



# Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

**THESE ARE DRAFT MINUTES AND ARE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL AT  
THE NEXT MEETING**

**A MEETING OF THE BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK NEIGHBOURHOOD  
DEVELOPMENT PLAN STEERING GROUP WAS HELD AT THE LIPHOOK  
MILLENNIUM CENTRE ON TUESDAY 10<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY AT 7.30 PM**

## **MINUTES**

### **PRESENT:**

Louise Bevan (LB) – Chair  
Chantal Foo (CF) – Vice Chair  
Cllr Jeanette Kirby (JK)  
Barbara Jacobsen (BJ)  
David Sawyer (DS)  
Andrew Thornhill (AT)  
Raine Ryland (RR)

Members of the public were present.

### **1. CHAIR WELCOME & INTRODUCTION**

LB confirmed recording the meeting audibly.  
LB pointed out the fire exits.

### **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Cllr P Curnow-Ford, Dennis Smith

### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None including RR (arrival 19:35)

### **4. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

The meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> December were approved subject to the following changes:

- Part 12 (public consultation) regarding Penally Farm having a response to traffic: change to the transport report stated that Penally Farm site would give 15% less traffic in the square compared to the other strategic sites.
- Change Ashgrove site to Andlers Ash Road site in para 7
- LB proposed, JK second – 6/6 agreed

### **5. MATTERS ARISING**

None



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

### 6. **NDP ADMINISTRATION**

1. NDP administrator – LB updated to stated there are 2 interviews on Monday for a new NDP administrator officer
2. CIL – deferred until AT's arrival

### 7. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION**

None

### 8. **POLICIES**

Feedback on pre-submission document (Dec 22):

LB had discussion with Alison and set a deadline for the feedback on the policies at 23<sup>rd</sup> January to allow time to prepare for policy summaries to be publicised. SG to ensure all actions from previous policies workshop actions and maps to be completed.

AT = 19:41 arrival

### 9. **SITES**

1. Residents group meeting

Residents group meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> January with Passfield and Land South of Liphook resident's groups.

LB – working parties have completed those 2 site summaries and others.

The aim of the meetings is to share the latest version of site summaries for relevant sites and receive feedback and input into the summary. There can then be a period of a couple of weeks for group reps to check back with the wider resident groups to ensure all comments are addressed.

2. Developers' engagement

LB – we have had minimal engagement with developers so far, but they are an important part of the process. We also want to work with the PC planning team regarding sites that have been put in for planning applications.

We have a mark in the timeline in February to meet with developers for them to present their current development proposals. At the consultation event in March, we also aim to have proposed designs available for public to view along site NDP site summaries and policies. It is not intended for developers to be present.

AT – asked if the Parish council could give some feedback on how NDP is meant to conduct itself in relation with the PC and their current planning applications they are



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

consulting on, and also the emerging plan. It would be good to ensure PC are taking emerging plan into consideration.

JK – advised best to set up a meeting with the PC planning team to discuss, and likely this hasn't happened so far as the NDP has not been finalised

LB – Cllr Peter C-F is aware that the NDP are interested in ensuring this happens

RR – will be helpful to measure against the policies and test the policies to see if they were practical

JK – sometimes it is useful to put more detail to comments, and it can be difficult to know what detail to put into PC responses.

AT – sense of urgency about the Allianz site as it is live.

Cllr Jerrard – the PC has looked at the application, and it has been going on a while. Notes that the liaison between the PC planning team and the NDP is not taking place as well as it should, on both sides. Cannot stop any developer of putting in any application of any size. The policies are critical, and to check that they work, it would be good to carry out liaison.

JK – the current Allianz design has some outstanding issues, that need to be looked into so there hopefully should be some further consultation that the NDP could be involved in,

AT the aim is to ensure all the work to date is utilised to help the PC.

LB – the aim of finalising the policies with summaries to allow the PC to use the summaries to guide their responses to Planning applications.

JK – We've all got to be aware, any comments made on planning applications that EHDC/SDNP will only pay attention to current live plans, so when the NDP is finalised the PC can push forward with utilise the NDP policies in their full effect.

LB – Book in an evening date to meet developers.

### 3. Do we allocate sites or not

LB – at the last meeting we discussed the pros and cons of allocating sites or not. Since I have also had further correspondence with EHDC. A summary of the conversation so far is as follows (read from the presentation)

- Purpose of an NDP is to set out a vision and planning policies for a parish
- If suitable sites come forward that can achieve the policies outcomes and deliver the parish's vision then the NDP can allocate these sites in the plan.



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

- Allocation – enacting the policies through the sites to get what local people want
- Clear NDP policies & site summaries includes benefits and constraints – to enable informed decision
- Allocation is a longer process – more scrutiny + in this parish no clear consensus
- Residents to give informed views (do you agree to allocation in principle? which sites, which order) / steering group to make final decision
- Currently working under the East Hants Adopted Core Strategy – reached our housing number. No timescale for Local Plan 2021- 40. So allocation would be above requirement, which has partly caused the delay in making this decision.
- EHDC's suggests 'simple allocations within the settlement boundary policy'
- Planning consultant advises 6-9 months extra before referendum if we allocate. If want to allocate big (strategic) sites suggests - joint conversation with SG / LAs / Aecom to identify what is involved
- Arising issue - planning application for some of the large sites – risk may get through before NDP in place

LB – unlikely be ready for referendum before the end of the year based on the various hoops to be jumped through. Alison has given the best estimate she based on her knowledge of where we are

LB – Chiltley has put in their application, and Penally has suggested that they are considering submitting their application within the year.

JK – it is important to note, that if the NDP is not finalised, and big sites are approved then a large chunk of CIL money could be lost.

DS – produce a framework of policies and how they will be done, and get those in place will put constraints on developers

RR – The NDP is at the bottom of the pecking chain in the planning decisions. It is not the SG's place to dictate the consensus. The public event may demonstrate otherwise, but at present there appears there is no consensus. It would be a shame due to the amount of work carried out to date.

JK – it would be wrong if the evidence is not considered

LB – one option is to delay the allocate question until after we have the plan in place, do some consultations with the public and keep these in the plan as views, and push through the NDP. Then have an early review on allocating sites once the NDP is in place. A discussion with EHDC formed 3 options.

1. Be prepared for allocation option – gain community views at the event, make decision to allocate or not in March, be prepared for allocation options
  - a. Pros – more site control over each site
  - b. Cons – take much more time + large sites gain consent before NDP in place and loss of CIL money



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

2. Finalise a policies only plan - forget allocation at this point – SG decide not to allocate now, gain community views and append in NDP, finalise plan, review at normal point for NDP reviews - which is where EHDC seem to be guiding us at this point.
  - a. Pros – get through quicker, developers comply with policies,
  - b. Cons - Less control
  
3. Review allocate option when NDP in place, SG decide to not allocate now, still gain comments from public at the event, and finalise plan with policies – with commitment to early review, then review allocation option once NDP is in place –
  - a. Pros – get through quicker, developers comply with policies, repeat referendum process again comments to review early once the NDP is in place.
  - b. Cons – not clear on funding, less control

RR – it is now seems to be about speed and making sure developers are controlled in some way, and to obtain the CIL funding. The public seem divided and it is not the remit of the SG to make the public reach a consensus

AT – there is no consensus or support of any sites

BJ – question on referendum process if we allocate at a later date.

LB – confirmed that you would have to go to referendum for major changes to the plan – allocation is a major change

CF – will there be funding from EHDC for a second referendum for a major review to the NDP to allocate sites, can we get funding from Locality for a review of the SEA, HRA and HNA etc. as it is important to ensure we have the funding at the correct time

LB – EHDC said we would need to go to referendum again

D – We have no control over the local councils Local Plans

RR - we did delay due to EHDC's timeframes to have their Local Plans in place, and to have a clear Local Plan for the NDP to reflect. This has not happened due to EHDC further delaying their Local Plan.

CF – delayed due to government changing their views on housing numbers

BJ – As a newcomer it is clear it is important to have an NDP in place and get the policies in action.

AT – The sooner we have an NDP in place with policies in place, there is some strength



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

LB asked if a decision could be made now.

CF – asked for more information on whether there would be funding in place for a review and the timeframes.

RR – the advice from EHDC and SDNP has always been to wait, and continuously wait. So we have a reasonable push back to ask for the funding. There may be a future proposal or change in proposal put forward by developers

LB – Locality website, says that any funding had since 2015 will be taken into account when assessing how much grant you can apply for

AT – Asked for the referendum process, and whether it is applicable for a policies only NDP.

JF + CF confirmed that referendum would be required for an NDP that is only for policies, and also a review for allocation of sites

RR + LB both commented that leaning between options 2 and 3.

RR- having an NDP in place is the priority.

LB – would like to make a decision at the next SG meeting.

### 10. COMMUNICATIONS & EVENTS

#### 1. March events

Purpose is to present a draft NDP and ask residents for their views. There will be tables and displays to be manned by the WP and hopefully more volunteers & SG

Table 1: Registration and how to give feedback. There will be feedback at the event via paper forms and also online feedback options

Table 2: Rolling slide deck – history of the NDP, initial feedback from on-line consultation – vision exercise i.e. what things are most important to residents, so SG can update the NDP vision

At end of February after SG meeting, aim is to have the policies and site summaries finalise and on the website with some basic consultation in the lead up to the March event.

Display of the policy chapter – laid out to tell a story –

Table 3: Neighbourhood design policies

Table 4: Environmental and green space

Table 5: Transport and movement policies



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

Table 6: Housing policies

Table 7: Sites

Table 8: Local economy policies

Table 9: Community facilities policies

Each display will have

- Overall aim of the policy chapter
- Individual policy summaries
- Relevant maps
- An interactive activity
- Feedback forms – asking what you like / don't like / what is missing

LB- May have support from relevant interest groups. For example at Environment Event, we had PECAN visit to discuss retrofitting and their super-homes project. We could bring in other people to assist with engaging activities at the event and to capture comments. Hoping to have HCC's policy team to assist and comment on transport policies and possibly EHDC affordable housing team.

JK – or the housing association

RR – concerns the housing association could look like a developer;

RR - there are charities that advise on affordable housing. Easier to get a housing association to attend, but it could be seen as controversial or a developer

Sites plan – potential sites of interest marked up in green/amber and red – key facts, and walking distance to village, developer's proposals potentially suitable to have on display.

RR – talked about engaging with policies, developers etc. but how about local businesses and getting their engagement, and in particular from the schools, both Churchers, Highfield, Bohunt and the federation. There are a lot of staff.

Is it worth to send out a request to the larger employers to ask them to come and comment, the smaller employers normally engage and give feedback, but the larger employers employ the biggest local workforces.

John public - AMK – not a large employer of the local population anymore.

### 2. Marketing Plan

BJ – the objective to reach as many people as possible, and the aim to make sure as many people as possible are involved in the process. Need to use as many channels as possible, such as Facebook, Twitter, and also leaflets.



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

The most important item is to update the NDP website, as the PC website is not up to date and need to ensure to send people to one place. This needs to be addressed asap so that the website is updated in time. But needs someone else to sort this out.

The millennium centre has a note on their website promoting the date. Roller banner in the millennium centre and in the living room cinema, and that posters can be put up in The Square and in local businesses. Emails to key people as well.

Can vote via the internet and also on paper, to give as many opportunities as possible, and get as many people as possible involved in the event.

RR – there is an NDP noticeboard – and also in doctors and Sainsburys, post office, Gables.

CF – used WP to put up posters and also access the notice board.

### 6 – part B: Community Infrastructure Levy CIL

AT – Putting in an CIL application by end of January. The funding is targeted at parish councils. There is a draft paper to circulate to the NDP and PC, at the end it would be best that PC are the signatures to give most weight.

The focus is nature recovery, environment, National Park for all – it is mainly about community infrastructure. Picked up on it from the healthy streets consultation (at Our Future Environment Event) held with transport planner from HCC.

To be clear, it is not a request for a ring road, and the CIL funding is not expecting applications like this either. As a neighbourhood centre, Liphook has more scope to gain funding. There are historical road issues that have been compounded overtime, which made sense at the time, but not now.

The focus of our bid is promoting a walkable neighbourhood. Lucy Saunders – who developed the Healthy Streets Manual (and now talks globally about healthy streets). She's given some advice on how to produce a CIL. Needs to focus on - Safety, health and wellbeing of neighbourhoods

Paths that connect Liphook and Bramshott into the NP, to make it a truly accessible area

- Raised footpaths on roads, to help prioritise pedestrian access and to slow down cars
- Reduce junction points to slow vehicles down
- Increase narrow footpaths to a minimum of 2m for safety
  - Allianz put in an application for assisted living but there is no safe footpath into the village centre which is not mentioned in their application





## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

- Remove road markings in 20mph zones to help slow down cars – potentially controversial
- Promote removal of roundabouts – potentially controversial
  - Legible London – to help promote local amenities and also help guide pedestrians around an area and distances and times to walk
- Reduce carriageway widths to reduce speed and increase pedestrian footpaths
- Take back road for green corridors and trees

Obviously will not get funding on all of the proposals, but worth applying for, as if successful further funding could be obtained from other sources, and allow future projects to be funded to assist with other applications in the locality. The pedestrian is the main focus

RR – the walkway along Haslemere road into the village centre, is not safe, and declared an interest as lives along the road – have we looked at how that impacts traffic flows, as widening the footpath at the pinch point at top of Haslemere Road would then cause issues with vehicles

AT – aim is not to worsen traffic, but to encourage people to leave cars outside of the village and walk in, and also address some areas of congestion by encouraging people to use a different mode of transport. Is it possible to push larger vehicles to not drive.

DS – there are 2 halves of the village, how would this work for larger vehicles.

AT – the aim is to demonstrate to the CIL funder that the proposals will make it safer for pedestrians to walk and move around the centre, and whilst it is ambitious it could result in several small projects – it will need to demonstrate that the resulting outcomes will not hinder vehicles needed to main areas

- Focus on making the routes safer, and the main routes in/out of the centre safer.
- Not sure how much money available, likely not as much as one may think.

AT – speed is the main issue, and the narrow footways are dangerous for both uses at present – this should focus on the main routes, not just the cut throughs.

RR – recalls there was a reason for the dropped kerbs in the centres was to allow ambulances to get through safely, not just lorries.

JK – we need to make sure who has responsibility for the various issues and projects.

AT – the majority of this will be in HCCs remit as it will be on their land. And it is HCCs policy to promote walkable neighbourhoods

SDNP – meeting on Friday 13<sup>th</sup> January – JK + LB –



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

- Need to check with SDNP regarding the referendum funding for 2 referendums.

### 11. MEETINGS WITH OUTSIDE BODIES

None. Meeting with SDNP later this week.

### 12. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION

KW – the NPPF makes a big issue on Sustainable infrastructure – gas, water, supplies, noticed that it was not mentioned in any of the slides.

RR – the summaries of the policies were displayed on tonight's slides, the full policies will come later

KW – when do we get to see the detailed policies for comment

LB – the intention is to have both the policy summaries and also the detailed policies at the March event

CF – aim to have the information up online end Feb / mid-March

KW – CIL money, who is going to initiate the projects proposed

JK – this has been discussed before, sometimes this can be dealt with under s106 agreements so dealt with. It depends who will initiate the projects

KW – who is going to initiate the projects and push them through, as the previous CIL funding put towards projects, i.e. Lowsley Farm, hasn't had resulted in the outcomes proposed; water and sewage are the key issues in the area. In Farnham's NDP there is a large section on services to make sure it is clear who takes responsibility

AT – as the proposals are on HCC land, the funding goes to HCC to fund the proposed project

LB – there is a piece of work that needs to be carried out at the right time to ensure the management of these projects is clear

RR – that is the compliance part, to ensure those responsible are accountable

AT – it is a political piece to push on the water and sewage authorities who are responsible, rather than the NDP and PC.

JW – what time is the meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> Jan – LB confirmed 7.30.

AT – indicated infrastructure in the site assessments as far as possible is within the remit of an NDP. Part of the planning procedure is for developers to show that a development can meet NDP policies

JK – The PC meet with officers regularly, and raise the concerns of residents with the district councils. Ultimately the District council is responsible to ensuring the infrastructure is in place.



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

### **13. REVIEW AGAINST THE TIMELINE**

LB – based on current information in place, it looks like won't be at referendum in place before the end of the year. Not going to publish yet, as needs further answers from EHDC first

### **14. REVIEW OF TASKS & ACTIONS & ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING**

- Decision on Allocate or not
- Meeting with Hayley on CIL
- Meeting with SDNP – send comments / questions to LB
- Send comments on pre- submission document policies before 23<sup>rd</sup> Jan – look back at actions from the policies workshop – this is the final feedback point
- Site assessments feedback for AT + CF
- LB – to email JW + Land South of Liphook 19<sup>th</sup> Jan event
- may have policies summarises and site assessments for a preview before the SG meeting

### **15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Next meeting is 14<sup>th</sup> February 2023.

LB – ended meeting at 21:10.