficient to spend all the funds available, but we asked that it be put forward into the next financial year's grants in order to enable us to continue with our trips which are enjoyed by many and give great pleasure.

Gay Huggins (Treasurer)

Ward Representative

WELL BEING GRANTS

Following the Council's decision that all money apportioned to the Well Being Grants must be allocated by the end of the last financial year, three applications were received from Stoke Bishop organisations hoping for a bit of the money left in the Stoke Bishop pot! The WGOP then asked that their application was withdrawn and transferred to the next financial year as they were not in urgent need, which was agreed, and so the two remaining applications were considered. One was from St Mary Magdalene Church to help fund 90 young people on a trip, at a cost of £900, which was agreed in full, and the second was from the 43rd Scout Group that meets in the hut off Kewstoke Road. Their application for £7,000 was rather "over the top" but we were able to give them nearer £3000 towards the renovation of the kitchen with the help of a loan from WOT funds of £500. We have asked them to submit a further application this financial year for help with the renovation of the toilets. We have reinstated the maximum of £3,000 per application, but we hope we shall be able to support our local community in several ways.

Gay Huggins

Ward Representative

WORKING GROUP FOR ENVIRONMENT

Environment Working Group – meetings Nov 2013 and Feb 2014. For official notes see the website www.activenp.co.uk for the Nov 2013 meeting and the NP3 notes for the Feb 14th 2014 meeting of the environment WG. Below are personally abstracted notes:

Stoke Bishop Items – items arising from Nov meeting

Damage to various verges – namely in Mariners Drive, Church Road and Druids Hill is an ongoing issue referred by Gerry Arnold who will bring these specific points to attention of the Gary Brentnall – who is the liaison person for this type of problem.

Gas Installation on Stoke Lodge still has not had its planning conditions complied with – namely the landscaping on all four aspects. However the notice-board outside Hiatt Baker development that has been attached to the listed wall is only a temporary one and is to be removed on completion of the contract.

Hiatt baker 106 fund: Flooding continues to be a problem in the Sneed Park Nature reserve and a request to possibly access some of the Hiatt baker 106 money was flagged up, although some future 106 money is also imminent for the Sneed Park area. Also present were Coombe Dingle and Sports Club managers (Shire Colts and SBRFC) who presented request against the 106 funds – these were: Upgrade of changing rooms, improvements to drainage at Parrys Lane end pitches and replacement of the artificial cricket pitch. With appropriate costings these could be submitted against the balance of the Hiatt Baker money. Approved bids for forwarding to the NP meeting were: Upgrade toilets in Canford WoT, upgraded access for Old Quarry Park Henleaze, and new safe access route to SL parkland and upgrade of SL House car park. These last three items have now been ratified by the NP and put into the forward plans.

Play area: At the moment not a lot has changed from a year ago - continues to be a “promise and delay” scenario. It has not been the weather to blame for failing to start, not that it would have been possible to place heavy equipment on the grass; but nevertheless the plans have been finalised, and important additions to the plan including necessary details of access paths and improved car-parking have now been seen and approved for expenditure by the NP at its March meeting. Issues about tree protection have been raised and solved, but the question of car parking still needs to be addressed for the Adult Learning Centre during the short time during work on the car park.

Overflow Car Park, Knotweed, and undergrowth: We were able to use Clean and Green funds to employ Community Payback groups to clear the path parallel to Parry’s Lane and around the gas converter, and to continue to clear scrub in the rear car park and remove elder scrub around a walnut tree. Clearance provided more parking spaces and it is very clear that, if continued to the wall, it would triple the originally available parking spaces. Permanent surfacing cannot be laid until the knotweed is under control. However, the present hard gravel surface is perfectly useable. Gary Brentnall has employed external contractors to give three sprayings, which should be easier and more effective now the scrub has been cleared. I will keep a watch on the situation and make sure the contractors are called at the due time. Jane Taylor for ALS is keen that this process continues and expressed optimistic hope that the walled garden could be treated similarly to make a gardening resource for courses.

Cotham School and Stoke Lodge: At the SB Forum, Malcolm Willis (Headteacher) and Sandra Fryer (Vice-chair of Governors) presented their view of two perceived problems of public access to SL and how this would interfere with their statutory duty to provide sport education to their pupils. These are dog-fouling and attack threat by dogs. Whilst dog-fouling is unpleasant and should be a duty of the supervising staff to ensure any fouling is cleared before pitch use (as in Coombe Dingle), the actual health risk is vanishingly small for the age groups using the field. They did acknowledge that the presence of dog-bins has hugely alleviated the fouling problem. As to the problem of dog

attacks, whilst no incidents have been recorded, there is anecdote of children being frightened by large dogs, needing teacher intervention. There may be no hard evidence for this, but it is a ploy we may need to respond to. The obvious answer is to require the keeping of dogs on a lead at any time there is sport in progress – similar to the restriction in many parks and on some beaches. BCC cabinet made a commitment not to fence Stoke Lodge to exclude the residents and we need to ensure there is no excuse to rescind this.

Alan Preece

Ward Representative

TREE REPORT

Tree Report to Stoke Bishop Forum April 2014

1. There is an amount of £2306 available to spend on trees within one mile of 3 Stoke Hill. This is s106 money charged as a result of development in the garden which led to loss of trees. I am in talks with TreeBristol to spend this money on replacing some of Stoke Bishop's "lost" trees and I have a meeting with them arranged for on May 1st. I mentioned this at the last Forum meeting and gratifyingly several of you came forward at the end of the meeting to look at the map of possible sites, and a few of you e-mailed me later with suggestions. We now have a list of 9 tree sites – we shall probably be able to afford 7 – and these sites will be assessed by TreeBristol soon and eventually the sites for the replacement trees chosen – we hope. The aim is to create maximum impact with this small number of trees, so the chosen tree sites are those which are closest to the greatest volume of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The NP will have to OK the final choice. I hope to present the list of sites later this year.
2. Meanwhile I am not sure if you have noticed but in the last two planting seasons a lot of replacement Street Trees have been planted in Stoke Bishop. Please find them and feel free to water them if we get a drought this year!

Shirehampton Road (outside the photographers) South Dene

Ormerod Road

Kewstoke Road (near Cranleigh Gardens)

Druid Road (Stoke Hill end)
Way end)

Branscombe Road (Avon

Parry's Lane (opposite No 116)(mine)

Bell Barn Road

3. I am keeping a close eye on the development in Trymwood Parade which led to the loss of a TPO'd Willow Tree. When all the work is over there is a requirement to plant 8 replacement trees (Planning No. 13/03149) and these trees are to be protected and maintained. I'll need to rely upon the local residents to report concerns either to me or to the Council directly.
4. Those of you with a long memory may recall the installation of the Gas Cabin/Kiosk in the Stoke Lodge Parkland corner (near the end of Ebenezer Lane) (09/01627). This replaced a too small gas valve on the roundabout verge at the top of Druid Hill. The kiosk was supposed to be screened by shrubs/trees from all four sides by Wales and West Utilities and at their expense. The NP3 Environment Group has since battled successfully to get it screened from two sides (east and west) (13/04420) and are pursuing the lack of screening of the west and north sides through the use of an official complaint lodged with Nicola Yates and passed to the Planning Enforcement Team (again). It is currently not clear if the fault is with the Utility Company for not doing what they were told or with BCC for not being explicit with their

requirements. I'll let you know the outcome. Hopefully one day you may even see the outcome, rather than see the ugly green cabin.

5. You may recall our upset about the planting of replacement trees by the University of Bristol in Woodland Road, Redland, for trees lost with the development of Hiatt Baker Hall. We won a long and bitter battle and at the last Forum you approved the new plans for all the replacement trees to be planted in the Stoke Bishop area. This is now "official" and you may care to look at Planning Application No 14/0462/COND.

Additional report for April 2014 Stoke Bishop Forum.

Breaking News following Tree Forum meeting 13th April 2014

The University of Bristol has twice now made representations/presentations to the Bristol Tree Forum suggesting that major developers, and themselves in particular, find the present Bristol Tree Replacement Standard too restrictive, and they ask to be set free from the constraints it imposes both on size and numbers of trees and the locations for the required re-planting.

The Chair of the Tree Forum wrote the following after their representation in January:

"The final statement was from Bristol University who asked for the Bristol Tree Replacement Standard (BTRS) to be modified for them because they sustainably manage an estate rather than develop property. This request follows public disquiet at their development in Stoke Bishop when they planted mitigation trees in Cabot. The general case is an extremely important issue since the BTRS underpins Bristol's new core strategy. It is designed to ensure, if a developer really has to fell trees, then they need to plant more on the same site according to a set scale. And if there isn't room, then they pay the Council to plant some on nearby public land. I suspect the University will be preparing a more detailed paper for the next TreeForum meeting (14th April) to allow a more informed and deeper discussion.

The TreeForum itself does not have the power of decision, it would involve the University appealing to Bristol's Planning Committee, but our view might influence the outcome. "

They did indeed make a further presentation on the 13th April and have said that

- 1) The standard size of trees to replace felled trees is too restrictive because some of the trees they want to plant are not supplied in those sizes.

The reply from the Bristol City Council Tree Officer present was that the sizes of replacement trees are a suggestion rather than a regulation and species, numbers of trees and their sizes was always open to reasonable discussion and negotiation.

- 2) Where there is no room to plant trees on or near the development site then the University should be allowed to plant trees elsewhere in the City on their land.

It is this last proposal that has alarmed me and I think should concern you - the residents of Stoke Bishop.

We should be terrified here in Stoke Bishop about what is going to happen to the University Campus over the next few years. They have put several large blocks of flats squeezed onto their site at Hiatt Baker. The University wanted even more blocks originally - asking for a block along the perimeter wall of Parry's Lane, which would have meant the loss of a further important screening line of trees. The landscape division of the University Estates management later stated that the wall and the trees together form a precious historical boundary which is important to maintain and retain!

When that block was rejected by the Planning Committee the University immediately put in a further application for it - but hastily withdrew it when some very nasty things were said about them on the BCC website (not by me!).

So I feel we have a cause for concern.

Bristol City Council Planning Department appears to be overwhelmed by the University, possibly too mindful of its economic clout in the city. I think this view was reflected in the BCC Officer's compliance and agreement when the University stated they had planted the trees in Woodland Road (in flagrant disregard for the Condition No 25 (clearly written on the website)).

Following urgent representation to the BCC Planners and subsequent re-thinking by the University the replacement trees have just been squeezed into the Stoke Bishop Campus, but clearly there could be problems in the future if the University wants to build further in Stoke Bishop - which I am quite sure they will want to do.

It will not be possible to mitigate the loss of trees occasioned by further student accommodation development on the Campus in the future by planting trees on the Campus, and thus planting will be suggested elsewhere on University land - meanwhile we in Stoke Bishop might have to watch the Campus being turned into the equivalent of Manhattan and the nature of the Conservation Area spoiled and degraded if the University is permitted to "export" replacement trees to other parts of the city.

Frankly I hold the view that if the integrity and character of the Conservation Area cannot be maintained following any proposed development by the University then they should build elsewhere. Allowing them to plant elsewhere this last time would have established a dangerous precedent. It cannot be a question of block upon block going up and then afterwards someone noticing they do not have enough space to re-plant trees and screen the new buildings in a residential conservation area. If there is no more space for replacement trees than that is what will happen.

Allowing exemptions is not a way to deal with any perceived problems - rather any rules should be sensible and clear in the first place.

I accept that they are good at tree management and spend more money on trees and landscaping than they have to - but they are greedy for growth and development too – so further development will just have to be somewhere else in the city, or they will have to comply with the part of the BTRS requiring that developers pay the Council to plant trees on public land as near to the development as possible. The University has said that BCC trees are too expensive and they can achieve greater canopy cover for less money than the Council can/does. Expensive trees on land close to their new development might just have to be the cost the University has to bear for further development in Stoke Bishop.

I well appreciate that part of the blame for this last "near miss" lay with BCC officers.

I should like to suggest to the residents of Stoke Bishop and to the Forum Chair, now that the dust has settled and following all the re-organisation and redundancies at City Hall, that this is an issue which we, through our Councillors the Stoke Bishop Residents Planning Group, should take up with

- **BCC Planning - not seeking punishment, but asking for an appreciation by BCC officers that they must enforce compliance with Planning Consent stipulations.**
- **the University Buildings Department and Estates Management to find out what will happen next time as we do not accept export of trees from this Conservation Area.**

Stoke Bishop Residents' Planning Group

Notes of Meeting 6th May 2014

Present

Roger Gamlin

David Brown

Stephanie French

Tony Hoare

Kate Hoare

1. University of Bristol Replacement Trees

Stephanie explained the concern of the Tree Forum, the Stoke Bishop Neighbourhood Forum and herself as NP3 Tree Champion that the university would like to persuade BCC that the Bristol 'Tree Standard should not be applied to their developments on 2 grounds:

- That it is too prescriptive in terms of species and sizes and doesn't allow for more specialist tree planting that the university may sometimes wish to do.
The group has some sympathy with this and understands that this may on occasion be considered appropriate by BCC. There appears to be no issue here as long as the standard is applied by BCC when it is appropriate.
- That the university has a large estate and requirements for replacement trees arising from the impact of development should not be constrained to the sites affected, but allowed anywhere on the estate.
The group was very concerned about this, particularly in the context of the recent situation at Hiatt Baker, now resolved by the plans to replace trees on the Stoke Bishop campus. Taken to the extreme this could result in the loss of all trees in Stoke Bishop to allow for further expansion of the halls here and all replacements planted elsewhere. This would destroy the character of the area, and the group considers be contrary to good planning practice and BCC policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Sites Allocation and Development Management Plan.

Action-KH to draft letter to BCC to convey concerns and to seek meeting with the Planning Service Director about this.

2. Hiatt Baker Parking Management

David raised concerns about the Parking Management Plan produced as a condition of the development. It is not clear whether all the actions proposed in para 4.43 of the Plan have been undertaken, particularly the monitoring required. Meanwhile the parking situation in Shaplands is as bad as ever, and the university seems to be having little success in preventing staff and students parking in residential roads, despite there being vacant spaces on site.

He considers that once the new blocks are occupied and the Shaplands parking restrictions in place this problem will continue to expand, as anticipated by residents in early discussions with the university.

He suggested as well as raising this with the university, it should be drawn to the attention of both the NP3 transport group and the Stoke Bishop Forum.

Action-DB to draft letter accordingly

3. Shepperton Homes-Footpath from Parrys Lane

Demolition has now started but the group is not aware that the landscaping details required as a condition of the development have been provided. The question as to how the lane will be maintained also remains.

Action-RG to write to Shepperton Homes asking for this information.

4. 67 Coombe Lane

Further applications have been submitted, raising the same issues about the future of the trees on site. Stephanie is making an objection to the current application and it was agreed that the group would support this.

Action – SF to provide a copy of her letter of objection.