

DUNSFOLD PARISH COUNCIL

Unit 3, The Orchard
Chiddingfold Road
Dunsfold
GU84PB

Minutes

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday, 8th July 2025 at 7.30pm in the Nugent Room, Winn Hall, Dunsfold.

Cllrs Present:

Cllr David Griffiths (Chairman)
Cllr Susannah Cooke
Cllr Tigi Singhateh
Cllr Nigel Waterson

Cllr Chris Lindesay (Vice Chairman)
Cllr Roy Enticknap
Cllr Phillip Travis

Clerk: Mrs J Nagy

Public: 2

Also Present: District & County Cllr Deanus

67 Public Participation

A member of public did not agree with having Public Participation at the beginning of the agenda, as this precluded members of the public being able to comment on discussion on items later in the agenda.

The Clerk explained that this was usual practice, as this section is not part of the formal meeting. However, it is possible to raise Standing Orders to allow a member of the public to speak at any point of the meeting, at the discretion of the Chairman.

68 Apologies

There were no apologies, all members being present.

69 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations at this point of the meeting.

70 Minutes

At the request of the Clerk, Cllr Travis clarified his response at the meeting held on 10th June 2025, to the query as to why he did not stand for election. He responded saying that the vacancy which he had originally applied for, had been identified as being a co-option. He also had concerns over the cost of holding an election, given the historic poor turn out in Dunsfold. Indeed, at the election on 5th June, there were only 146 voters, two of whom spoilt their ballot papers.

It was proposed by Cllr Enticknap, seconded by Cllr Cooke and AGREED by all present that the Minutes of the meeting held on 10th June 2025 were a true and correct record, after the above amendment.

It was proposed by Cllr Travis seconded by Cllr Singhateh and AGREED by all present that the Minutes of the meeting held on 17th June 2025 were a true and correct record.

71 Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman had no announcements

72 Correspondence and Action Lists

The Correspondence and Action lists were noted by all present.

The Clerk updated Councillors in that she now has access to the Waverley BC s106 data base. The s106 Officer has advised that the c£780000 for affordable housing from the Wetwood Farm will not be allocated specifically to Dunsfold.

This was felt to be unacceptable and Councillors wished to take this further with Waverley BC. Cllr Lindesay said that the Housing Survey needed to be updated, as in his opinion, there was a need for 3- and 4-bedroom affordable homes in the village.

Cllr Deanus advised that Alfold Parish Council had a monthly meeting with Claire Upton-Brown, Head of Planning at Waverley BC; the Clerk will investigate having a similar meeting.

73 Committees

There are no Committee Minutes to note, as no meetings have taken place since the last Council meeting.

74 Committee Membership

All Councillors are members of the KGV Management Committee as the Council as a body is sole trustee.

The Finance and Commons Committee has membership of up to five Councillors. At the May meeting there were only five councillors in post, so it was agreed that all would be on these Committees to be reviewed once there was the full complement of seven.

It was agreed that membership of Committees should be as follows:

Finance Committee – Cllrs Enticknap, Lindesay, Singhateh, Travis and Waterson.

Commons Committee- Cllrs Cooke, Enticknap, Griffiths, Singhateh and Travis.

It was noted that there was currently no HR Committee, but this could be reinstated if required.

75 Waverley Borough Council

Cllr Lindesay advised Cllr Deanus that the felling of ash trees outside the Sun Inn due to die back took place on a Sunday, and that the resultant sawdust debris was of great inconvenience to customers. Cllr Deanus will take this up with Waverley BC.

Referring to earlier discussions on tracking s106 contributions, Cllr Deanus said that Waverley BC does not have a good track record in securing Community Infrastructure Levy (CiL) monies. Alfold PC has received very little in CiL despite having considerable development.

He suggested that Dunsfold PC asks Waverley BC what monies are available for its area, and where previous monies have been spent. This could be a topic for discussion when the Council meet with Claire Upton-Brown as suggested earlier.

Councillors are probably aware the UK Oil and Gas plc (UKOG) has surrendered its licence to drill at Dunsfold. Cllr Lindesay said that UKOG still has extant planning permission, but cannot proceed without a licence.

76 Surrey County Council

Cllr Deanus covered both County and Borough matters in his report above.

77 Local Government Reorganisation

Cllr Deanus said that the questions on the Government consultation were poorly written in his opinion.

Surrey CC is proposing the formation of Neighbourhood Area Committee, which will include parish councils, but these will not be decision making bodies.

With reference to the potential issue re Woking BC's debt, Cllr Deanus said that the Government has said that no council will be bankrupt as a result of the reorganisation.

Neither a two-tier or three-tier option will affect the provision of core services such as social care, education and bin collections.

Some unparished areas wish to create new parish councils, but the Government is not in favour of this.

Essentially, the Government want elected mayors in all areas.

The Chairman thanked Cllr Deanus for this information.

He referred to the Clerk's report.

Waverley BC is in favour of a three-tier structure – East, North and West Surrey - with Dunsfold being in West Surrey, to be made up of Guildford, Surrey Heath, Waverley, and Woking.

Surrey CC is in favour of a two-tier structure – East and West Surrey- with Dunsfold being in West Surrey, to be made up of Guildford, Runnymede, Spelthorne, Surrey Heath, Waverley and Woking.

Cllr Waterson noted that SALC is only responding to Q8 of the consultation - Will the councils' proposal enable stronger community engagement and deliver genuine opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?

He was of the opinion that the Council should also respond to Q8 and also Q5 - Will the proposal prioritise the delivery of high quality and sustainable public services to citizens, improve local government and service delivery, avoid unnecessary fragmentation of services and lead to better value for money in the delivery of these services?

The Clerk advised that Waverley BC is holding a webinar on 16th July hosted by Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils. She is registered to attend; Cllr Travis indicated that he could attend also. It was noted that Surrey CC would not be in attendance, possibly as it held differing views as to the two- or three- tier structure.

After discussion, it was agreed that the Clerk would provide a resume of the information presented at the webinar on 16th July, and then, together with the Chairman, would draft a response Q5 and Q8 to the consultation. This would then be circulated to Councillors for prior approval before submission before the deadline of 5th August.

78 Annual Governance & Accountability Return and Public Inspection of 2024/2025 Accounts

The AGAR paperwork and supporting documentation was agreed at the last meeting.

It was noted that Boxes 4 and 9 were ticked as No.

Box 4 related to the publication of the Public Rights Notice, and it was believed that this was not published on the Council website as it could not be found. Since the meeting, it has been pointed out that the Notice was published on 12th June 2024.

The Box 4 response has been changed to a "Yes" response, and an explanation of the amendment has been submitted as part of the supporting documentation.

Box 9 related to the administration of the KGV Charity and the acknowledgement by the Council that the financial situation of the Charity had not been correctly monitored throughout 2024/2025 due to staffing changes throughout the year. The wording of the explanation was amended to ensure that there was no implication that this oversight was in any way attributable to the previous Clerk, who left in the autumn of 2024.

It was proposed by Cllr Griffiths, seconded by Cllr Cooke and AGREED by all present that the amendments to the final documentation were formally noted; it was noted that the amended AGAR documentation has been submitted to the External Auditor.

79 Accounts

Payments List

Payments lists of £4780.57 for the Council, and £2,577.71 for KGV are included in this pack.

The Clerk advised that the balance payment for Doormatic for replacement garage doors had already been paid, out of the KGV account. It was agreed it should come out of Council funds, out of the KGV maintenance ERM.

Therefore, the payment lists were revised to be £6070.57 for the Council and £1287.71 for KGV.

The payment lists as amended were AGREED by all present.

Current financial situation of the Council

The Clerk hoped to produce financial reports for this meeting, but cannot reconcile the main current account, due to opening and closing balances not being available.

Councillors NOTED this information.

Current financial situation of the KGV Charity

The Clerk has submitted a meter reading to EDF, which has not been done for over a year. This has resulted in a credit to the account of £2290.00, which the Clerk will try to get paid back.

She has calculated what the Tennis Club owe in electricity and will be invoicing accordingly.

The Social Club is behind on its monthly payments of £300; the Clerk will chase.

Councillors NOTED this information.

Refurbishment of the King George V Pavilion

Councillors were asked to consider three quotes for the painting of the interior of the Pavilion, these being for £5500.00, £3375.00 and £4250.00 all ex VAT.

It was proposed by Cllr Griffiths, seconded by Cllr Cooke and AGREED by all present that the painting contract be awarded to David Hitchcock, at a cost of £3375.00 + VAT

It was agreed that all KGV maintenance payments should come out of Dunsfold PC funds, out of the KGV ERM, until this is spent.

KGV car park works

Cllrs Griffiths and Singhateh, met with Axtells on site, together with the Clerk. On the

recommendation of the contractor, it was agreed to add an extra protective layer to the two-layer tarmac construction, which assists in wear and tear at a cost of £972.00 + VAT, bringing the total cost to £46,020.00.

Councillors NOTED and AGREED this additional expenditure.

At the Extraordinary Meeting on 17th June, Cllr Enticknap expressed concern that the plans for the proposed phone mast showed cabling for electricity is required across the car park. The Clerk has reviewed the plans, and an "access route" is shown, but it is not clear what this route is; there is no reference to cabling.

For avoidance of doubt, the Clerk has written to Galliford Try (who have taken on the project from Sinclair Dalby) informing them that the Council will not permit any trenching of the car park and that any electricity cabling must go around the edges.

Axtells are starting preparatory work on 9th July, and hope to tarmac about a week after that. The car park can remain open during the prep work. The Clerk has been liaising with the bookings clerk at the Pavilion to keep her informed.

Councillors NOTED this information.

HR Support options

As agreed at the Annual Council Meeting on 6th May, two invoices from Worknest are on hold - £2963.08 for HR Support and £179.00 for legal expenses insurance, which is optional. The Clerk had sourced a similar contractor, Council HR & Governance Support, which would charge £1250 pa for a three-year contract, £1050 for five years.

It was agreed that the Clerk would contact Worknest for a copy of the agreement and what services are provided. These would seem to be very similar to that offered by CHRGS. However, the contract with Worknest is for a minimum of three years, with three months' notice, which would be February 2027 to end in May 2027.

The Clerk has therefore put the contract renewal premium for £2963.08 on the payment schedule.

Councillors NOTED this information

80 Planning Applications

Reference	Address	Proposal	DPC Response
WA/2025/01046	Little Basket Cottage, The Common	Erection of single storey extension following demolition of conservatory; to ratify the response of "no objection" agreed at the last meeting. To ratify the response of "No Objection" agreed at the last meeting	The "No objection response" was ratified.
WA/2025/01218	Mallows, Mill Lane	Erection of extension and alterations following demolition of conservatory.	No objection
WA/2025/01250	Wrotham Hill	Siting of 2 caravans for residential use - LDC	Noted
WA/2025/01261	Wrotham Hill	Erection of brick retaining walls with flint insets following removal of existing log post retaining walls.	Object, on the grounds that the proposed brickwall is higher than the existing log post wall.
WA/2025/01265	Wrotham Hill	Siting of a caravan compliant container for ancillary residential	Noted

		use as sanctioned by consent WA/2022/01276 - LDC	
--	--	---	--

81 Planning Decisions

The following decisions were NOTED.

Reference	Address	Proposal	DPC	Decision
WA/2025/00729	High Loxley, Loxley Rd, Loxhill	Erection of agricultural barn	No objection	Granted
WA/2025/00742	Wrotham Hill	Continued use of land as a residential caravan site - LDC	Noted	Lawful
WA/2025/00926	Wrotham Hill Cottage	Erection of brick retaining walls - LDC	Noted	Refused
WA/2025/00729	High Loxley, Loxley Rd, Loxhill	Erection of agricultural barn	No objection	Granted

82 Planning Appeal

The following appeal was NOTED.

Reference	Address	Proposal	DPC Comment to original application
APP/R3650/X/25/3364731 Re WA/2024/01684	South Fork Wrotham Hill Dunsfold Godalming GU8 4PA	Siting of a shipping container - LDC	No comment as LDC
APP/R3650/X/25/3366497 Re WA/2025/00705	South Fork Wrotham Hill Dunsfold Godalming GU8 4PA	Siting of a caravan for residential use - LDC	No comment as LDC

Appeal W/25/3362383 against WA/2023/01020

This appeal relates to the erection of 21 houses on land north of Miller Lane. The Council submitted a statement to the Inspector supporting the development. The hearing is being held on 22nd July at Waverley BC offices. Speakers will be heard at the Inspector's discretion, with a limit of 5 minutes. Speaking notes will need to be handed to the Inspector afterwards.

After discussion, it was agreed not to send representation to this hearing, as the Council's views had been already submitted to the Planning Inspector.

83 Old School Site Working Party

Cllr Griffiths, in his capacity as Chair of the Working Party, referred to his discussions with the Diocese, when it was made clear that they were not intending transferring any of the property back to the village. There is a possibility of a small area of the building being used as a community facility.

However, since that discussion, the Diocese has sent an email with different proposals, these being

- the original school buildings at the front of the site would be transferred to Dunsfold Parish Council for the re-development of a community facility or a single bedroom flat for local people (which the Parish Council could sell if they wished)
- the rear of the school buildings (where the school was extended) could be developed for two small housing units which would contribute to the refurbishment of the community space or the costs involved to convert into a residential flat
- the third portion (the rear of the site) would be developed by the Diocese for a 4 bedroomed house for sale

The Diocese is hoping that the Council will support these proposals. It advised that it has incurred significant legal and other costs related to the school site over a long period of time, so it would

expect to recover a contribution towards these costs as part of any settlement with the Parish Council.

Cllr Griffiths said that in his opinion, more information was required for the working party or the Council to make any decision or recommendation. For example, no mention was made of the playing field. The front section would not be big enough for early years provision, being similar in size to the Nugent Room. It is not clear if the two new housing units would come to the Council or not.

In the interim, he has been advised that the ex-directors of the Dunsfold Village School Trust intend to reinstate the Trust, with the intention that the School should be returned to the village.

At this point, the Chairman proposed the suspension of Standing Orders to enable members of the public to speak; seconded by Cllr Singhateh, agreed by all.

A resident reminded Councillors of the history of the site, which he has previously circulated. The Diocese had spent diocesan money in trying to overturn a Diocesan Trust, so to try to claim back any legal costs was disingenuous.

The listed building is in a poor state of repair, not having been maintained.

A second resident did not agree with the re-forming of the Dunsfold Village School Trust, as he felt it would cause issues moving forward. The field is land-locked so would be difficult to develop for housing.

Cllr Griffiths suggested that he as Chair of the Working Party should go back to the Diocese to clarify what is being offered. Whatever proposals come forward needs the support of the village as a whole, not just the Parish Council.

The second resident asked if the Working Party accepted the Diocese's proposals, would the Trust still be re-formed? Cllr Griffiths said that was up to the directors.

It was noted that the legal costs which the Diocese now wanted contributions towards were significant, nearly £100,000.

Standing Orders were reinstated.

It was agreed that Cllr Griffiths as Chair of the Working Party would go back to the Diocese for clarification, and would report back to the Council. A full consultation would be considered for any proposals for the site. Cllr Griffiths noted that there had been more movement on engagement with the Diocese over the last few days, then there had been for some weeks.

84 Council Surgeries

The next surgery is to be held in the Nugent Room on Saturday, 12th July between 10am and 12noon, with Cllrs Lindesay and Travis in attendance.

85 Dunsfold Neighbourhood Plan

Cllr Waterson referred to his report as circulated.

Nine sites have been assessed and scored. Two – Blacknest and Chennels – were not scored. UVE advises that Chennels does not need to be scored, as it now has planning permission.

He suggests that a small group of Councillors, perhaps three, should meet and score the remaining site and then supply a report to be approved by the Council as a whole.

He appreciates that the Clerk is busy with other issues, but UVE has offered support from a junior colleague to assist with some of the administrative tasks. This work will need a specification from

the Council to enable it to be costed.

The Clerk expressed her concerns that the sites were being assessed by a small group of Councillors, instead of a Working Party with residents as members together with Councillors. She felt that this approach could be challenged by developers at the inspection stage. It could be also viewed as not being transparent and not involving the wider community.

Cllr Waterson disagreed with this advice. A Working Party had not been successful in the past and it was up to the Council to drive the Plan. Of course, residents would be consulted at a later stage.

The Chairman asked who would be responsible for the actual physical production of the Plan. Cllr Waterson said that this could be the junior colleague suggested by UWE or the Clerk, if her time allowed.

The Chairman said that UVE has been advising on the process, and giving lists of work to be carried out. For Councillors to do this work was a big commitment.

The Clerk suggested that a separate administration assistant could be employed to do such work.

Cllr Singhateh said that there was a draft Plan in existence, and asked how much work was required to amend that to be compliant.

Cllr Waterson said that UVE had advised that the draft Plan had two flaws, in that the criteria for site assessment had not been correctly followed, and that public engagement had been poorly conducted.

It was noted that Cllr Lindesay had a personal and pecuniary interest in the Neighbourhood Plan, and had recused himself on the advice of Waverley BC Monitoring Officer.

The following actions were agreed, with Cllr Lindesay abstaining:

- a) that a meeting would be arranged for Councillors (with the exception of Cllr Lindesay) to score the remaining site based on the agreed template
- b) the clerk would chase Waverley BC on questions previously posed on the Housing Needs Survey and density formulas
- c) a sub-group of Cllrs Waterson, Enticknap, Griffiths and Travis will have a review meeting with UVE to include the SEA update and further AECOM involvement
- d) UVE would then advise on the next steps leading to the Regulation 14 consultation

86 Phone Mast on KGV Field

There has been no response to the Clerk's emails to Carter Jonas. She has ascertained that Sinclair Dalby are no longer involved, with Galliford Try apparently having taken over. (See report on KGV Car park tender update) Emails to Galliford Try have also not been acknowledged.

Councillors NOTED this information.

87 Reports on Meetings attended

NALC Legal Update; 18TH June 2025

The Clerk attended this seminar. Topics covered included the following:

- Employments Rights Bill
- Remote meetings, to be enacted when parliamentary time allows. Will include provision for proxy voting
- Dependent Carers' Allowance, which is allowed by principal councils, but not at town and parishes However, this can be paid if the council has GPC. Co-opted Councillors are not eligible for allowances, which being reviewed
- Martyn's Law (consideration of potential terrorist attack at public events) - got assent in 2025 but will take two years to full implement
- Planning & Infrastructure Bill, second reading June 2025
- The Smaller Authorities' Proper Practices Panel (SAPPP) formally the Joint Panel on Accountability and Governance (JPAG) has issued its 2025 Practitioners Guide
- Legal Topic Notes are now Legal Advice Notes

Waverley Borough Council Local Plan Workshop; 24th June 2025

The Clerk attended this workshop on behalf of the Council. It was an interactive visioning exercise and she did not feel best placed to comment on some issues. It was noted that the housing requirement for the Borough is 1458 per annum, this being 29000 over the 20-year plan period.

SALC Clerks' Forum; 1st July 2025

The Clerk attended this meeting; there was a similar Councillor's Forum on 2nd July.

Topics covered other than Local Government Reorganisation, covered earlier in this meeting, included the following:

- Govt agreement to allow remote meetings, but no time scale for implementation
- New Employment Rights Bill as from 2026
- Cessation of Neighbourhood Planning funding
- Budget and precept setting

Prior warning of a consultation on the AGAR documentation due to take place in Autumn.

Councillors NOTED this information.

88 Items for Information

There were no items submitted for information.

89 Future Agendas

There were no items submitted for future agendas.

90 Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, 2nd September 2025; there are no meetings in August.

The next scheduled meetings are as follows:

- Commons Committee – Monday, 21st July 2025
- KGV Management Committee – Monday, 21st July 2025
- Finance Committee – Monday, 28th July 2025

Chair of the Council Dated.....