



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**

TUESDAY 14th February 2023 AT 7.30 PM

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)
Cllr Peter Curnow-Ford (PCF)

Other councillors present:
Cllr Don Jerrard

Members of the public were present (MP)

- 1. CHAIR WELCOME & INTRODUCTION**
LB confirmed recording the meeting audibly and pointed out fire exits.
LB introduced new NDP administrator Tash Hoare (TH).
- 2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
Dennis Smith
- 3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
None
- 4. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**
LB proposes to approve. Seconded by JK. All in favour.
- 5. MATTERS ARISING**
None



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

6. SITES

1. Approach to decision making –regarding whether to allocate sites in the NDP or not

Summarisation of conversation so far. 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, however, it is a longer process – with more scrutiny and we have no clear consensus in the parish.

SG do want residents to give informed views on the principles of allocation and which sites are preferred, with steering group making the final decision.

We have reached our housing number. Allocation would be above requirement of East Hants Adopted Core Strategy.

EHDC's suggests 'simple allocations within the settlement boundary policy' - prevents speculative development for 2 years.

Planning consultant advises 6-9 months extra before referendum if SG allocates.

Arising issue - planning application for some of the large sites – risk may get through before NDP in place – loss of additional CIL.

At last meeting considered options: 1. Prepare to allocate, 2. Finalise a policies only plan, 3. Review allocation options once policies only plan is in place.

Having talked to East Hants, now understand that we can review a made NDP or do a new plan at any time with funded available though Locality. Would need to go through full reg 14/16 process and referendum again.

Option 2 and 3 – not much distinction between the two. Therefore 2 options.

A: Prepare to allocate: gain community views at event – then decide to allocate or not. Pros: more site specific control. Cons: take more time, planning applications may get through before NDP in place, loose additional CIL. Or:

B: Finalise policies only plan with aspiration to consider allocation at a review or second B&L NDP. Pros: get NDP in place quicker, achieve additional CIL, can look at allocation options when SD & EH have clearer strategy. Cons: less control, though mitigation is our robust policies, design codes

LB proposes Option B: Finalise plan with policies only. Seconded by PCF. All agree.

CF: stresses that decision has not been made lightly and might still result in speculative development. Whilst we spend time deciding, decisions are being made and proposals put forward by developers.



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

DS: two distinct things, policies and allocations. Not sure we get extra control by allocating – if larger sites get permission while we're still deciding that's no good.

AT: we're supposed to be in line with local plans – with them withdrawing we're unable to find strategy that would get support from them, if we were to allocate. Frustrating for everybody – lots of effort over years. Not made easily. Benefit to community is to secure CIL contribution, to do that need to accelerate plan.

PCF: Parish Council will have to take heed of policies, EH will too. Still have option of putting design statement forward which would have same strength as allocating.

JK: strong policies directed at this community means we have taken all info on board.

PCF: E.g. if an application goes through and we have policies in place that impact on that application, the head of planning would subject that (application) to planning committee which is a full public planning hearing. We get a second chance at that point. Get in first, secure something, use that as a base point, move forward. Given East Hants not having local plan, South Downs pushing back too, the earlier we do it, at least we are secure and can always have a second review.

RR: Expresses thanks for all the colleagues round table and previously for the work they have put in. Working with AECOM, summaries etc. won't be lost – will be built into policies and design code.

JK: adding thanks to volunteers on behalf of council.

2. Feedback from Residents Group workshop on 19th January

Held meeting with Passfield group and Land South of Liphook on 19th Jan. Will finalise those site summaries and rationale regarding decision not to allocate. Will carry on with site summaries for larger areas/sites – Passfield, Penally, Land South Liphook, Land West Liphook.

Matrix will continue to represent other sites in the NDP. Will continue developing against our policies – green amber red. Will be kept in appendix of plan.

PCF: Suggests freezing the site summaries we have now. New input changes continue to be documented, associated with original summaries. If there is significant change, that change is reflected as a possible change in red amber green on summaries. When we go back, we can say we now we have new data which may change the colour. Makes life easier, don't have to wade through material. Primary and secondary change control process.



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

LB: Purpose of site summaries – kept within appendix of NDP as extra info. Can be shared with East Hants and South Downs to inform their decisions. Will enable the NDP to demonstrate the sustainability of different locations of parish for our spatial strategy policy.

3. Update on plans for developer's engagement

LB: agreement at last SG to meet with developers. Ran out of time, policies not ready and would need these for developers to say how they will deliver to them Holding off a date until policies finalised. Would anyone like to advise on process?

RR: It is because we decided not to allocate, not just because we aren't ready.

LB: Still relevant to talk to developers.

RR: Their purpose was to explain how they will be meeting each policy once published.

LB: March event – display site summaries and developers most up to date version on their plan. Is that the right thing to do now?

JK: Doesn't feel right. But if residents have had opportunities to see site summaries, landowners themselves should have right to comment too.

RR: Informal consultation, not formal – maybe we see who wants to talk in light of new info.

AT: As long as they have had adequate time to read policies they can come to talk meaningfully.

LB: Do we need a date?

RR: Let's see, given we are not allocating, if they want to.

CF: Decision was B, not allocate, with the aim that we review allocation options later. Still worth having a meeting, to explain decision, if they want to come they can. Still running side by side as appendix.

DS: Having policies fixed, we will be able to identify sites afterwards anyway.

AT: Think they will show an interest. A long game for them.

RR: Timing is tricky as we need to prepare for March event.



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

JK: Don't think we have capacity.

LB: Pause plans to meet with developers consider when policies are ready

7. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION

MP Queried where site assessments would be held. Disagreed with adding to an appendix. Suggested adding to a website is fine.

LB: This will be considered.

AT: We are taking advice on the correct procedures from a planning consultant.

RR: We will capture the work that has been done in a legal form assisted by the planning consultant.

MP2 asked if the scope of the SG was looking at both EHDC and SDNP.

LB confirmed NDP covered all parts of the parish.

MP asked what SG meant by no consensus and if all views expressed over the years have been taken into account. They considered there was a consensus at the time of the Ferrier work about 8 years ago

CF: Points out many years have passed and there are conflicting opinions with no consensus

RR: There has been no consensus in meetings recently.

MP supports the decision but suggests there is more background evidence.

LB: When NDP policies are in place this will help to inform views.

MP heard about residents group meetings and queried whether the SG had engaged with developers.

CF: The residents groups meetings were to explain how the site assessments worked. The meetings are about the site, not the developers' proposals.

PCF: There are some technicalities here – without allocation the SG won't offer an opinion on proposals. This is to avoid pre-determination.

MP asked whether policies would be finalised in time for next month's open days.



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

LB & RR: Confirmed policies would be finalised but in draft form.

AT: And the design codes.

8. POLICIES: Public viewing session

20:15: LB points out six chapter headings around room that form the basis of the NDP policy chapters – sustainable dev and housing, environment and green space, transport and movement, conserving heritage, community facilities, supporting local economy. Public to look around and write comments afterwards if they wish.

Return at 20:27.

9. NDP ADMINISTRATION

Update on CIL funding application from AT:

Meeting between AT & LB with Hayley Thorn and Ben Kennedy from Hampshire Highways. Purpose to discuss application to SDNP for CIL contributions. Based around comments and feedback from sustainability workshop, esp. movement and transport within village (Liphook primarily).

SG gave them summary of the application to include a healthy streets assessment of Liphook to identify where footways and junctions could be better. Biggest problem is the Square, but because at this stage we don't have the modelling and traffic assessment (one was done 2017 but not recently), there are a number of pieces of information missing that meant that application fell down.

They did say EH have a CIL funding app open that would accept a study application as well. Recommend we target around wayfinding, new cycling facilities, seating & green infrastructure. Very narrow focus, leave the more complex Square piece of work to EH CIL.

They suggested Hampshire CC would undertake healthy streets assessment straight away. Also would initiate traffic study – trip counters on vehicles, look at service bays in village.

PCF: Could they use ANPR to determine routing of vehicle through the village?

AT: Will ask them. They do appreciate in order to be effective it needs as much data as possible. They were very helpful in guiding best value out of application.

They also felt there are developer contributions already allocated to transport improvements. Some funds could be used to help pay for modelling. If we set up application in the right way, we can get this going. Objective is to get it designed and



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

implemented to make it safer to move and walk around Liphook as pedestrian and cyclist. If we get that right, we can help improve the traffic.

10. COMMUNICATIONS & EVENTS

LB: Looking at branding for March event. Plan to continue with previous effective NDP branding – black and pink – updating with new logo and info.

PCF: Parish councilors spent a long time designing new branding 2022. That logo, font, colour scheme should be followed.

CF: Too pedantic?

PCF: Not too pedantic. The Millennium Centre uses it too. Pink will have to go.

RR: NDP has always been known as pink and black.

JK: Agrees – NDP is separate. Mostly follow council branding but exception for pink and black.

LB: Website - TH is currently updating. Archiving old info, new logo, policies will be loaded up onto website with consultation questions.

11. MEETINGS WITH OUTSIDE BODIES

LB: Meeting with Chris Paterson, SDNP. Their current local plan is to review plans for reg 18, consultation by early 2025 where they will present their preferred options. Call for sites is part of that. They acknowledge B&L NDP put in a response to their call for sites in 2022, that info is on NDP website. It is favourable to SD area of land as far as a sustainable site for B&L.

The housing & economic development needs assessment identifies what is required for the SDNP, they aim to break it down into requirements for individual settlements. Currently SD has not set housing provision for Liphook. It is possible this may change through the LP review.

RR: Are we talking to East Hampshire as well?

JK: Yes.

12. REVIEW OF TASKS & ACTIONS & ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

Review of tasks and actions allocated.

1. SG Re-visit date to meet with developers once policies have been published
2. LB clarify with planning consultant the correct procedure for recording site assessments



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

3. AT to finalise CIL application and look at EHDC CIL
4. Draft policy summaries – Appendix 1

13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

LB: Proposing to cancel March SG meeting – March 22nd and 25th events need planning work. Next SG meeting in April.

LB – Ended meeting at 20:42.