



BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

admin@bramshottandliphookndp.uk

A confidential meeting of the NDP Steering Group took place at 8:31pm in the Main Hall, Liphook Millennium Centre, Midhurst Road, Liphook on Tuesday 10th March 2020.

EXEMPTED MINUTES

Present: Darren Ellis
Chantal Foo (VC)
Cllr Jeanette Kirby
Roger Miller

Apologies: Louise Bevan
Cllr Sumi Olson
Raine Ryland

Also in attendance: Christine Hill (Public - Working Party Member)
Eliza Margrove (NDP Administrator)
Andrew Pope (Public - Working Party Member)
Cllr Eddie Trotter (Parish Councillor)

Meeting started 20:31

CF noted that the attendees are bound by the same confidentiality rules as the other meeting. CF noted that if there are any conflicts of interest (COI) with AP and ET they would be asked to leave as standard. JK noted that the responsibility is with the attendee to remove themselves from the room regarding COIs.

DE wanted to comment on the draft exempt minutes [from the February 2020 NDP meeting].

- Third bullet point down (p5) written is 'another site', but he had said 'an additional site'.
- 003 land at Bohunt Manor (p5) fourth bullet point down, written is 'can't', but he had said 'wont'.

DE noted that exempt minutes might end up in the public domain, so should be accurate. CF noted that some NDP members don't like speaking in public, so that was the reason why some exempt meetings were held. The NDP are having difficulties getting things done because they are worried about discussions being in the public domain, that can lead to confusion instead of a definitive decision.

The Steering Group (SG) discussed that where the Parish Council rules that the exempt minutes should be made publicly available, the SG should be notified in advance. The SG discussed the reasons why the council may feel that for transparency, exempt minutes should be put into the public domain.

RM suggested that the full and frank discussions are held in exempt meetings, and then the decisions should be in the public domain. His preference is that the exempt minutes are not published and that they continue to hold private meetings.

DE noted that the council have exempt meetings where there is a personnel issue, and that the NDP are having them because they do not wish for developers to have the information. DE noted that he is not uncomfortable about anything that he has stated in meetings, but isn't comfortable that third parties are deciding to publish exempt minutes.

JK noted the NDP SG is an advisory group for the Parish Council (PC), and the SG minutes were checked and found not to contain confidential information. DE replied that it would be useful for the PC to tell SG members in advance if they feel that the SG exempt sessions will be published. This would be a courtesy.

CH suggested that at the end of the confidential session, it may be agreed with all SG members whether or not they feel that the nature of the meeting was confidential, and whether minutes should be exempt or not.

ET noted that the minutes should explain why they are having a confidential session. CF replied that exempt sessions are always on the agenda. JK clarified that the [current] exempt session was held in order to discuss the exempt minutes.

JK noted the hour long talk with DB in the previous meeting, stating that DB had been asked if he had any experience in dual parish overlapping – and that he did not. JK would like this to be put back into the minutes. He was only giving his opinion, but he has not done NDP cross boundary work. CF was happy to add these to the minutes.

CF noted David Brocklebank (DB) made the point that you have to demonstrate that the other sites are not as good as the site in the national park. DE noted that if we put a site into our plan, both authorities will look at our plan and agree or disagree, and throw it out if they disagree.

The SG discussed how much of DB's talk should be in the minutes, and how much of their responses.

RM proposed, JK seconded. DE and CF objected.

DE stated that the minutes should either be full or completely reduced to a statement.

RM suggested that DB's key points be made, while noting that he was inexperienced. DE replied that it would be demeaning to say that DB is inexperienced. JK noted that it looks like the NDP were taking advice from the developer. CF suggested that this be a compromise, that DB has good experience, that he does not have cross boundary experience.

CF suggested EM add in a bullet point about the CIL, negotiations with community benefits, and that the NDP could to go over and above housing allocation with reserve sites to make sure the parish grows sustainable solutions 20-30 years.

CF noted the problems with the minutes, and the lack of decisions, and the lack of clarity. CF noted that there is nothing factually incorrect in them, but there are a lot of contractions and this would be edited by her so that the PC understand what happened at the meeting. CH replied that this editing sounded like a summary of the meeting, and not a description of the meeting. CF replied that her editing was to produce a clear summary at they go along in the order that they occur.

RM proposed, JK seconded with those amendments. SG unanimously approved the minutes.

Actions – Eliza to add these into the minutes. Subject to those amendments they don't need to be checked by the SG.

The meeting ended at 21:11

Signed:

Date:

Print:

Chair