

Hook Neighbourhood Plan



Minutes of the Hook Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting Thursday, 16 March 2017 at 19.30 hrs Hall 2, Elizabeth Hall, Raven Road, RG27 9HH

Present Jane Worlock (Parish Council Chair)
Debra Davies (Parish Councillor)
John Orchard (Parish Councillor)
Martin Whittaker (Chair)
Anne Atkins
Sue Mesher
Sandra Smith
Brian Birchfield (District Councillor)

David Carlisle (AECOM) – technical support

17.06 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from:

Jane Bonnin (Parish Councillor)
Rob Leeson (District Councillor)
Diana Whittaker (Secretary)
Janet West (JWe)
Mike Morris (District Councillor)

17.07 Minutes of the NPSG Meeting held on 19 January 2017

The minutes of the previous meeting were not available for agreement, MW advised that there were no actions or salient points that need to be brought forward to this meeting.

17.08 Introduction from David Carlisle (DC)

DC has been appointed to provide technical support the Steering Group.

DC informed Members that his role is to provide expertise on Neighbourhood Plans and Local Plans and is working with Local and Unitary Authorities. DC has seen NPs through to success at referendum.

DC explained that the Department for Communities and Local Government are making technical packages of assistance available to unblock delays in the NP process. There are more support packages available to set the group up for Site Assessment and Strategic Environment Assessments.

The Department for Communities and Local Government will give priority to NP Groups that undertake site assessment and if there is a 3yr land supply in place the NP will take precedence.

There may be some clarity to be gained from the emerging Local Plan, the current allocation for Hook being 90 units to be allocated by the NP and the Strategic proposal at Murrell Green.

Site selection is critical to the success of the NP.

17.09 Update on Local Plan

BB informed the meeting that Cabinet has agreed the draft LP, HDC expect to begin the Regulation 18 process in March (when some of the detail is provided by East Hants DC) and consultation with residents is expected in May. It is possible, however, that this process could be delayed if there is a change in the political leadership at HDC following the AGM in May. If this happens the NP could be delayed until March 2018 and the new homes bonus may be lost. If Murrell Green does not go ahead West of Hook will be selected this being the only urban extension available.

DC responded that the numbers in the LP could go down given the commitments in the pipeline (3385 as of February) including Grove Farm (at appeal) but a further requirement could be received from Surrey Heath under the duty to co-operate.

17.10 Brownfield Development and SANG

17.10.1 JO explained that some of the sites on the business park are not considered suitable for residential dwellings by HPC and had previously asked HDC to invoke Article 4 so that proposals that would currently be permitted development need planning permissions. HDC resisted this request which was not at the time of concern to HPC as the only available SANG was under HPC control.

The rules on SANG are now changing constantly and HPC cannot have confidence that they will be able to resist undesirable development.

Action: District Councillor Burchfield to pursue the request made by Hook PC for an Article 4 direction on the Business Park at Hook. BB

17.10.2 DC informed the meeting that there have been some changes to SANG in that it may be possible to use SANG contributions to enhance existing open space – such as Hartletts Park - to make this more attractive to dog walkers. DC agreed to consult with their in-house expert on SANG for innovative solutions to lack of SANG capacity.

Action: DC to check for best practice SANG examples where suitable space is reaching capacity around a settlement DC

17.11 Site Assessment

DC explained that site assessment could include sites such as the business park: if a planning application has not come forward any site can be selected by the NP process. It may be possible to form a comprehensive plan with several landowners involved. This would be a timing issue, the NP would need to come forward before a planning application, it may be possible to agree with landowners that the NP is the vehicle for their development. The NP Group need to look to the future horizon some 15 years hence and the possibility that more than 90 dwellings are allocated in a controlled way by the NP.

Members were urged to not to underestimate the power of lines on a plan; if the NPSG and subsequently the residents agree to allocate

land for development via the NP this is a strong negotiation position with developers.

DC urged the meeting to begin a call for sites, this will enable a proper due process for site selection. Suggestions included publication on the website, advertisements in local press and contact letters to landowners and planning consultants who may be known by HPC or HDC. DC agreed to forward a template for the call for sites letter.

The meeting discussed the process for call for sites and agreed that HPC will send out the letters (as they are responsible for the submission of the NP) and the NP Group will meet with developers to assess the proposals. Concern was expressed regarding funding, DC agreed to investigate the possibility of further funding from Locality.

Action: DC to check eligibility for further grant funding for groups seeking allocations (in addition to technical support) DC

Action: DC agreed to share Call For Sites templates DC

17.12 Murrell Green

MW asked the meeting whether, in view of the complexity introduced by the possible 1800 houses in Murrell Green, it might be sensible to exclude it from the NP. Alternatively, should it be kept in so that, for example, the Design Statement would apply?

BB suggested that, as Murrell Green is a Strategic Site, the NP should not be involved in this process. There will be a masterplan for the site with a committee formed to progress the development. It may be possible to try to include HPC and the NPSG.

DC suggested that as Strategic Policy will always trump a NP that the group concentrate on positive suggestions for example the green infrastructure, public footpaths and the link to the existing community at Hook.

The meeting agreed that they may not be able to influence the development but that the NPSG need to look at the interface with the existing community. Parking was suggested as a concern given that the new high speed train may be operating from Hook station. There are already problems with parking on residential streets and this may exacerbate the situation even though there is a suggestion that the car park at the station will be improved by an additional storey.

DC confirmed that the NP can include an Infrastructure Schedule and this could include cycle parking and safe cycle routes and this would be a statutory planning document. A prospectus could be produced and used in negotiations with prospective developers.

17.13 Structure of NP

DC advised that the NP should be in a simple format: Introduction, Vision and Objectives, Land Use (this includes planning polices) Delivery and Community Projects.

There is a template DC agreed to provide the template and transfer his suggested draft plan into the template.

Action: DC offered to transfer draft plan into AECOM plan template (including delivery chapter and projects/infrastructure table) DC

17.14 CIL

If CIL comes in and the NP is in place 25% will be passed to HPC. HPC will then be able to consult on the use of CIL using the schedule.

17.15 Resident and Business Surveys

Members were unclear whether the results from the original surveys were achievable in an NP. DC explained that an NP cannot include a requirement on Statutory Bodies such as BT who are only required to provide a unit ready for connection and the Water authority who need only agree the developers' treatment for sewage.

Action DC: DC kindly agreed to look at the results of consultations and the items that have been excluded from the scope of the NP to see if they are proper to the NP. DC

17.16 Project Plan

JW asked if there could be a project plan produced and Members agreed that this is now possible and required.

Action DC: Provide an indication on timeframes for call for sites, site assessment, SEA, Regulation 14 consultation and preparations for submission – to inform new plan programme. DC

Members agreed that they would accept responsibility for sections of the programme and take ownership of their part of the project. If Members do not respond in a timely manner this part of the programme will be deleted and not, therefore included in the NP.

17.05 Next meetings – Room 2, Elizabeth Hall

20 April 2017

18 May 2017

15 June 2017

The meeting closed at 9.50 p.m.