

Hook Neighbourhood Plan



Minutes of the Hook Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting
Thursday, 19th October 2017 at 19.00 hrs
Hall 2, Elizabeth Hall, Raven Road, RG27 9HH

Present Martin Whittaker (Chair)

Sue Mesher
Rob Leeson (District Councillor)
Anne Atkins
Jane Bonnin (Parish Councillor)
Sandra Smith
Jane Worlock (Parish Council Chair)
Debra Davies (Parish Councillor)
Janet West (JWe) (joined the meeting at 9:30)
Christine Randall (minutes)

17.79 Welcome and apologies for absence

Apologies were received from:

John Orchard (Parish Councillor)
Angelo Arulchelvam
Mike Morris (District Councillor)

17.80 Minutes of the NPSG Meeting held on 21st September 2017

Members agreed the minutes as a true record of the meeting subject to changes agreed with correction of minor typos.

17.81 Actions from previous meetings

All complete except:

17.46 Action JB and MW to look at website news feeds. – **ongoing**

JB/MW

17.56 RL and JO to reconcile their views of the Centre - **ongoing**

RL/JO

17.62 Action RL New version of the draft project plan and schedule for agreement to be sent to members, to include meeting dates. - **ongoing**
Agenda item.

RL

17.65 At present the Masterplan is scheduled to be complete by 1st Feb 2018. This seems an extended period of time and will be questioned by JO.

Brought forward to 2nd November

17.82 RL to update the progress on the Project Plan document. Agenda item

RL

17.87 Updates to NP document Transport: Some parts already sent but RL needs to talk with JO about transport further work. Agenda

17.87 RL to pursue a map of the open spaces in Hook Parish. and produce headlines for areas of community value with justification. **Ongoing**

RL/JO

17.87 AA to find out if there is more funding available for the final titivation of the report. **Agenda item.**

17.82 Update on Hart Local Plan

RL reported that the Grove Farm (Netherhouse Copse) appeal has been allowed. This has set an awkward precedent as this will be an urban extension that undermines HDC policy and the latitude HDC believed they had with a 5year land supply in place was rejected by the Inspector.

The planning application for West of Hook is in, it is possible that the proposal will be rejected and heard on appeal. The Grove Farm appeal decision may result in this this appeal being allowed through, though if a Reg 19 LP is in place this may help to defend it.

Current HDC plan is to update the Local Plan to create a version suitable for Reg 19 consultation, that can be formally approved in early January. Reg 19 consultation is a statutory period of 6 weeks. HDCs intend to submit the Local Plan in March/April 2018.

JW briefed members on the recent consultation with the PC by the proposed developers of West of Hook.

RL reported on the recent Government Consultation on housing, the acceptance of the consultation would mean a decreased housing requirement for Hart. However, this Government paper is only a consultation, and, given that there are quite a number of Councils that have a significant increase in the housing requirement (one is quoted at an increase of 800%!), and they, of course, will be protesting very robustly, it seems uncertain whether the paper as proposed will go through with those numbers. Also, the Government is not going to agree the final numbers in time for Hart to get a Local Plan in by the end of this Council Year on 31 March 2018.

RL reported that HDC appears to have no intention to remove Murrell Green from the Local Plan. JW questioned RL as to why Winchfield is not the preferred option. RL replied that this could be due to transport issues.

RL reported that as the Grove Farm appeal was granted the extra housing numbers will relieve the NPs of the mandatory numbers.

17.83 Updates on:

SEA

MW reported that he still awaiting a response from Technical Support.

Village Centre Masterplan

MO reported on behalf of JO that the team are visiting site next week and significant progress will be made before the next meeting.

JW advised that the Old White Hart for sale - to be confirmed **Action JW**

JW

17.84 Site assessment prioritisation

MW is writing the NPSG site allocation report and will circulate for comment before the next meeting.

Assumptions:

MW and JO attended a conference on Neighbourhood Planning and were able to take advice from a Planning Inspector and other professionals present. The consensus of opinion was that if there is no Local Plan in place the NP must make assumptions based on the information available. Also planning permissions granted between publication of the Local Plan and the NP are to be subtracted from the 87 dwellings, current requirement for the NP. **Action MW to circulate MW. Action All Review document**

MW

AA asked if SHLAA 193 is to be assessed MW replied that this site was dismissed by Technical Support due to size but could be appropriate if SHLAA 210 comes forward. The problem with SHLAA 210 is that access is

via a private road. AA agreed to obtain the title to the road from the Land Registry.

Action AA to obtain title from the Land Registry.

AA

MW agreed with members the rationale for allocating the sites. Members confirmed that they agree with the methodology used.

SHL126:

Members discussed at length the site proposed by Vortal who have asked to meet with the NPSG. RL thought it might be useful to meet with the developers because the NPSG has identified a need for accommodation for older people. The developers are proposing a different and desirable concept, fundamentally different to any existing facility. This proposal could mean that older people have accommodation and support from private dwellings through to nursing home care on the same site. The concept is for private dwellings for 55+ independent living through to care home. Retirement to a flat is thought to be the last move but actually last move is often to an extra care unit and can be traumatic. A retirement village would mean that residents would not be afraid as all needs can be dealt with on site with no uprooting. This proposal would make important provision for a section of the community. The retirement village does not need to be near to the Village centre: a bus may be provided.

Members did not agree, pointing out that this land is outside the remit of the NP: if Murrell Green is not developed this site becomes a satellite community that is against the aims of the NP and the PC, and therefore should not be allocated. If Murrell Green is developed this proposal should be part of the strategic plan and should not be allocated under the NP.

Members agreed that MW reply to Vortal declining the request for a meeting.

SHL5 and SHL130:

Members discussed the possible allocation of SHL5 and SHL130

SM and SS agreed to look at producing a report that gives planning reasons why these sites should or should not be selected/prioritised. **Action SM and SS.**

SM/SS

17.85 Project Plan

RL reported that he needs further information before the plan can be completed as requested in a recent e-mail.

17.86 NP draft discussion

2.2 Is it the role of the NP to support the local plan or just to conform to it?

RL – I had wanted to make a number of positive opening points to the document. This wording can be changed, I don't see that 'support' need to be controversial, but conformance with the requirements of the Local Plan, and support for meeting the housing needs of the District, might be an alternative.

If we can deliver numbers of dwellings that are in excess of the requirements of the LP and welcomed by the residents of Hook, then I think that we should point out that we are being good citizens. It was agreed to change to "complement the Local Plan".

3.3 Should community aims be in a separate part of the doc?

RL – I think that each subject chapter should include all the relevant thoughts on that subject so that they can be read and understood as a coherent (or not) whole. Hence, the structure as drafted. I think that the community aims

will often link to the planning policies and the reasoned justification will apply to both.

MW pointed out that he and JO had attended an NP seminar where an inspector had said that community aims/non-planning policies should be in a separate section, or preferably an appendix. This was because inspectors don't concern themselves with these.

3.11 Are the Reasoned Justifications in this and other sections sufficient or do we need more?

RL – I think that all the reasoned justifications need more work, but I think that this can be done through the public consultation process. It seems to me that we need more general public input all round. believe that SM is starting work on looking back at earlier public inputs to gather further material.

However, professional support may be needed to ensure the evidence is fit for purpose.

3.14 Should Hook Centre be a geographical area round the centre, or should it include schools, community buildings etc wherever they are?

RL – I think that you all know that I am a strong advocate of the 'joined up centre' idea. If this is to be changed, then quite a lot of the content in the 'centre' section would need to be changed as well. The thinking is that the 'centre' will only be an attraction, and a greater success than it is today, if there is a symbiotic relationship between the businesses, the HVH halls and the schools (and any other attractions that we can add there in coming years).

Members agreed that the Retail hub is the centre of the commercial activities not facilities, the Masterplan is considering the retail centre, so this area will be defined as the Centre in the NP.

4.7 Do we have anything that is unique and distinctive? What do we need say to the Local Plan? Go with what we have got

RL – Environment is not my strong point. Aecom review comments are asking us to be very specific and to avoid duplicating content that is already in the Local Plan.

JWe agreed to review the environmental issues in the NP

JWe

17.86 Way forward

MW informed Members that there are two stages of consultation: the official is later in the process. We need feedback at this stage.

Members discussed the options, and if it matters how many people respond. Evidently it is more important that the NPSG illustrate and evidence that the community have been consulted.

Members agreed to host two consultations:

- Thursday 18th January at the Elizabeth Hall 5-9
- Saturday 20th January at the Community Centre 12 – 5

AA agreed to book the Halls and manage the consultation process.

Action AA to book the halls for the Site Allocation consultation and manage the consultation process.

AA

The format for the boards, flyers and possible cheese and wine will be agreed at the next meeting.

Consultancy

AA previously circulated a budget statement showing that there is £15,831 remaining in the budget for the production of a NP.

MW and JO are not sure where we go from here a package may not be available if the NPSG need consultant. MW will contact an Inspector and ask if he can come along and quote for a review of the NP prior to submission.

**Action MW will contact the Inspector used by Odiham and Rotherwick.
MW**

MW

17.87 Next meeting – Room 2, Elizabeth Hall

16th November 2017

The meeting closed at 10:00 Christine Randall