

**Normandy Action Group (NAG) Annual General Meeting
12 November 2025 at 2000 in Normandy Village Hall
Draft Minutes**

Present: Mike Aaronson (in the Chair), Paul Hart (NAG Treasurer), Les Asher, Roshan Bailey, Phelim Brady, Fiona Clarke-Hackston, Nod Clarke-Hackston, Richard Cunningham, Mike Dean, Adrian Gay, Ellie Gay, Nick Gough, Caroline Gower, Jenny Hughes, Mike Hughes, Christine King, Ollie Nevett, Nick Norton, Linda Peacock, Roger Shapley (part), Eileen Wicks.

Guests: Dr Al Pinkerton, MP; Councillor David Bilbé (part); Councillor Simon Schofield; Amanda Pick (Parish Clerk)

Apologies: Dina Ahmed, Martin Sweeting, Councillor Keith Witham.

1. Mike Aaronson, Chair of the NAG Steering Committee, opened the meeting and welcomed those present. He thanked Roshan Bailey, Chair of Trustees of Normandy Village Hall, for the Trustees' generosity in making the Hall available to NAG at no cost for this and other meetings during the year, and thanked the following guests for sparing the time to attend the meeting: Al Pinkerton, MP for Surrey Heath; David Bilbé Guildford Borough Councillor for Normandy and Pirbright; Simon Schofield, Acting Chair and Chair of the Planning Committee of Normandy Parish Council; and Amanda Pick, Normandy Parish Clerk.
2. The Chair had posted the draft Minutes of the 2024 AGM on the NAG website after that AGM, and again ahead of this meeting; they were duly approved. Under Matters Arising he reported that he had submitted grant applications to Normandy Parish Council (NPC) and Surrey County Council (SCC), and that NAG had gratefully received £150 from each to help with the ongoing costs of its online communications, both email and website.
3. The Chair spoke to his Annual Report, and apologised that he had only been able to post this on the website shortly in advance of the AGM, along with the meeting agenda and Treasurer's Report. The Report dealt with the impact of Government's changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF), which had resulted in a doubling of the housing target set for Guildford Borough Council (GBC), and had introduced the new and contentious concept of 'Grey Belt', which represented a significant easing of Green Belt restrictions in favour of developers.
4. Predictably, these changes had led volume house builder Taylor Wimpey (TW) to resurrect its previously rejected [plan](#) to fill in the entire green space lying between Normandy and Flexford with up to 950 dwellings. This would amount to an urban-style development in a countryside setting, radically changing the size, look, and feel of the village. It constituted a major threat to the way of life in Normandy, and now dominated NAG's agenda. A further threat was posed by a proposal for 200 houses to be built in the Green Belt at [Shortlands Farm](#), near the boundary with Ash; a previous [application](#) in 2017 for 300 homes on this site had been refused.
5. In response, NAG had stepped up its flow of email newsletters, had printed flyers alerting people to the threat and encouraging them to join its mailing list, and with the help of an army of volunteers, had distributed them to the whole village. As a result, numbers of

people on its list had more than doubled, from around 250 to over 550. NAG had issued a call for voluntary donations to meet its additional costs (see Treasurer's Report, below). It had also hosted three seminars in the Village Hall to explain the intricacies of the planning system, had convened a group of individuals with expertise in planning matters, which had generated a detailed response to the EIA Scoping Request that marked the first stage of TW's application, and had carried out a quick survey of its members in response to TW's 'emerging vision'. The latter showed overwhelming opposition to TW's plans; NAG had managed to publicise this as part of its ongoing contact with local written and broadcast media. NAG had also sought to engage with TW at the so-called 'consultation events' organised by the latter, although this had not been productive.

6. The Chair also gave an update on the Surrey Hills AONB (now National Landscape) review, which continued to advance – very slowly. The other major feature in the external environment was the reorganisation of local government in Surrey, which from April 2027 would see GBC disappear, along with the ten other district/borough councils in Surrey, and Surrey County Council. In future Normandy would fall under a new West Surrey Unitary Authority, with an obvious consequence that decision-making would be taken further away from the areas and the people affected by those decisions. This could have particularly serious implications regarding planning decisions.
7. Discussion centred on the potential impact of the TW proposals and the best way for the community to respond. Dr Pinkerton stressed the importance of engagement with the developer if the worst possible consequences of the development were to be avoided. He said he was very aware of the concerns of local – and neighbouring - residents, with regard especially to flooding risks, infrastructure gaps, traffic, road access upgrades, and the need for improved community facilities such as GP services. However, a number of those present who had taken part in the TW consultation events expressed their frustration, both at the shortage of detail about the scheme that would be proposed, and the apparent unwillingness of the TW representatives to listen sincerely to the concerns that were being raised. Given the scale of the TW proposal there was a strong argument for deferring consideration of it until it could be looked at in the round in the context of the Local Plan, which GBC was in the process of revising. Dr Pinkerton said he was happy to write to GBC to make that point.
8. Councillor Schofield explained how the Parish Council was responding to the prospective TW planning application. It needed to have solid evidence of what local residents thought about it now that there was more detail on the table from TW, and to this end was organising a survey of all households, the results of which would be fed back at a Village Meeting on Sunday, 30 November. He thanked Rachel and Richard Cunningham in particular for their help in organising the distribution of the questionnaires, which were also available online. As a Statutory Consultee, NPC had to consider the evidence objectively – taking specialist advice as appropriate – before deciding what position to take in response to any planning application. He also referred to the implications of local government reorganisation and the need for clarity about the role of parish or town councils in any future setup; a number of schemes to maintain local involvement were being trialled, but it was not clear how they might fit together. Finally, he reminded the meeting that although it had been focusing on the prospective TW application, the

Shortlands Farm one was likely to emerge even sooner, possibly by the end of November.

9. The Treasurer presented his report. Expenditure for the past year had totalled £319.52, which was significantly more than the previous year (£122.26), because of activities undertaken in response to the emergence of the TW threat. The additional expenditure had been mainly on flyer production and the increased cost of the NAG email platform given the significant increase in the number of subscribers. Income, which included the two grants from NPC and SCC referred to above, had also benefited from a generous response to our ad hoc call for donations, which had so far raised £926.02. Funds available for the coming year totalled £960.80, with planned and unavoidable expenditure at around £350, leaving around £600 available to support activities associated with the prospective major developments in Normandy. However, depending on the decisions made about how to use these funds, there would need to be a discussion about financing any additional short-term activities should they be necessary, as well as anticipated recurring costs for 2026/27. The options remained a combination of grant income, further member voluntary donations, or a move back to a formal subscription model.
10. The Chair explained that at its founding in 2006 NAG had given itself a constitution appropriate to its role as an unincorporated association, but that this had become redundant following, in 2017, the move to being an organisation operating mainly online and no longer asking its members for an annual subscription. However, it was generally considered desirable to have an up-to-date constitutional document, and a draft had been prepared and posted on the website shortly before this meeting. Because the provisions of the new constitution called for resolutions to be circulated 14 days in advance it was not possible to propose its adoption at this AGM, but comments were welcome either now or subsequently, and a formal resolution would follow in due course. Councillor Schofield requested that the document make clear that Parish Councillors were attending meetings not as members but *ex officio*, and the Chair undertook to make the necessary addition.
11. Under Any Other Business, Les Asher proposed a vote of thanks to the Chair for his leadership of NAG, which was warmly endorsed. The Chair also expressed his gratitude to the Steering Committee for their support throughout the year, as well as the volunteers who had distributed leaflets, and the members of the experts' group.
12. All members of the existing Steering Group had indicated their willingness to stand again. The meeting unanimously re-elected Mike Aaronson (Chair), Paul Hart (Treasurer), Dina Ahmed, Les Asher, Mike Dean, Nick Norton, and Martin Sweeting, to serve for a further year on the Group (under the new constitution this would be two years). The Chair said the Committee would welcome fresh blood and asked those present to spread the word. [After the meeting Nick Gough kindly agreed to be co-opted.]
13. The meeting closed at 2140.

Mike Aaronson (Chair of the Meeting)

14 November 2025