

Extract minutes AGM 19 Feb 2003

2.4 Trustees and Development – Gordon Gillies

a) Gordon Gillies referred to the report and that there were 22 development applications in 2002 compared to 23 in 2001. Two of these were refused. Two applications were for demolition and rebuild, one of which was accepted and the other was withdrawn after we had made objections to the Council.

b) Residents were reminded that if they object to a development, it is their responsibility to write to the Council and not leave it to the Trustees to do it for them.

c) The committee are concerned at the damage and congestion caused to the Estate by heavy vehicles during development construction. Residents undertaking development are required to ask contractors and suppliers to use modestly sized vehicles where possible, control parking, confine off loading to within the site if possible and to sign an undertaking to repair and restore roads and verges to their state before development commenced. Copies of these conditions were made available at the meeting.

d) A development charge will be made in future for all new development applications. The proposed level is £100 but there was a general feeling that it should be £200.

e) Annie McAlister, *Roughdown*, Ellis Avenue mentioned that any residents who might have problems concerning regulation or control of developments should seek the advice of the Enforcement Officer at Chiltern District Council who is most helpful.

f) John Warder, *Chalfont View*, Lincoln Road advised the meeting that following a recent change in the Planning Committee at Chiltern District Council, members of the public are now allowed to attend and speak for 3 minutes at Planning meetings on any specific application provided that a request is made in advance.

g) Gordon Gillies expressed his thanks for the assistance of the Parish Council in providing details of planning applications within the Estate.

2.5 There being no further questions on the Committee Report, the Chairman asked for a proposal to approve these sections of the Report. Brian Davies (*Cartref*, Chiltern Hill) proposed adoption of the Report and Dennis Palmer (*Warren Lodge*, Upway) seconded the proposal which was carried.

Extract minutes AGM 25 Feb 2004

4.4.5 The development fee was proposed at the 2003 AGM and was intended mainly to provide some contribution for the additional wear and tear to Estate roads from contractors' vehicles. Normally only 8 or 9% of residents undertake developments in any one year and it is considered unreasonable for the remaining 92% of residents to pay for this additional wear. Mr & Mrs G T B Camsey have written questioning whether the Trustees and Committee have exceeded their authority by obtaining approval for this fee at an Annual General Meeting. The Trustees and Committee have checked the Terms of Reference drawn up by solicitors following the formation of the Roads Committee in 1956 and reviewed and re-endorsed at the 26th AGM on 4th February 1983 and satisfied themselves that this action is correct. The proposed charge was clearly outlined in the 2003 Annual Report and at the 2003 AGM it was suggested from the floor that the charge should be made £200. However, the Committee consider that for smaller developments which do not involve heavy vehicles using Estate roads over a number of weeks then they should have discretion to reduce the fee to £100. It was suggested that this proposal should be formally approved by the AGM. Proposed by Mr Jonathan Sitwell, *Woodlands*, Halfacre Hill, seconded by Mr John Williams, *Hartwell*, Winkers Close and the motion was carried.

Extract minutes AGM 23 Feb 2006

4.4.2 The policy re-introduced two years ago of making a charge for house owners undertaking development, to contribute towards the wear and damage caused to Estate roads by contractors'

vehicles has made some contribution to funds for road maintenance. The demolition and rebuild of one house in 2004 and another two this year made us very aware of how much damage and wear to the roads is caused by the large, heavy vehicles delivering plant, equipment and materials. We have been given very clear warnings by the engineers surveying Chiltern Hill that we must restrict and control the number of heavy vehicles using the Estate roads which were constructed for ordinary passenger cars and light commercial vehicles. The Committee are convinced that the present scale of charges to cover such wear and damage is not adequate and are requesting that the basic charge for an extension development to a house should be changed from £200 to a sliding scale between £100 to £750 depending on the scale of the development. This can be assessed in collaboration with our consultant architect in proportion to the scale of the development. For a complete demolition and rebuild it is proposed that the charge should be increased from £1,000 to £1,500. This was discussed at some length by the meeting and the overall view was that, because we must ensure that we control heavy traffic and limit our roads to the domestic use they were designed for, there should not be a restricted scale as proposed, but the Committee should have freedom to assess the extent of each individual development and make a charge up to a limit of £5,000. Consideration might be given to requiring part of that charge as a deposit, some of which would be forfeited if damage was caused in other parts of the Estate than the immediate vicinity of the construction. This was proposed by Denis Palmer, *Warren Lodge*, Upway and seconded by John Aubrey, *Redlands*, Ellis Avenue and passed unanimously. The Chairman pointed out that the advice of our lawyers would be taken on how to apply this justifiably and reasonably and that the sliding scale of charges as requested by the Committee would be developed with careful consideration given to the way in which charges are made for a full scale demolition and rebuild. The revised charges will not change the long standing requirement for every house owner undertaking development being directly responsible for restoring the adjacent verges and road surface to their original condition prior to the construction starting.

- 4.4.3 Andrew Butler, *Squirrels*, Winkers Close pointed out that, whilst it was important that we should have certain restrictions during construction work to minimise disturbance and inconvenience to other residents and that we ensure that charges for development are adequate to cover damage to roads, it is also essential that our restrictions are not regarded as prohibitive. If imposed insensitively it could act as a deterrent. The Chairman assured the meeting that any such restrictions will be handled with great care and sensitivity by the Committee and Trustees as it is in the interests of us all to ensure that the Estate maintains its exclusive appeal and environment. However it is also essential that we control contractors' vehicles, ensure that our roads are protected from damage and that the extra wear caused by construction is paid for by the developer and not the rest of the Estate.

- 4.4.4 Jonathan Sitwell, *Woodlands*, Halfacre Hill questioned the trend towards new houses of styles of design which do not seem in keeping with the rest of the Estate. This was endorsed by further comments from Martin Crossley, *Woodvale*, Lincoln Road, Andrew Butler, *Squirrels*, Winkers Close and others with particular reference to the new house just completed in Woodside Hill. The Chairman pointed out that the design style of houses had changed and evolved throughout the seventy eight years of the Estate and that one could almost establish the decade in which most houses were built by the design style. The majority of the Estate is within a specially designated Established Residential Area of Special Character Policy H4, development within any of these areas must maintain the special character of the area and this is closely controlled by the District Council. This was confirmed by our Parish Councillor Denis Palmer, *Warren Lodge*, Upway who said that the Parish Council also look carefully at all development plans and submit their views to the District Council. The details of Policy H4 are closely aligned to our own criteria for assessing new proposals. However, maintaining the special character of the area does not mean stagnation of architectural design in a time warp. Our consultant architect is particularly careful to assess each proposal on its merits as a design and also its scale, proportions and how it will fit into the street scene and location. Personal tastes for house designs will inevitably vary enormously but it is interesting that our consultant architect, the Trustees and the Planning Officer of Chiltern District Council all felt that the new house in Woodside Hill, whilst being a new and different design, would still fall within Policy H4. For the reassurance of residents of Woodside Hill, the replacement house design for *Lyndale Cottage* is very traditional and conventional, that being the taste and choice of the new owner. The Trustees and Committee are determined to preserve and maintain the character and environment of the Estate whilst making allowance for the evolution of architectural design and style.

4.4.5 There being no further questions on the Committee Report, the Chairman asked for a proposal to approve these sections of the report. Mrs Brenda Wickham, *Chiltern Lodge*, Upway proposed adoption of the report and Mr Michael March, *Pembroke Lodge*, Upway seconded the proposal which was carried unanimously.