



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

admin@bramshottandliphookndp.uk

A meeting of the NDP Steering Group took place remotely at 7.30 pm on Tuesday 18th August 2020

MINUTES

Present:

Chantal Foo (Acting Chair)
Cllr Jeanette Kirby (Parish Council)
Darren Ellis
Raine Ryland
Louise Bevan

Also present:

Cllr Don Jerrard (Parish Council)
Cllr Eddie Trotter (Parish Council)
Christine Hill (working party member)
1 member of the public

1. Chairman's announcements

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and advised that the meeting was being recorded by audio and visual for the purpose of the minutes.

2. Declarations of Interest

None declared

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 22 July 2020

An amendment to the wording to provide clarification regarding EHDC's large site allocations was proposed by CF. It was noted that the names of members of the public attending the meeting do not need to be recorded and that Cllr Jerrard had attended the meeting. An amendment to the reference to site LIP011 in the February exempt minutes was requested but it was pointed out that approved minutes cannot be retrospectively amended. It was therefore noted that LIP011 is at Longmoor Road and not at Haslemere Road.

Three members of the SG queried the wording attributed to them in the minutes. It was proposed that the minutes be approved with the above amendments but also subject to a check of the recording to ensure there are no substantive changes to what was said by individuals.

Proposed RR, seconded JK. 4 in favour; one abstention due to non attendance at the meeting.

4. Update on the NDP

The Chair noted that there was an amendment to the AECOM report which has now been circulated to all SG members. AECOM had stated that there were 12 sites that were large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings therefore also being required to provide affordable housing but in fact there were only 10 sites. The number of sites that could provide residential or mixed use was also updated. The revised report will be put on the NDP website.



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

admin@bramshottandliphookndp.uk

5. Draft NDP Structure and Format Revisions

CF and LB had reviewed the draft NDP and looked into whether there should be any format revisions. Health and wellbeing will be incorporated throughout the report. It is necessary to decide whether to have the site allocations at the beginning of the report or whether they follow the policies. CF outlined the proposed structure and confirmed that this will be circulated to the SG for comment. RR suggested that Climate Change and Sustainability, although part of Public Services, should also be a thread running through the plan. There was a general discussion on how this can be made personal to the local community by such features as alternative methods of providing SUDS (other than large ponds) appropriate to local areas, tree planting, size of front gardens, electric charging points etc. RR emphasised that local communities are empowered to do something at local level. CF pointed out that different options could be applied to suit the character of local areas.

6. Parish wide survey

CF suggested that a parish wide survey should not be carried out as previously. CF outlined that the prime importance now was to assess the sites, and although a parish wide survey is useful, it would delay the current work if carried out as it was time consuming and would require detailed analysis. CF suggested that this survey could be done in a different way as the group also needed to find out how Covid had affected people's lives such as working from home, shopping locally, not travelling so far/often and walking around. Questions around this subject could be specific to any land put forward. RR referred to the surveys carried out during the Parish Plan which were more general and suggested that questions could be designed to assess whether sites still met the earlier findings, as well as being more 'concrete' rather than vague.

DE queried whether there should be a question to ask the community if they were willing to take more housing to achieve community benefits. CF responded that this is not necessary as the next part of the consultation is where the public could see the community benefits offered for the sites put forward. JK commented that the NDP had been implicit during previous consultations in asking the community what benefits they were looking for and that the public understood that housing brought these forward. RR pointed out that this was the opportunity to bring the concept of community benefits and housing together so the public were aware of the bigger picture. CF proposed that the public survey be part of the next public consultation feedback mechanism, to be available online and at the event to cover all areas of the parish. 4 in agreement, one abstention.

DE queried the survey sent out to Bramshott residents. JK confirmed that the original survey had been devised by a Bramshott resident and the second survey was similar but no sites had been referred to. It had previously been agreed that the results of this survey would not be used.

7. Land uses required based on community needs

(a) Additional Requirements to be added to the Assessment Matrix

CF outlined that the original assessment matrix had been formulated by RM and DE and included all sites submitted to both EHDC and the SDNPA during their independent Call for Sites. That matrix had provided further details such as physical walking distance to facilities, access to recreation areas, train



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

admin@bramshottandliphookndp.uk

stations, schools etc. JK suggested that for sports facilities the matrix should include the area required for facilities; whether noisy sports could be accommodated; impact by lighting; car parking requirements and whether there could be multiple use parking; the topography of the site (as a hilly site would not be suitable); drainage (badly drained land would also be unsuitable); any landscape impact (and not necessarily related to the SDNP) but whether the community felt that there would be a landscape impact; where the access to the site would be and if it also had suitable pedestrian, cycle and disabled access. RR felt that there should also be consideration for access for employment (whether inside or outside the parish) and reference to the A3 corridor should also be included; whether a site could have mixed use was also a key consideration. This also linked to recent changes and whether there was an increased requirement to work from home, and also what facilities are required for those who do not have suitable space at home. CF commented that the wording on this subject needed further thought. RR requested there be a section on environmental benefits. It was considered that there may need for sub-categories to incorporate these, which could potentially be site specific.

CF informed the group about the new use classes proposed by the government. These basically incorporate retail, light industrial and employment uses plus some leisure and recreation into one Class E which then provides the opportunity for change of use without the requirement for planning permission. This is unless there is an Article 4 direction placed on an area by the LPA, and there are several in this parish. The SG would have to bear this in mind when allocating land for a specific use. CF suggested that this will also need to be included in the matrix.

CF confirmed that the suggestions will be written up and circulated in draft form for the SG to consider for the next meeting.

(b) Key community requirements for sites.

Sports facilities has already been raised, the other key requirements were employment, particularly flexible spaces and start-ups, and also more rural industries as opposed to large units, especially the smaller ones such as those that had been in the Business Enterprise Centre. There is a need to consider whether there is a need for further allotments, as this will also contribute to health and wellbeing. Allotments would need to be on productive ground to fulfil their purpose, so shaded and badly drained land would be inappropriate. The parish council has already split up existing allotments into half and quarter plots to meet demand of those on the waiting list. This has not been picked up by a particular working party but it has been mentioned in our evidence base.

(c) To agree methods and actions to gather further information to support potential land use allocations

JK will investigate the number and size of existing allotment plots and how many are now on the waiting list. This may come under sports and recreation wp.

JK commented that the number of people on the list for self-build plots was 553 district wide and 139 in Liphook, as shown on EHDC website and the HEDNA identified the number of affordable housing



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

admin@bramshottandliphookndp.uk

required across the district. There are about 4,500 affordable houses needed across the district during the plan period. The SDNP have a particular requirement for affordable housing, and these may be able to be retained in perpetuity. This makes it easier to calculate the local housing need especially as there is a shortfall in supply of affordable housing on many sites. It could be possible to set up a Land Trust to enable easier management of small quantities of affordable housing units. It would be useful to detail how these work to demonstrate and explain this to the community to show that affordable housing can be accommodated. Many people can afford to pay open market rent which may be the same amount in rent as they would for a mortgage but as house prices in the local area are above average many people still find it difficult to get on the housing ladder. The SG will need to investigate the size of the open market properties and whether there were ways to make new houses more affordable.

8. Next Meeting

This will be at 7.30 pm on Tuesday 15th September 2020. This will still be an online Zoom meeting.

9. Exempt Session

CF read out the statement excluding members of the press and public from the exempt session. Proposed CF, seconded JK all in agreements. CF reminded those remaining that disclosure of interests still applied and any discussions must remain as confidential.