

SHERFIELD ON LODDON PARISH COUNCIL



NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN COMMITTEE

Minutes of Neighbourhood Plan meeting held on 20th February 2014

Present - John Darker (Chairman), Alan Ball, Ivan Gosden, Sandy Johnston, Natalie Larner, Kym Greener, Bryan Jenkins, Steve Levin, Peta Alvares, Bruce Jones, Ian Wilson, Peter Lansley, Howard Perkins, Oliver Bartrum, Muriel Wooden, Mary O'Connor, Adrian Burt, Eleanor Burt, Kathleen Gaiger and Peter Hayes (Minutes).

Planning Aid: Phil Turner; Pam Moore.

1. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Tony Soane, Sally Hennessey and Bruce Batting.

2. **Introductions**

JD welcomed guest speaker Phil Turner, supported by Pam Moore.

3. **Presentation by Phil Turner**

Phil introduced himself as representing Planning Aid, now retired. He used a powerpoint which concentrated on several issues, especially related to site assessment.

- Sherfield Neighbourhood Area: need to have dialogue with neighbouring parishes, eg Bramley, Stratfield Saye, eg with regard to transport issues (cycleway from Bramley);
- Process overview: develop an overall vision for SoL; consult with all residents, including teenagers and non-residents who work there; have dialogue with all (possible) landowners, all together or separately or both. JD indicated that the preferred option for the steering group would be to hold minuted meetings with landowners. In an East Sussex parish, the school, County Showground and the National Trust had worked together with the NP team; create a set of objectives, prioritise them and see if they will fit into the NP; draft policies using '*Development will be permitted provided that...*'; policies can relate to traffic and highways issues; check with BDBC if draft plan acceptable; go to examination, and finally, referendum (51% in favour will get the Plan 'made');
- Meeting the basic conditions: BDBC say 'all policies are strategic'; Pre-Submission Local Plan (8/13) identified two 'strategic gaps': Basingstoke/Chineham & Bramley/Sherfield. This includes MOD land to the W. of Sherfield: not likely to be suited to development, but serves as a green area;
- Site assessment methodology/criteria: look at all tracts of land; keep full documentation/audit trail; for teenagers and future generations identify needs for social housing via a local housing needs assessment (conducted by Community Action Hampshire) - this helps with the question: 'How many additional dwellings do we need?'
- Site assessments: 2 options: use your own template or that of BDBC. Key questions: Is (the site) suitable/available/deliverable?



SHERFIELD ON LODDON PARISH COUNCIL

Steps: draw up longlist; check what BDBC have done; field surveys with clipboards; surveyors' instruments not needed but cameras are; notify landlords if viewing site from a highway or public path.

Record the basics: check with BDBC on any existing permissions; brownfield OK, unless contaminated.

Strategic fit: include any policies related to traveller sites; consider Local Plan designations eg Redlands/SS3.7/Bramley Parish; need Sustainability Appraisal from outset. Since the publication of the draft Local Plan there had been new developments eg Kennel Farm; Kiln Farm – these should be noted in the Plan.

Visiting the site: current/possible future usage; 'not imposing on certain views'; what's 'next door'?; loss of privacy?

Suitability/Availability/Deliverability: consider flood plain; biodiversity landscape; green infrastructure; Landscape Character Area (HCC gives free guidance); BDBC – Landscape Capacity Study (2010). Constraints would include NT land (note area adjacent to SoL – Vyne estate).

Look at phasing any possible development.

A number of points arose in relation to SL's question: 'How many additional dwellings do we need?' PT: Look at SHLAA; take views of younger/older people and families; consider 'exception sites' (social housing outside the settlement boundary); self-build plots on small pockets of land; look at the demography 20 years on.

JD asked if a consultant would be required to survey environmental features. PT: This would depend on the detail in BDBC's evidence base.

JD thanked PT for his informative presentation.

4. Minutes of the last meeting (16/01/14)

The Minutes were accepted as providing a correct record of the meeting.

5. Matters arising from the Minutes

SL said that there was no written record of Taylor's Farm being the official name for the Croudace development. IG said that this had been verbally agreed at a meeting with BDBC 4/5 years ago. JD suggested that SL take the matter up with Martin Bierman and Elaine Still who were at the meeting.

PA said that she had attended the Open Day at Sherfield Park Community Centre, although at the time of the last meeting she had not indicated her availability. Names of committee members attending both Open Days were not recorded in the signing-in book.

6. Declaration of pecuniary interest

IG declared his pecuniary interest as a landowner.

7. Evaluation of Open Days

JD said that these had been universally well-received. NL added that they were well-publicised, including door-to-door visits and with every business informed.

Information from the display boards would be uploaded to the NP area of the website with a link to the online questionnaire. B Jen confirmed that the hard copy and electronic versions of the questionnaire would go live from 1st March.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON PARISH COUNCIL

PL queried the status of the questionnaire saying that 'new things are coming out'; he was concerned about interpretation of the data from Q 2 a). JD said there would be future questionnaires, but PL thought there could be 'fatigue' with these. B Jen. indicated that further public sessions would also yield feedback from the community and that discussion with local people was iterative.

SL asked for more copies of the SWOT leaflets.

PH said that Open Day feedback had been summarised and would be sent out to those attending who had not received these documents.

There was an extended discussion on presenting two of the displayed maps on the website: one showing 'opportunities for' the other 'threats to' development.

OB asked how these sites had been identified, saying that landowners would have their own views. KGr thought that the sites could come as a shock to landowners.

IG responded that a sub-group of the committee had put up a number of sites 'for discussion' (he was a landowner himself). He indicated that the 'opportunities' sites were already in the public domain.

OB commented that a small group had decided that one set of sites represented 'opportunity', the other sites being 'threats'. JD asked for a committee view on placing/naming these maps.

AB thought that the maps should be presented as for the Open Days. KG felt that their presence gets people involved as well as better informed.

It was decided that the two maps would be presented and that KG and AB would draft the careful wording to accompany them. This would be circulated around the working group.

8. Next steps

Questionnaire responses (March); analysis (April); reporting to APM (9th May)

Site assessment policy: JD expressed the view that this should be handled very carefully. It would be planned for at the next meeting and include dealing with landowners.

Planning for APM: next meeting.

Date of next meeting: Thursday 20th March at 7.30 pm.