



**BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK NDP DEVELOPERS MEETING WAS HELD AT
LIPHOOK MILLENIUM CENTRE
TUESDAY 19 September 2023 @ 7-9pm**

ATTENDEES

NDP Steering Group

Louise Bevan (LB) - Chair
Cllr Jeanette Kirby (JK) - Chair B&L Parish Council
Alison Eardley (AE) - independent planning consultant
Raine Ryland (RR)
David Sawyer (DW)
Barbara Jacobsen (BJ)
Andrew Thornhill (AT)
Cllr Peter Curnow-Ford (PCF)

Site Promotors / Developers:

Andrew Munton, (AM) Reside Developments, Headley Road dev. (Presenter)
Fay Goodson, Reside Developments
John Brindley, (JB) CMYK Planning Passfield Mill (Presenter)
Ryan Johnson, (RJ) Turley Planning Consultants, Harrow Estates, Westfield (Presenter)
Steve Neal, (SN) Harrow Estates, Westfield

Members of the public were present (MP)

1. CHAIR WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

LB opened the meet and welcomed site promotors and residents. Steering group members and site promotors introduced themselves.

LB explained the purpose of the meeting: Regulation 14 (formal public consultation) closing on 22 September 2023. We have invited developers and site promotors to provide their comments and feedback on the NDP Plan Policies and Design codes.

LB confirmed that NDP decided in February 2023 not to allocate sites in the Plan and won't be commenting on any developer's proposals.

LB presented the B&LNDP journey which started in 2017 with a community visioning and design forum. There have been subsequent community events and consultation in Feb 2019 and March 2023.

The challenges for the parish have remained the same over this period including, location of development, traffic issues, need for affordable homes for local people, protecting the environment and infrastructure requirements.



During this time EHDC have withdrawn their Local Plan, and we expect a new Local Plan in autumn 2025.

The NDP aims to address all key issues and we are now progressing towards Referendum June 2024.

LB presented Policies focused on some of the key issues - addressing location of development & traffic issues in a sustainable way including BL10, BL11, BL12.

LB presented Map of 10minute walkable Liphook: Ideally development will be within this area with strategic walking and cycling links where required to give good access to Liphook center.

LB referred the audience to the B&LNDP website where the full Draft Plan, Policies and Design Codes can be read and community can leave their feedback on the Plan.

LB opened floor for initial comments & questions

Q If all new development needs to be within 10minute walkable neighborhood - what about sites within the SDNP? Do you support any development in the Parish? There aren't any sites.

A: RR: We are not saying we will only support development within that area. Each site will be looked at across all Policy areas. The vision is for development to be within the walkable neighbourhood – in an ideal world.

Q / Comment: SDNP undertook a call for sites and are currently assessing/producing site assessment to be completed in winter 2023. They are considering sites in the Park. It is a commonly held misconception that the SDNP is off limits. That is not true. SDNP considering allocating.

Q / Comment: The only real space is in SDNP.

A: LB: We are not allocating sites. This is a question for SDNP.

LB closed general questions for site promoters presentations

JOHN BRINDLEY, (JB) CMYK

Presentation of Land South of Passfield Mill, Passfield Industrial Estate: We are looking at this Plan differently from other areas as we not proposing a housing development but to extend business opportunities at existing industrial employment site.



We support BL19 as it proposes supporting employment areas and allowing for expansion. The site we have been promoting is not in Liphook, it is an industrial estate which is remote from other areas, adjacent to existing industrial area.

A further comment is that all NDP Policies relate to housing, not a lot on non-housing developments. It would be good to have policies to guide developments that are not housing focused.

JB Showed Map of existing industrial area. Proposal provides part time bus services in the area around East Hants. JB Presented concept of flexible space, rent office space, meeting facilities. Could provide medical or nursery space, care home, seed bed of startup units, small workshops from single to double story. Would allow companies to expansion as well as 3 larger yard builder merchants with more outdoor space. AMK want to build new offices, and propose on site cafe. include TPO, trees. Create large areas of open space, biodiversity net gain, (10%) meets Policy.

Re Transport Policy: difficult but site is already an existing destination and will work to make it more sustainable. EVC e.t.c.

ANDREW MUNTON (AM) RESIDE DEVELOPMENTS

Presentation of Headley Road: Submitted a Planning Application in 2015. PC were generally supportive, but application was refused. NDP policy is for smaller modest sized housing & custom builds which we support.

Regarding Policy BL6 - while we very much support fruit trees, however Policy is very prescriptive, and we would recommend bit more about community gardens, people don't want trees. We will continue to promote the site to local planners.

STEVE NEAL (SN) & RYAN JOHNSON (RJ) - TURLEY PLANNING CONSULTANTS / HARROW ESTATES

Presentation of Westlands Park: We have engaged with plan as drafted which shows significant unmet housing needs for elderly, affordable housing, infrastructure needs & GP surgery. Both upper local planning authorities EHDC and SDNP tiers are considering plans. There is a missed opportunity for Council to set an indicative housing number for Parish to manages expectations.

Implication of Policy BL1 should be referred to SDNP local and EHDC local plans.

Figure 9 - red circle, good concept. We encourage discussion to fund and deliver infrastructure, address congestion, GP surgery, link road etc. Urged audience to go and look at Westlands Park website. Road, and various benefits. We will continue engaging with all parties. Suggested this is an Interim NDP that would last until local plans are progressed and then it will be reviewed.



LB clarified the NDP is a not 'interim'.

Q: Confusion over percentage of affordable housing types.

Q; In BL2 Is that for 75% affordable rented to 25% Shared ownership Market.

A (AE) Yes, it is under-pinned by the work the group commissioned on local housing needs. A Local Housing Needs Assessment was prepared for the parish by consultants (AECOM), which follows the endorsed government methodology to determine likely housing needs (size, type, tenure, affordability) over the lifespan of the neighbourhood development plan. This work has demonstrated that there is a need locally for affordable housing to be provided with a larger proportion being for rental as opposed to discounted homes to buy. Of those discounted homes to buy, the Government require the first 25% of these dwellings to be "First homes", which is a new Government initiative. We will review how we describe the evidenced housing need in the Plan.

Q: What about 25% older people v first time buyers.

Q : How are you going to enforce housing for local people?

A: (AE) There are limitations to what we can enforce. Lots of NDPs have tried to prioritise affordable homes for local people but thrown out – largely because housing waiting lists are not part of the planning system, rather they are dealt with by the district housing team – anyone across the district can join that list if they require assistance with housing and they can be housed across the district (they can give a preference as to where).

The Government recommends that 25% of affordable homes to buy (i.e. discounted market homes) are to be developed "First Homes". This is a new scheme that, for the first time, enables planning authorities the option to require an uplift on the discount applied to those homes (which is normally 15%, but the scheme allows up to 50% where viable). The scheme also enables policy makers to direct that First Homes element to those with a local parish connection and or key workers. The Local Housing Needs Assessment suggests that this product would be helpful in the parish including a requirement for additional uplifts to the discount and prioritization of local people. This is currently included in the Plan, however EHDC suggest that they do not support the First Homes product generally. This will need some discussion.

Q: What about Density of housing?

A: (AE) Density is considered in the Plan within the Design Guide and is based on mirroring prevailing densities as far as possible. There is always a balance to be made though between reducing densities (which can raise house prices) and uplifting densities (which can help to reduce the amount of greenfield land being



developed). Ultimately the policy and Design Guidance will be used on a case by case basis to assist the Planning Committee in making decisions. EHDC has been commenting on our Plan and we have to conform to their Design guidelines and development has to be in keeping with local character of Liphook which can help steer Developers.

Q: did you come up with 10 min walkable neighbourhood? Can we have more details e.g. public rights of way - 10, 15, 20 mins walking? If a site meets criteria & is greenfield sites - do these not need safeguarding? On Plan can we see 20 min walk, 2-3 mins by bike.

A: (LB) Yes, could show more detail.

A: (RR) This came from national guidance on walkable neighbourhoods

(AT) 10 mins to walk. Policy and map, doesn't prevent or exclude

Q: Explanation suggest policy is looking to encourage reduced need for cars?

A: (AE) To clarify the location of development policy not supporting greenfield sites per se, although there are very few brownfield sites in the parish; those that exist are already within the built up area boundary, so the principle for development is established. The policy seeks to focus development to the most sustainable locations to cut down on car use (among other things). It doesn't exclude further-away developments, but we are very cautious to avoid piecemeal developments and need to balance issues of sustainability. The policy would not stop a strategic development taking place, for instance via the emerging Local Plan(s), but it does seek to provide criteria against which such sites should be determined and delivered.

Q: Preserved Heritage Policy. EHDC has 5 Sites of Special Housing Character within the Parish which are not mentioned.

A: LB - very good point. Please feed all your comments into the online consultation process via our B&LNDP website.

Q: First slide on Main Challenges – states NDP to Fix: my understanding of how NDP works, out of all those things I believe you can have no influence on 7 of these challenges - You cannot address challenges.

A: (RR) These are key issues that the community has been telling us about since 2017.

A: (LB) We can address some of it, within the limits of what NDPs can do.



RR: there is useful list of other elected people who you can lobby. We should remove the words on slide. Local people use it as a vehicle through which to communicate. NDP gives voice, what can we do, we don't

LB: There is an error on the slide. It should read and I have changed slide to say Main Challenges in the Parish

Q How will we know if it is achieved? In the Conservation area we need wider pavements e.g. The Square, but it cannot happen. Take the new building by the old Cobblers, the development did not widen pavements.

A: (AE) if we had Plan in place, we could have had an influence but in absence of a made NDP you are reliant on out of date EHDC plan.

Q: There are 6 roads but only link to half the Parish

A: (AE) That is a legacy of what we are working with. There are challenges to making changes in retrospect, but having the NDP will help up to influence future development. The Government has a net zero target and we can use our Plan to contribute to delivering that, for instance promoting walking and cycling for local journeys. Ultimately we must work within the planning framework – and few Highways Authorities (e.g. HCC) are looking to support major new road schemes now.

Comment / Q: Well done on progress of the Plan which has been years in making. I know that NDPs are both a sword and shield to defend against what is not wanted. EHDC does not have a 5-year plan. Does Village know we are not getting the protection of a shield? May be half a shield.

A: (AE) The challenge we face is that the parish is split over two local authorities (EHDC and SDNPA). Both authorities are reviewing their Local Plans. Any sites delivered in the SDNPA part of the Parish will not contribute to the housing numbers in the EHDC part of the parish. The sites in the EHDC part of the parish are strategic in nature. The NPPF does allow NDPs to allocate larger sites, but the sites in question are very large and potentially outside the scope of the NDP. See para 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework: *“Neighbourhood planning groups should also give particular consideration to the opportunities for allocating small and medium-sized sites (of a size consistent with paragraph 69a) suitable for housing in their area”*, where paragraph 69s says in terms of size: *“land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved”*.

The local planning authorities, by way of their strategic nature, are also well-placed to want to assess such large sites against other strategic sites across the region as a whole.



Additionally, there has been a lack of support generally from the community about sites – noting that the SDNPA site would not contribute to EHDC's housing numbers.

In Liphook we are very well protected on an environmental basis with two local plans emerging. National level expecting national government to make changes to national planning - housing numbers with 2 years owing, authorities waiting for other housing numbers.

We can have an early review of the Plan-in in the meantime, working on an out of date local plan – which is dictating what developments happen. That's why having NDP in place is so important.

Q: We must have advocacy/transparency

A: RR: it is a compromise. Better to have half a shield than no shield. Not a full shield but better to have something, better protected against speculation.

A: LB - need clear communication to explain the context of decisions, right place to be at the moment.

Q: Alison you have done many Plans, have you come across split planning authorities – where the main planning authorities has to find all housing? The most ideal site, if we must develop, is in SDNP. How will NDP help us get the right development? How are we going to get over this? We will keep going east. We should force issue with SDNP and EHDC.

A: (AE) SDNP and EHDC both working on new local plans. All sites have to be assessed against standard criteria. It is a robust procedure, comparing other sites at regional level. At SDNP, some areas that have cross overs have done Plans, but the SDNPA are encouraging strategic sites to be considered at the strategic level. We have examples of NDPs that have allocated sites for housing, but this does not prevent the local plan allocating additional strategic sites and there is nothing you can do to stop this. We are not trying to stop development, but make it sustainable.

Q: Two planning authorities not looking at Liphook as a whole. How is NDP bringing those two authorities together?

A: RR: we can't solve that.

Q: I represent Residents Group for Westlands Park. No impact on land supply without liaison with both SDNP and EHDC. We must ask for a coordinated response to Plan from both SDNP and EHDC. Otherwise we will just get major development in both SDNP and EHDC and east of Liphook

A: (AE) That is outside scope of NDP. Take it up with your MP.



Q: Liphook is good for development with A3 and station. Tourism : why SDNP was not interested in developing access to Park? Directions are not clear. Not welcoming.

Q: 1941 Act and enjoy the public access to national parks.

A: (LB) Yes Policy BL21 makes reference to access to South Downs.

A: (AE) The policy is about supporting Rural Tourism and explicitly references Liphook as being Gateway to National Park. There is an associated project to work with partners, EHDC and SDNP on this, including signage and improved access where this can be undertaken sensitively.

A: (RR) signage improvement is in Policy.

Q: Ryan Johnson (RJ) Harrow Estates. We request residents to make comments to. There are many benefits of the Westlands Park proposal: providing a gateway to SDNP, a reception centre and car park.

Q: What is the feedback online?

A: (LB) : We will be looking at feedback on Friday 22 September. Please come along to Steering Group meetings which take place on second Tuesday for every month

A: (AE) : Deadline midnight 22/9 once all representations have been received from all statutory bodies: Natural and Historic England, SG to look at all feedback and how to address representations and will require amendments. We will wait for all feedback first.

Q: Surprising to know planning authority SDNP is a large national park with hundreds of parishes involved: 51 and nearest one is Rowlands Castle is split in same way. Finished plan was made last week.

Q: You are looking at Liphook in very rosy terms. Reality is different. Sandbags on Midhurst, blocked sewers, need to address infrastructure. It is a major issue, new housing developments plugging 100 more houses into already blocked drains is not sustainable.

A: (LB) Need to add and reiterate at local plan and managed outside NDP.

A: (RR) Protection is already there, but we need to do better job of communicating it in Plan. We haven't covered, but can state where it is in the legislation.



A: (AE) It is other authorities'/organisation's responsibility to deliver that, e.g. GPs and surgeries we can't influence. There is a policy in the Local Plan (EHDC) that seeks to ensure that all development is brought forward with the necessary supporting infrastructure (developer contributions help to deliver this).

Q/Comment: We need to be specific of the local issues. Need more wording in Plan.

Q: Andrew Munton (AM) In terms of Vision, Is the NDP the right thing for you at this time? Just Do a Design Guide?

A: (AE) NDP is not just about allocating site. It is about influencing the look and feel of development, The SDNPA has signalled that they will not be giving the same level of weight in planning to village design statements. They recommend that Design Guides prepared and underpinned by NDP policy will assist in bringing that weight up. Even speculative developments still must adhere to Policies.

FINAL SUMMARY (LB)

We will pull together all the findings and prepare requirements for Reg 16 to be done by EHDC which will start in November 2023. We will meet up with EHDC and Parish Council to approve this next phase with Referendum planned for June 2024.

Submission document goes to EHDC who will manage further consultation (regulation 16) which is another opportunity for the community give feedback. We won't receive this feedback. EHDC will collate and give to Examiner.

(AE) EHDC will gather all representations, all information, documentations and history and appoint (with input from the Parish Council) an independent Examiner who will undertake Examination.

Legislation requires referendum, there is no minimum turnout and a simple majority is required to pass the NDP.

Q: People are bored. It has taken 6 years - will anyone be bothered to vote?

A: (AE) By going through process we hope to get more people involved and it is often a higher turnout than local elections.

LB checked there were no further comments, thanked everyone and brought meeting to an end.