



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

A MEETING OF THE BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN STEERING GROUP WAS HELD AT THE LIPHOOK MILLENNIUM CENTRE

TUESDAY 9th May 2023 AT 7.30 PM

PRESENT:

Louise Bevan (LB) – Chair
Cllr Jeanette Kirby (JK)
Barbara Jacobsen (BJ)
David Sawyer (DS)
Andrew Thornhill (AT)
Raine Ryland (RR) – arrival 7.40
Cllr Peter Curnow-Ford (PCF)

Other councillors present:
Cllr Don Jerrard

1. CHAIR WELCOME & INTRODUCTION

LB opened meeting at 7.30pm.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Chantal Foo, Dennis Smith

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

4. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

LB proposes to approve. Seconded by PCF. All in favour.

5. MATTERS ARISING

- PCF: Has there been any external feedback since last mtg on the decision not to allocate sites?
LB: Not directly – however in the consultation response to follow later in mtg.
- LB discussed evidence and how to present it with planning consultant Alison Eardley following questions in last SG – the Evidence Pack will be separate from the NDP itself.
- AT has finalised EHDC CIL application.

6. NDP ADMINISTRATION

NDP Steering Group meetings:



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

- LB: Now we have finished main consultation we will be scaling back public facing meetings as required, in line with work needed. To be reviewed on monthly basis, public to keep checking website. June meeting is likely.
- SG member Chantal (VC) is taking temporary sabbatical to focus on family and business matters. She wants to be clear this is not due to disagreement or direction of NDP, she is still very supportive but wants to take time to focus on family & business.

Locality application:

- Planning consult Alison Eardley's contract has ended for year 22/23. We need to re-apply to Locality for 23/24. Applications still not open yet – current delay. Expected to open this week.

(RR arrival 7.40)

7. COMMUNICATIONS & EVENTS

The March Public Consultation:

Attendance

- 173 members of public attended the consultations in March.
- There were 257 pieces of individual policy feedback – those were not unique individuals but comments across all policies.
- Highest response was for Chapter 1 Sustainable Dev and Housing, then Chapter 3 Safe and Active Travel.
- 3 developers responded and East Hants responded.
- Vast majority = positive with plenty of constructive comments and small number of disagreements.
- RR: Pleased with number of responses for Biodiversity & Green Spaces, showing good engagement with this important policy.

SG session to review changes needed for all 21 policies, based on the feedback given at the events. See Appendix 1 for slide deck presented alongside.

AT presenting Chapter 1: Sustainable Development & Housing

BL1: Location of Developments (slide 5)

- Support for walkable neighbourhood. Support for brownfield sites. Agreement on setting assessment criteria. Range of views on location – anti chicken-farm, some support for Bohunt (though SDNP), some preference for near to A3.
- In response to conversations around chicken farm – be clearer about strategic link over infrastructure in plan, to enable more direct connections for travel. Through policy you should be able to put requirements on development.



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

- RR: BL10 also talks about linking to the neighbourhood – link these policies together, and identify the links on the map (to ask Alison).
- AT: Walkable neighbourhood concept also goes some way to suggesting it, but be clearer.
- PCF: latest consultation from SDNP – what if they were to develop in SDNP, what would be the criteria? Parish Council has already responded. The temperature within the SDNP is different this year to last year. Support development where it could make sense, so what is the criteria?
- To do: Identify strategic links over infrastructure in plan → this takes the walkable neighbourhood concept but pushes it further. Link together with BL10/11, and identify the strategic links on a map if possible.

BL2: Meeting local housing needs (slide 6)

- AT: How to put local needs first/help those in the community to remain?
- JK: Petersfield tried to make new housing focus on local people first but very hard to enforce.
- PCF: can local authorities/HA's do it?
- AT: yes, but that's only a portion of the product. Need to ask Alison how enforceable and how to word.
- To do: If possible, add criteria to put local needs first so that the current community remains in Parish. If this is too difficult to enforce, policy still to highlight importance of people who are already connected to the community.

BL3: Character and design of development (slide 7)

- AT: the policy combined with the Design Code covers the points raised.

BL4: Climate change and design (slide 8)

- AT: Can the wording in policy be strengthened to achieve higher standards? To ask Alison about viability assessments and how they can be used.

JK presenting Chapter 2: Biodiverse Environment and Green Spaces

BL5: Green and blue infrastructure and delivering biodiversity net gain (slide 10)

- Some confusion on what net gain means and we can't do much different to what Natural England do.
- Residents impressed that so many green spaces were identified – this links to the green corridors that people want.
- To do: link policy with BL16 (allotments & community growing spaces & green corridors) as consultation showed enthusiasm for active community participation in this area.

BL6: Managing the environmental impact of development (slide 11)

- No disagreements



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

BL7: Local Green Spaces (slide 12)

- No disagreements

BL8 Protection of locally significant views (slide 13)

- Following developer response (commissioned their own work to suggest SG view wasn't significant) need to double check this policy is robust.

BL9 Dark skies (slide 14)

- No disagreements

RR presenting Chapter 3: Safe and Active Travel

BL10: Improving walking, cycling and equestrian opportunities (slide 16)

- Total focus on Square. Everyone has their own solution, but this plan can't do most of it e.g. redevelopment of Square.
- Agreement on signage and lighting which is more within our remit.
- Implications: clear not just about the Square but all opportunities Parish-wide. Not just about moving vehicles from A to B, but improving active transport.
- AT: part of one CIL application is seeking new modelling including pedestrians.
- RR: this is what developers should be looking at too. It's an issue for everyone, not just cars. Example is Peak Day Centre – those not in cars have to cross the car park to get to it.
- To do: Be clearer policy is not just about the Square but all opportunities Parish-wide. Not just about moving vehicles from A to B, but improving all active transport.

BL11: Mitigating vehicular impacts at junctions and pinch points (slide 17)

- Disagreements came where people believed policy wouldn't do anything.
- Suggestion to put something in policy about car parking? People upset e.g. no space in Midhurst Rd for Peak Centre or Green Dragon as everyone using cinema
- LB: do you put another car park in to encourage more cars? Is it a bad thing to be discouraged from driving and to encourage others e.g. bike racks
- RR: good point. For policy – make other concrete suggestions like bike racks.
- LB: whilst doing this we need to be gathering ideas for CIL projects too.
- RR: people pointing out that we are picking from EHDC/national, hard not to when we do have to be in line. But maybe we could have more pinch points on maps to make it more specific, clearly recognising Square being nightmare at peak times, and Midhurst railway bridge.
- LB: could go with strategic links on map.
- PCF: add Headley Rd avenue and schools, and Longmoor. Second map – heatmap along with the pinch points would be helpful.
- To do: Specific suggestions like back racks. Plus locate the pinch points on a map. This clearly shows we are paying attention to local area. Same map as strategic links from BL1? Heatmap to be added?



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

BL12: Publicly available electric vehicle charging (slide 18)

- EV charging surprisingly confrontational, not everyone agrees with it. Can we make it clearer that this is PART of active travel, not solution?
- PCF: agree to adapt this policy, we don't know where the EV situation is going.
- RR: not enough on public transport. This is because we can't do much about it, but can we do anything?
LB: could we have map for desired public transport routes, linking hospitals, station etc.? Link to heat map etc., all related.
- All agreed on map with key routes and services, linking to BL18.
- DS: can we link up with other councils?
- PCF: yes possibly. Link to Haslemere hospital for example.
- NH: Is this a significant change to the policy and its wording?
- RR: change name to greener vehicle options? This moves EV down the priority list but still there.
- PCF: Or targeted local transport? Do we have any experts we could talk to? E.g. find cost for a bus – driver, vehicle etc., find out if that is sustainable?
- RR: can talk to Bohunt which is exactly that and always loss making. Some private schools do too.
- JK: Age Concern have their bus too.
- To do: rename and slightly re-direct policy. Talk about public transport/targeted local transport here too. Add to map key routes and services inc. hospitals, station.

DS presenting Chapter 4: Preserved Heritage

BL13: Conserving the heritage of the parish (slide 20)

- Tricky to highlight newer areas – if we start doing some of them maybe all will want it.
- RR: Roger hasn't done his list of heritage assets. He probably hasn't got the time to do it.
- LB: to pursue

BL14: Sunken lanes (slide 21)

- No disagreements. Still need to update map with some more – maps finishing session needed.
- JK: East Hants will have it already. Ask them.

BL15: Enhancing Liphook's shop frontages and design

- Agreement to put Station Road in this policy.

BJ presenting Chapter 5: Connected and Supported Communities

BL16: Allotments and community growing space (slide 24)

- No disagreements, to link up with BL5 Green Spaces if possible.

BL17: Enhancing cultural sporting and recreational facilities (slide 25)

- List of projects for CIL would help with the disagreement that policy isn't constructive enough.



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

BL18: Providing adequate health and education services (slide 26)

- Also comes back to list of projects to be more specific about tapping into grants etc.
- LB: make it clear at beginning of NDP what we can and can't do?
- RR: we already do, people will still say it.
- PCF: is there anything pro-active we can put in? new health centre – should not just support one GP but should be linked to community, to PC, to funding sources, to range of services.
- RR: tricky – developers can suggest sites but NHS might not want them. Centre around social prescribing and easy access?
- PCF: Or an onboard pharmacy. Ways around it.
- RR: our policy can be more specific on health. Worth talking to Alison about how to be pro-active within our limits.

LB presenting Chapter 6: Enhanced and Circular Economy

- To do: ask Alison about demonstrating 'circular' in policy, not just in the title.

BL19: Enhancing opportunities for local employment (slide 28)

- To ask Alison about wording policy to support existing cluster areas of business

BL20: Enhancing the role and setting of Liphook village centre (slide 29)

- Policy to mention Station Rd/Newtown

BL21: Promoting and sustaining rural tourism (slide 30)

- Give clarity that this policy isn't necessarily about building new things, it's signposting etc., which is more within the remit of NDP and won't increase traffic.

Developers feedback (slide 31)

- LB: 3 developer responses received. All highlighting East Hants lack of plan and our new status as 'Tier 1' settlement in East Hants – large settlement. Casting doubt on housing numbers as reason for not allocating – all suggested reconsidering.
- PCF: Suggestion from one developer to ask EHDC & SDNP for indicative housing requirement number could be good.
- JK: They didn't want to give us a number last time.
- DS: Development should be led by local people.
- RR: Should be, but isn't, so we need to work with it.
- PCF: At the district level – 2 offices. Might change in two weeks after changing office. 2024 for EHDC, 2025 for SDNP.
- RR: Regarding developers' disagreement with one of our locally protected views: policy is not to stop development where there is a view, just to take it into account.
- LB: We cannot commit to an early review as they have asked. We need to be clear the NDP is not an interim.
- RR: Has everyone seen the developer's full comments as well as the summary?
- NH: Not yet. Will share with the SG.



Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

8. REVIEW AGAINST THE TIMELINE (slide 32)

- LB: NDP is likely to get approval from PC in June rather than May. In order to get to Reg 14 we need to complete a SEA, or we need document to show we don't need one. At the moment our assessment says we do, but that was a while back before we decided about allocating.
- RR: did we have one before?
- LB: we had scoping document only.
- LB: Alison needs to know if there are any major changes to plan (based on tonight's meeting) then will update plan, send that and previous scoping doc off. 5 weeks needed to review and come back with Y/N. No – ready to go into Reg 14. Yes – that will hold things up. Because scoping doc is quite comprehensive Alison thinks it would be easier for her to do, rather than apply for AECOM.
- LB: we need Design Codes, maps, table of projects, developer contributions, and SEA. Then meeting with PC for them to approve the plan when they have seen the final doc – hopefully June, maybe July.
- BJ: drafted public update but now wondering if we need to know more about next steps.
- LB: yes to hold off for now, lots more public participation to be done for Reg 16.

9. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION

- RE Policy 21 and access from B&L to SDNP – SDNP had a meeting where leaflets were provided with walking routes from different areas – one was B&L. This showed access which they weren't aware of before. Comes back to signposting.
- Public access to NDP meetings – Liss' NDP had 4 years doing plan, all meetings were advertised and public attendance in that time was zero so B&L has done well. BUT hoping for continued good public access to meetings now.

10. TASKS, ACTIONS & ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

- NH to send policy changes based on this evening's meeting to Alison.
- LB to send SEA details off next week after draft NDP is updated. To meet with Parish Council to approve NDP when this is done, hopefully June.
- Another mapping session to be done before next SG meeting.
- SG to begin planning for Reg 14.

11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Next formal SG meeting likely to be 13/06/2023 but need to confirm – will update NDP website.

Meeting closed – 21.30.