

ALFOLD RURAL INITIATIVE

A vision for the future of Alfold

INTRODUCTION

The Alfold Rural Initiative (ARI) was started in August 1996 by the Alfold Parish Council and other members of the village community and supported by Waverley Borough Council and Surrey Voluntary Services Council.

The Initiative was prompted by the realisation that the village people wanted to have a strong influence over the long term development of Alfold in terms of its requirements for housing, employment opportunities, environmental issues, traffic and safety issues and general community facilities and services. They wanted these issues to be recognised and addressed, not all at once but in a planned and coordinated fashion but most importantly taking into account their wishes and views. It was therefore clear to the Parish Council these issues and concepts should originate locally, be endorsed and owned by the local population and should be taken into account when local plans are drawn up by the statutory bodies.

The procedure adopted by the Parish Council and the ARI steering group for consultation was "Planning for Real" - a hands on, non-confrontational method using large scale maps of the area and pictorial option cards. This study took place in October 1997 with help and advice from Margaret Wilkinson from Neighbourhood Initiatives and with advice and financial support from Waverley and the Surrey Voluntary Service Council. Following this consultation exercise the results were analysed and the Steering Group split into four sub-committees to consider housing and planning, environment and traffic issues, employment, leisure and crime issues and finally health, welfare and community issues. There follows a full report on the analysis, conclusions and advised action from the four sub-committees as approved by the Steering Group on 23 September 1998 with the recommendation that a summary of this document be published and circulated to all households in Alfold inviting further written comment and views from them prior to submitting this document to Waverley.

Inevitably, due to the scope and complexity of the issues covered by the ARI, some matters have progressed more rapidly than others. Those suggestions that could be actioned quickly have been moved forward. Others, however, which are more complex, for example, Employment and Health are taking longer. Regular reports and updates will follow.

Approved as a material consideration September 8th
1999.

ALFOLD RURAL INITIATIVE
HOUSING SUB COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT

by
Colin Fraser (Committee Chairman)

BACKGROUND

Over the past 10 - 15 years there has been a planning presumption against the building of additional dwellings in Alfold. There have been numerous applications for the construction of additional houses during the period, most notably at Brockhurst, on Chapel Field, at the Pig Farm, at the Equestrian Centre and at Springbok. All of them have been opposed by the Parish Council and turned down by Waverley or at Appeal. There have, however, been three exceptions to this planning policy

Firstly, the approval for 12 affordable homes for local people on Chilton Close. These houses were built by Downland Housing Association, on land owned by Waverley and were all for rent. The Borough retained the remaining land at Chilton Close for future development should the need arise.

Secondly, five executive houses were built at Glebelands Meadow. These were allowed under a planning gain and section 106 agreement for the removal of the Budd scrap yard.

Thirdly, permission was granted for four dwellings on the site previously occupied by the Chez Jean Restaurant.

There have also been some one off 'in fill' additional houses built along the Loxwood Road

The housing group in reporting their findings and recommendations have taken two studies into account

1. The findings from a 100% survey on housing need recently performed by Waverley Borough Council, a copy of which is available and
2. The expressed views of the parishioners as recorded in the planning for real consultation exercise.

Both studies reflected that there was the need for a small number of additional affordable houses in the village, and that the village supported such a development, provided the rural character of the village was maintained. There was also a sentiment expressed that they should primarily be for 'local' people – people with some ties/connection with the village.

HOUSING NEED/TYPE

The Waverley Housing Needs Study, referred to above, clearly indicated that there was a local need for some 'social affordable' housing, similar to the twelve houses already built in Chilton Close. This local need may require further research as to detail, but it is very likely that a small number of additional dwellings (social affordable) will be justifiable, although it is the Parish Councils preference that a proportion of these will be 'shared ownership' as well as rented, unlike the first twelve which were all for rent.

The second category of housing that has been identified has been what is called 'market affordable' housing. This need has been identified by the 'Planning for Real' study. Whilst great emphasis was placed on the retention of the green, rural character of the village, and also the design and location of such houses, it came through as an identifiable need for the continued development of the village - for a small number of 'market affordable' family homes, 2/3 bedroom houses for families wanting to live in Alfold, not necessarily with any direct connection with the village. Again, there appeared to be support for this concept to ensure the continued growth of the village, provided it was done tastefully and without damaging the character of the village

LOCATION/SITES

Clearly this issue has the potential of being highly controversial and contentious. The group was advised by the experts that there is and will continue to be for the next 5 to 7 years a clear presumption against housing development in Alfold.. Alfold is a village which lies beyond the green belt but which is subject to policies of considerable restraint, for instance there are boundaries to any area of development within which some limited development has been permitted, e.g. infilling. As yet these boundaries are not formally stated but will be so in the future, and our advice is that they are likely to remain very tightly drawn round existing concentrations. Thus any development outside these boundaries will have to be justified and this is an important point to bear in mind in relation to what follows.

However, dealing first with the "social affordable" housing. As stated earlier the land owned by Waverley at Chilton Close has been designated in principle for an additional 20 dwellings. Recognising this, together with the economic benefits of having the services/infrastructure already in place, it seems logical to the Housing sub-group that, assuming there is a need, that the case for an additional 8-12 dwellings should be developed with Waverley in conjunction with a Housing Association, for local people subject to appropriate section 106 agreement but this time to include shared ownership housing.

As regards the 'market affordable' housing. In the first instance the Sub Group felt it should identify the "ideal" site and support a case for some additional dwellings on this basis. However, after extensive discussions, having taken advice from the experts the Sub Group decided to determine the key criteria that will be relevant in selecting an ideal site/sites. The group did not consider it was part of their remit to identify such potential sites but rather to provide a framework of principles by which the Parish Council and parishioners can assess potential sites in the future. These key criteria were tested against some of the known potential sites, and found to be relevant and useful in determining their suitability for providing

some additional dwellings of this type. This approach has been adopted as being fair and equitable to all the landowners who potentially have sites to develop, rather than the Parish Council appearing to favour one particular site. It also allows the Parish Council to be entirely impartial to any applicant that may arise in the future. These key criteria have been listed, agreed and made public, and any application may be assessed against these parameters, at the time of application.

The key criteria agreed are as follows :-

Availability of site - the PC is aware of some sites in the village that have been subject to previous planning applications, but there may be other sites in the village that may be put forward by landowners that are currently not known about. Therefore "availability" at the appropriate time is clearly a crucial factor

Scale of site – the size of the site in relation to the proposed number of additional dwellings is important, both in terms of the current situation and perhaps even more importantly in the future. (eg A small number of additional dwellings on a large site could present major problems in the future in relation to the balance/rural character of the village. Conversely it could provide room for further expansion if required at some point in the future)

Infrastructure – Electricity, sewage, drainage, cabling, gas, roads etc. Many of these aspects of infrastructure are already issues for the village and must be evaluated carefully in any future development plans.

Socio economic – the balance of the village is an important consideration, recognising the old centre of Alfold and the newer Crossroads area , focal points within the village, the Church, the Pub, access to shops/facilities etc.

Rural character – Felt by most members of the village to be very important. No large scale developments, retaining the Conservation area, retaining the "**important open land**" between the Centre of Alfold and Satchel Court Drive, the design and layout of any additional dwellings to be in keeping with the village etc.

Cost/value – any solution has to be economically viable at the end of the day. Some compromises may have to be made. It is important to recognise the extent of these compromises in relation to the goals of the original exercise. (e.g. if the houses have to be too expensive, or there have to be so many of them, does this seriously jeopardise the original intent or bring the scheme into conflict with the other key criteria).

These parameters therefore are considered by the Housing Sub Group to be the key criteria against which any developmental proposal/ planning application should be judged. However it should be remembered as stated earlier that there is a general presumption against any housing development in the area

There are however possible planning gains identified from the study

1. Solving identified parking and traffic problems in the village.
2. Tidying up land whilst maintaining the rural character by appropriate screening etc.
3. The improvement and upgrading of services including water, drainage and electricity necessary for a particular new development might benefit existing residents particularly if in an area where the existing infra structure is known to be poor.
4. The provision of a "community use" area in conjunction with a small housing development.

The group was advised that any developments outside the planning "boundaries" will have to be justified as an "exception to policy" The 'Planning for Real' exercise has highlighted one possible 'cross over' issue namely, the traffic, the parking problem in the centre of the village, and the perceived need for a small number of additional dwellings also in the centre of the village. Conceptually, therefore there appears to be the potential to solve both the traffic/parking problem and the need for some additional houses. This could be the basis of an exception to the general planning rule. In addition there are other possible planning gains to be achieved within the village, as detailed above.

Whilst conceptually these appear to be very appealing solutions, the sub group agreed, that much more work needs to be done, covering a wide number of issues, some of which are noted below. Not least, taking professional advice to assess the feasibility/economic viability practicality of any such scheme certainly before any external discussions should take place. (As an aside, there was also a recognition that the Parish Council's negotiating position (and Waverleys) would be much stronger if one landowner felt he was in direct competition with other sites/landowners rather than if there was only one site suitable – hence the recommendation for the PC not to be associated with any one particular site).

Specifically, in relation to traffic and parking gains, more work has to be done on the economic model to assess the price/number of houses, the traffic calming measures etc. possible. The parking restrictions that would need to be enforced in the centre of the village, the impact on the village shop etc. Concern was expressed that if the parking issue was resolved, unless the calming measures were effective, the accident problems in the village could be worse. Waverley also cautioned the Group against using additional housing as a negotiating chip with Waverley to solve a traffic problem. There would have to be a real, justifiable and agreed planning gain before the reaffirmed presumption against development could be disregarded.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The housing sub group recommends a proposal for 8 - 12 additional affordable houses at Chilton Close to be developed with all speed, in conjunction with Waverley and a nominated Housing Association.

The group identified from the "Planning for Real" study a need and support from the village for additional market affordable housing. The scale of this should be around 20 to 25 in total but there seemed to be definite preference by the village for each development to be small so a number of sites might be involved. In addition there appeared to be a preference for dwellings in scale with those already in the village i.e. small to medium sized dwellings.

The sub group should pursue the parking/housing possibility on a confidential basis (no public/landowner contact) taking the advice of the experts under the overall guidance of Waverley, to assess the viability of a proposal on a "realistic" basis. This exercise should be conducted within the next 6 months and during 1999 the results reported back to the steering committee prior to any external contact being made.

As far as informing the village on progress from this group, it is recommended that a summary of this document be incorporated with the Alfold Rural Initiative report which is published and circulated to all households in Alfold, for consultation and views, prior to being presented to Waverley as the Alfold Plan for the future

By this means as far as Housing is concerned the public (and landowners) can be made aware in a formal way of the key criteria against which any future application for additional dwellings, will be assessed by the Parish Council.

October 1998

ALFOLD RURAL INITIATIVE

REPORT OF TRAFFIC WORKING GROUP

by

Kav Newnham (Committee Chairman)

INTRODUCTION

For the past year the group including the chairman, Waverley Borough Councillor Ron Baker, Surrey County Council Highway Engineer Graham Hodgson, villagers Sid Jenner, Bob Perkins, and Mary Brown, and Parish Councillors Nick Pidgeon and Don Budd, has met regularly to discuss Alfold's traffic issues, as highlighted in the A.R.I. consultation exercise

The group assessed every card laid down by villagers in the Planning For Real Exercise. The suggestions were then prioritised into **Now - Soon - Later** categories for consideration. Some were discarded as being impractical.

DISCUSSIONS

There followed detailed discussion on every feasible suggestion, and the bulk of these centred around the perceived traffic problems in the area of The Old village and around Alfold Village Stores. The lack of proper parking was an issue, as was the way the public parked, at times inappropriately causing a traffic hazard.

The group also looked at other problem areas including Dunsfold Road, Loxwood Road, the A281 Guildford/Horsham Road and the junction of the A 281 with Wildwood Lane.

Our expert Graham Hodgson discussed each issue in detail, saying he believed the traffic group had done a good job identifying Alfold's problems. However in a couple of cases, proposals for improvements were neither feasible or lawful. He gave as examples, suggestions for putting down double white lines on Loxwood Road, saying the carriageway was too narrow, particularly in the area of Alfold Stores. He also warned against seeking traffic measures - i.e. double yellow lines, where enforcement would be impossible.

He obtained statistics which reveal that Alfold is "comparatively safe" and trouble-free though he accepted this was not the villagers perception due to the high volume of traffic, and the regular "near misses".

Based on the results of the consultation process and thanks to the enormous amount of time put in by Bob Perkins, the group was able to suggest a Traffic Management Scheme for Alfold. The Surrey County Council Highways is helping to evaluate these ideas..

Graham Hodgson has stressed that it is "absolutely imperative" that there is a "partnership arrangement" between the Parish Council and the County Council if any moves are to be made in the future. He stated that it was essential to ensure money is set aside for such

improvements, by the Parish Council. If villagers want a traffic management scheme to get off the ground they must be prepared for Parish funds to be used.

Mr. Hodgson said Surrey County Council could be asked by the Parish Council to draw up a design brief, but the Parish Council could seek its own consultants to write a detailed brief.

The initial cost of examining Alfold's problems in detail would cost around £2,000 and it could be as much as £15,000/£18,000 to implement it. There was little or no hope of progressing if parish funds were not included with County Council funds.

THE WAY FORWARD AND ACTION PLAN

The Steering Group should recommend to the Parish Council that the Parish Council approach the Surrey County Council to join in a partnership arrangement in order that a Traffic Management Scheme in Alfold could be developed.

One major action is the necessity to seek ways to alleviate the lack of car parking in the centre of the village, land for a village car park/s to be made available in the area around Alfold Village Stores at minimal cost to the village.

It was also agreed pavements needed immediate attention - some work has already been undertaken. It was suggested that cyclists should be allowed to use pavements, provided they dismounted for pedestrians in accordance with the law.

Enquiries should be made of Waverley to determine whether any off street parking could be made available near Brockhurst Cottages.

In the long term - a pavement should be provided from The Compasses Mobile Home Park to the Crossways Stores.

The Parish Council should investigate the possibility and acceptability of providing some low level street lighting at "black holes" in the village: i.e.

- Chilton Close Entrance.
- Clappers Meadow Entrance
- Craft Centre
- Village Bus Stop

October 1998

ALFOLD RURAL INITIATIVE
ENVIRONMENT GROUP REPORT

by
Kay Newnham (Committee Chairman)

INTRODUCTION

The group included villagers Sid Jenner, Bob Perkins, Mary Brown, Nick Pidgeon and was chaired by Kay Newnham. Help and advice was sought from outside agencies including: Waverley Borough Council's countryside officer, Ian Baldwin and Waverley's leisure and culture department headed by Peter Maudsley.

The group assessed every card laid down by villagers in the Planning For Real Exercise. The suggestions were then prioritised into Now - Sooner - Later categories for consideration. Some were discarded as being impractical.

DISCUSSIONS

There followed detailed discussions on every feasible suggestion.

Although there were a large number of varied suggestions for improving Alfold's environment many of them, when examined closely, included proposals for facilities and improvements on land in private ownership. The group decided that some of these suggestions should not be examined further as suggestions and ideas were beyond the remit of the ARI - others, it was agreed, should be taken further with local landowners.

ACTIONS PLANS - THE WAY FORWARD

The Group recommended that a number of environmental improvements be pursued:
Including:

- Community Composting Scheme - a Waverley Borough Council, initiative.
- Ongoing improvements and maintenance of Jubilee Pond and the area surrounding it. This should include new benches and waste paper bins for picnickers.
- Clean up Rat Infestation at The Compasses Mobile Home Park in Dunsfold Road.
- Suggestion to Moorlands to re-paint pub sign at the Crown
- Dog Free Zone at Recreation Ground
- Landscaped roundabout at The Crossways. Seek discussions with Country Gardens.
- Continue to vigorously monitor the increasing noise pollution from Gatwick air traffic, active discussions with BAA and maintaining representation on GACC
- Parish Council to investigate the alleged closure of footpaths and bridleway located near White Lea with Surrey County Council.

October 1998

ALFOLD RURAL INITIATIVE

REPORT ON LEISURE-CRIME/STREET LIGHTING AND EMPLOYMENT

by

Chris Copus (Committee Chairman)

INTRODUCTION

A working group of local residents have met to categorise the planning for real suggestions into 'Now', 'Sooner', or 'Later'. A small proportion of suggestions were rejected for being totally impractical or already existing. Most of these ideas that already exist are centred around leisure provisions at the recreation ground which suggests an information sign is needed at the roadside.

Further meetings are planned to include more specialised individuals who have already been identified and have agreed to assist with the next step to create action plans and establish who will carry them out.

IMPORTANT ISSUES IDENTIFIED

LEISURE

All the actions and suggestions identified in the 'Now' category have been completed. Which were items of vandalism and graffiti in the recreation ground and improvements to the cricket square. All the other suggestions were in the 'Soon' category with emphasis on a supervised playgroup, a 14-18 year old self run shelter, improvements to Clappers Meadow playground, and a youth football team. This latter suggestions has already been set up this year.

CRIME/STREET LIGHTING

There are major concerns regarding vandalism, theft, drug taking, solvent abuse and illegal dumping and as a consequence the possible need for a police foot patrol. Police figures have been requested to enable the group to monitor actual crime within the Parish. The group realised crime was very much a big issue at the time of the consultation process because of particular problems at that time and felt they should not over react without monitoring over a length of time.

Most of the figures are theft and burglary related and are up to the first quarter of 1998. They are as follows:-

1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
37	48	92	73	6

Surrey Police advised that Neighbourhood Watch Schemes need to be promoted rather than the presence of a Police foot patrol. If an increase in crime is detected then more action would be recommended. The possibility of street lighting should be investigated to assess

whether it would help crime reduction and population safety. Costs and a possible survey need to be considered to help with the street lighting debate.

EMPLOYMENT

There were many suggestions received for employment opportunities in the community. The key areas for consideration are child care and crèche facilities, a "Lets" exchange scheme, Community workshop, and local service and job creation facility. It is recognised that relevant agencies need to be contacted to explore further development.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To continue with the working group and include Richard Gates (Waverley Borough Councillor) and Alan Fisher (Surrey Voluntary Service Council) to set up action plans.

To continue monitoring Police figures supplied by P. C. Andrew Smallbone (Surrey Police) to assist in the crime recommendations.

October 1998

ALFOLD RURAL INITIATIVE

REPORT FROM SUBCOMMITTEE CONSIDERING COMMUNITY, HEALTH, SOCIAL and other associated issues

by
Jenny Masding (Committee Chairman)

INTRODUCTION

The committee consisted of Jenny Masding, Neville Chamberlain, Don Budd and Keith Debenham They immediately divided their brief into two main categories

1. Community Issues and Facilities and
2. Health Issues. It was immediately apparent to the committee that their brief was very wide ranging and complex and there was a need to categorise to make any sense of the Consultation Process. The suggestions requiring investigation and debate ranged from very reasonable issues one would expect to address in any rural community, national issues which are mainly resource and legislation issues and thus difficult to address from a local level to the rather more sublime wish list of a population. They looked at every suggestion received in the Consultation Exercise using the methodology shown by Planning for Real experts and identified issues that required further debate, investigation or discussion and rejected issues only if there was unanimous agreement and all these issues have been logged and their reasons for rejection recorded.

COMMUNITY ISSUES and FACILITIES

UTILITIES

Many and varied suggestions, complaints and requests relating to

1. Electricity supply
2. Mains Drainage in the extremities of the Village
3. Gas
4. State of pavements and adequacy of road maintenance by Highways Authority

ACTION It is the view of the committee that the Parish Council does have a role to play here in opening or continuing discussions with Seeboard, Thames Water, Southern Water and Surrey County Council emphasizing villagers dismay at certain issues and seeking action to improve. Whether the provision of gas is now any more viable than it was when last the gas authorities did a survey is not clear and another survey would be necessary but probably at the Gas Boards expense not the Parish Council's as it is unlikely the number of households who would be prepared to switch to mains gas has reached the critical amount required by the gas board to make it a viable concern.

COMMUNITY TRANSPORT

Transport impacts on many aspects of villagers suggestions, requests and a genuine desire to help the disadvantaged in the Community. But an assessment of real need would have to be made.

ACTION Parish Council to have discussions with experts on Community Transport on the **NEED, HOW BEST TO PROVIDE IT and HOW TO FINANCE IT.** Waverley Borough Council, (Housing department) is just starting a full survey across the Borough into matters concerning community transport. When this is complete and the results are available the committee will have discussions with the Waverley officer in charge (John Swanton) and in addition the Surrey County Community Transport Officer, Stephen Stiles, to assess how this information can be used in Alfold to facilitate the provision of necessary community transport.

VILLAGE FACILITIES

The range of suggestions for activities, services and venues was wide.

ACTION Set up a Committee to discuss the role of the Village Hall in this and attempt to assess which of the suggested services and activities there is a real need or large enough demand for to achieve any viable service. We suggest this Committee should consist of Parish Council members, Village Hall representative, Church representative, Youth representative, Senior Citizen representative and Infant representative.

VILLAGE SHOP IMPROVEMENTS

ACTION Parish Council could discuss with present owners whether there are any ways in which the Parish Council could help or enable the village shop in the provision of this essential service to the village at a time when we recognise that a lot of village shops are having difficulties.

MOBILE LIBRARY ACTION already enacted

JM has liaised with Surrey County Council Officer responsible and has the results of their audit on usage. SCC does not intend to remove the Service unless usage drops further. It was clear from the results of the ARI that some of the problem is that the population is not aware that the service already exists so the Parish Council is now publicising its existence and timetable in the Parish magazine. Also from the Surrey County Council audit results it appears the two sites that the library stops at may not be the best to meet demand but the Parish Council needs to investigate this. The committee are already looking into this.

HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE ISSUES

There were varied and numerous suggestions but most resolved round the issue of **ACCESSIBILITY, QUALITY AND ABILITY TO MEET NEED** which is a

general national issue. Any population would understandably like to have their own Doctor, Clinic, District Nurse etc. but quality depends on the size of the service and generally quality is easier to achieve the bigger the critical mass using the service and Alfold is small. There were requests for Breast Screening, Blood Transfusion Service, Chiropody, Preventative Medicine Clinics, Well Men Clinics and our own Health Visitor and facilities from which our GPs could operate within the village. These issues require more investigation to establish the real needs and real gaps in the service, if any, and then if a real need or problem is established the Parish Council should work with the Statutory agencies to see if any changes can be implemented

ACTION Immediate . JM to have informal talks with our main providers of primary Health Services- the Loxwood Surgery and Rudgwick Surgery to establish

1. Their views of where they see problems arising in the provision of Health care for the Alfold population. Are there any areas which cause them concern, do they see any real needs e.g. Community Transport or areas where Alfold people are at a disadvantage compared to the other populations. Or do they have any particular problems in Alfold.
2. Do our demographics lead to any areas where there are specific problems in providing adequate services.
3. Issues concerning provision of Health Care Services other than medical
4. If there was a appropriate venue with modern facilities are there any services that they could provide in Alfold efficiently, safely, and cost effectively

Then the committee to assess the real health needs and invite discussions with Community Health Council, Health Authority and Voluntary sector to see if the Parish Council plus a statutory or voluntary body could enable any actions to meet the wishes of the Village or address specific problems. But it is not yet clear what will be the full effect of implementation of the Government's White Paper. Dr. Jenny Masding to speak to village bodies already existing immediately to ask if we could combine forces to provide transport for village members to the Surgeries.

October 1998

J. E Masding
Chairman Alfold Parish
Council
Approved by PC
23/3/99.

CONCLUSION

The Sub committees will continue meeting to further the various action points and will report directly to the Parish Council and steering group on a regular basis. Further supplementary evidence and reports based on their work will be issued by the Parish Council.

Dr. Jenny Masding
CHAIRMAN
ALFOLD PARISH COUNCIL

ALFOLD RURAL INITIATIVE

Alfold Parish Council would like to thank all of those who have been involved in the Alfold Rural Initiative

- *Dr. Jenny Masding
- *Mr. Colin Fraser
- *Mr. Nick Pidgeon
- *Mr. Chris Copus
- *Mrs. Betty Ames
- *Mr. Don Budd
- *Mrs. Kay Newnham (Waverley Borough Councillor)
- Mrs. Lynne Enticknap (Clerk to Alfold Parish Council)
- Mrs. Margaret Wilkinson (Planning for Real)
- *Mr. Stephen Thwaites (Waverley Borough Council)
- *Mr. John Swanton (Waverley Borough Council)
- Mrs. Jenny Falcolner (Waverley Borough Council)
- Mrs. Diane Malpass (Waverley Borough Council)
- Mr. Andrew Longley (Waverley Borough Council)
- Mr. Peter Maudsley (Waverley Borough Council)
- Mr. Ian Baldwin (Waverley Countryside Ranger)
- Mr. Steve Andrews (Surrey Voluntary Service Council)
- *Mr. Alan Fisher (Surrey Voluntary Service Council)
- *Mr. Ron Baker (Waverley Borough Councillor)
- *Mr. Michael Blower (Waverley Borough Councillor)
- *Mr. Richard Gates (Waverley Borough Councillor)
- *Mr. Graham Hodgson (Surrey County Council Highways)
- *Mr. Neville Chamberlain
- *Mrs. Mary Brown
- Mrs. Pat Wakefield
- Mrs. Dawn Botting
- Mrs. Jane Moulds
- Mr. Robin Erricker
- P.C. Andrew Smallbone (Surrey Police)
- Mr. Bob Perkins
- Mrs. Jackie Miller
- Mr. Sid Jenner
- Mr. Keith Debenham

* donates present members of the Steering Group October 1998.