



# 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 13<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2022 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)

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 and Dennis Smith

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

None

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

Minutes of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2022 were approved.

### **5. MATTERS ARISING**

JK – referring to the Passfield discussion had during the last meeting, the meeting minutes are considered a true record of what was said. On page 2 – we said that the SG would amend the reference to ‘Land at Passfield’ – however, the land owner put the site forward as ‘Land adjacent to Passfield’ – and it is being suggested that it is left as it is for consistency with the AECOM report, but add a reference that it should be referred to ‘Land at Passfield’ for clarity.

Public – gets that, but to counteract that, the original reference makes it sound to be an extension of a business unit, its not an extension or adjoining the business park but separated by the now car park.



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

JK – needs to be an amendment/statement to clarify where the site is, and that it is misleading calling it Land adjacent to Passfield

JK – need to have both names in references in the NDP.

Public – is it time to call it 'Land at Mill Lane', not to be misleading in particular to the councils, as the land is not an extension of the business park.

JK – the AECOM report is a reference document that cannot be amended.

LB – action to make sure all the site summaries are in line with each other, and to utilise both names in the SG's references to the site..

### 6. NDP ADMINISTRATION

- Update on recruitment of NDP administrator

LB discussed looking for a new administrator. The job role is likely 10 hrs a week, looking for someone to do admin and meetings and minutes, social media work, but we may not get that skill level. Advert to be put out before Christmas, with the aim for interviews in January

- An outline of budget plan

LB looked at it with JK and the Executive Officer, the current balance is around £16,000 taking into account the fees of the planning consultant. We are thinking about £3k for the administrator, which should allow us to complete the NDP. CF – clarified that the £16,000 doesn't include the grants from the government

- Information on SDNP CIL funding application

LB talked with Hayley at HCC about do as a feasibility study, but the CIL money is not available for the feasibility study but to be used for the infrastructure project itself. LB to ask if we are eligible for any funding. Looked at the EHDC CIL funding, opens 6 Feb and closes 24th March – need to clarify if we would eligible for any funding. LB – asking CF and AT for any ideas on how to achieve this..

### 7. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION

Cllr Jerrard met Lucy Howard with Cllr Curnow-Ford. Chris Paterson was unable to attend. There is now a timetable for the SDNP Local Plan. Lucy Howard was praising JK input. Council are short on money but going to appoint a new projects manager to replace Lucy Howard who has now moved on.

Cllr Jerrard attended an EHDC meeting that 38 attended to talk about the EH Local Plan consultation. Also attended the one in Alton. Consultation is about what sort of communities are desired. Nothing about specific sites or housing numbers. The consultation ends shortly. JK was unable to attend the EHDC.

Reviewing their plan at the moment, not intending on doing a new plan, looking at their current plan, they are looking at numbers, with the aim to tell councils in summer, and then plan on asking councils if they want to do neighbourhood plans, or collaboration with SDNP. Each council will be given choice to do Neighbourhood Priority Statements instead of a new plan, to obtain the CIL funding. Our situation is that we are in the middle of a plan.

Chris Paterson (SDNP) wants to hear from the parishes in the autumn. Asked how they are linked with EHDC? SDNP have consider themselves alone from the other



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

councils, but understand they have a duty to collaborate. They are going to resist the overtures to increase housing numbers.

JK asked for clarification on the Neighbourhood Priority Statements.

Chris Paterson was concerned about land banking, getting them into an NDP and then not building, which means the numbers are not met. Only 60% of developments have come to fruition that were in NDPs.

Liss had an allocation of 150, and 77 have been built on the Ashgrove (?) site. The remaining 73 haven't been built and the developers have been approached to see if they are going to proceed or not. SDNP need to take into account what sites have been built. SDNP want to deal with strategic sites, not sure what size they are referring to.

### 8. **POLICIES**

LB – done a huge amount of work on the policies, but not much to update on. Received the updated report from the planning consultant. Had a workshop to look at the details and actions to improve and finalise the policies. We did get was a list of maps that we want to put into the plan. LB meeting with Alision on Friday to work out what is needed to be done within the timeline. The plan is very detailed and technical. We need to make sure it is user friendly to be presented at our event. Feel we need to get it out before the event when the policies are ready.

### 9. **SITES**

LB – The steering group had a workshop on the sites

#### 1. Site summaries – work being completed by CF + AT

CF gave an update on the method of preparing the site summaries, and the current status of the site summaries and progress so far. The majority of the sites that have been assessed as having potential have been completed, with the remaining sites that were highlighted as green or amber in progress.

#### 2. Site engagement, and the resident meetings, and the idea of engagement with developers

LB – aiming to present to residents groups on the 18 or 19th Jan evenings. Site summaries will be presented and out for the public representatives to take a look and feedback, and then take back to the resident's group. Summarises all the assessment work done so far. Resident's groups and the SG may not agree on everything. The story of how that site came through, is at the bottom and is like an appendix. The summary is not saying the site is being allocated.

LB – some developers have made contact including for development at Land South of Liphook. Also spoken to planning consultant representing Penally Farm. They are starting to think about planning application. We want to engage with them, they seem keen to talk and include the community comments in their plans. Added in a point in



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

the timeline to have conversations with the developers, after the resident's representative workshops.

3. Discussion on how to make the decision on allocation or not.

LB – we need to decide whether or not to allocate a sites in the NDP. The 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 policy outcomes and deliver to the parishes vision then the NDP can allocate these sites in the plan.

We need to set out the questions we are going to ask decide who should answer them i.e. does the public decide whether to allocate or not, or does the SG make the decision on the Parish's behalf.

At the workshop we did a brainstorm of pros and cons. LB – allowed the public to read the presentation, and then to answer questions.

Clearly some pros – control over what is allocated and use of the allocation and can ensure get what the community wants from the policies. It can prevent speculative development, and gives the NDP more control of this. Developers can fund projects.

The risks are we can allocate a site, then EHDC can allocate another site so we end up with more development. It could delay the NDP as my understanding that there is more scrutiny, and could add months to the process. Another con is sites could be submitted before the NDP, which results in less CIL and less control. And risk of losing the whole NDP as the public are voting on the site instead of the policies.

Pros and cons of not allocating. Not a completed list, especially the cons.

LB – the purpose of an NDP is to set out a vision and policies. Allocating is something we do not need to do. No allocation means focus on the policies which is the essence of the NDP. Once in place those policies apply to all sites and to be complied with. An NDP will be completed much quicker, less time, resource and capacity of the SG. Scope to complete ahead of sites applying for planning permission, to try and obtain the full CIL funding. The NDP is about the policies.

The NDP can work with the councils to provide the data to the LPA, but con is that the LPAs then make the final decision on which sites would be best suited.

Cllr Jerrard – the policies are critical. This came up in Liss, which is wholly in the SDNP. The problem in Liss is that developers are not complying with local policies. The Ash Road developers did not comply with the design policies and the NDP, and enforcement is weak. Chris Patterson asked for liaison with the SDNP so that they can try and strengthen the policies to make them enforceable. It is a worry what is enforceable and what isn't.



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

LB – it is worrying that if the wording of the policies isn't strong enough that they may not achieve the desired effect or be enforceable.

Public – worry from the resident's group, seen as an endorsement than a standalone application. Interesting what CF said, that it is down to the wording of a policies, and where EHDC have had their hands tied with the landowner the resident's group have been having an issue with. An example is 'No external lighting will be erected in this land', lighting was erected outside the site shining into the land. EHDC were unable to enforce this as it was due to the wording of the conditions. Need to be water-tight and have teeth behind them.

### **10. COMMUNICATIONS & EVENTS**

LB & BJ met to set out an outline of the community event in March and associate market. Also proposed some questions to be asked at the event, which is all draft and open to suggestions.

The purpose of the event – is to present a draft of the B&L NDP (correct terminology), including what an NDP is, the benefits, the story of its development, a draft vision and what it is trying to achieve, i.e. the strategic objectives, policies and statements of each policy describing what it is about. The site summaries of each site put forward will also be presented.

The event will be asking residents to give their views on the vision, objectives, and policies. Feeding back to the public, at this point, their original comments.

Pros and cons of allocating sites in the NDP will be presented and at a point in the event, we will be asking about allocation. Including asking what residents like about any sites, and any missing content. By the next SG meeting, hoping to have the specific questions.

#### Marketing

BJ – will be promoting the March consultation event. It is key to get the public's views. The proposals are ideas and subject to the available budget. Challenging to get as much visibility as possible. Got to target all the demographics, and not just about social media as not everyone has access. All the promotion and marketing will guide to the website, which should have everything that is proposed to be presented at the event for those that cannot make the event. Need to engage the volunteers to leaflet drop. The Liphook community event, as a print advert, all channels needed to be used. Liphook community magazine, Posters around the square if businesses are willing. Or paid adverts could come up online, if searching for something else. Pop up stand in the LMC. Can track google analytics and also how many website views. Living room cinema willing to have a stand in their foyer. March is not that far away so need to start multi channel promotion.

Website + Facebook key – key to get the dates out



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

LB – 25th March (all day), and 22nd in the evening because cannot use 23rd in the main room.

18-19th Feb – 7:30pm is the aim (residents groups invites only)

LB – showed the update timeline.

### **11. MEETINGS WITH OUTSIDE BODIES**

LB in-advertently had a conversation with the planning consultant for Penally Farm (had been given contact as a resident). LB will record notes from the conversation. They are keen to discuss and advise they are aiming to submit an application within the next year. LB + JK organising a meeting with the LPAs.

### **12. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION**

Cllr Jerrard – stated the elephant in the room, is that if ask the public what they want, the public will want the traffic to be sorted. That is their primary concern. Cllr Jerrard heard one idea for the plan, was for a way for pedestrians and cyclists to go around the square.

LB – commented the CIL funding discussed was for a feasibility study to look at ways to improve the square and improve pedestrian and cyclist movements around the village centre. Penally Farm – said that they have answers to the traffic concerns and how to address them. We need to look to Hampshire CC transport plan, and consider moving residents away from cars to more walking and cycling, which will take decades to transition. It is challenging.

JK – do we need to invite HCC to the March event and ask them explain what is achievable. LB –yes additional workshops, to look at more focused areas, such as the environment and transport is important

DS – do the site assessments look at the traffic?

LB- In draft NDP there is a new section on spatial strategy that looks at the site in connection with the rest of the parish, distances from the centre, its walkability and cyclability. Each site summary says how the site measures up to this. So yes, this is being captured but do not have all the solutions.

LB – to community with Hayley at HCC on whether can get any funding to assist with feasibility study for the square.

Who else needs to come to the event – e.g. EHDC and SDNP, should they have a representative at the event.

Public – 2nd December, on the Liphook community page, Bloor Homes issuing leaflets. What happens about the housing numbers? CF commented that there isn't much the NDP can do about it, as it is speculative development, and likely will follow.

JK – EHDC had it as a strategic site.



## Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

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

LB – have given 2 months after the March event, to finalise the draft, then start the process of Regulation 14. Need to consult with EHDC and SDNP and update them on our current stage. May need to carry out an SEA and HRA, and/or Sustainable Assessment. Reg 16 is in EHDC hands.

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

LB – key action – a solid plan on the process on how to decide whether to allocate or not.

Complete as many site summaries as possible.

Contact HCC about CIL.

Contact EHDC and SDNP.

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

10th January is the next meeting 19:30pm

LB – ended meeting at 20:45.