MINUTES OF THE LONGSTOCK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (NHP) STEERING GROUP COMMITTEE MEETING – HELD 7 PM, WEDNESDAY 1st JULY 2020, VIA ZOOM

In Attendance:

Angie Filippa (AF) Chairman

Sophie Walters (SW) Resident and Chair of Longstock Parish Council

David Burnfield (DB) Resident and Longstock Parish Councillor

Simon Borthwick (SB) Representative Leckford Estate

Liz Bourne (LB) Plan-et Becky Hopkinson (BH) Plan-et

Apologies:

Alison Warner (AW) Secretary
Beccy Soper (BS) Vice Chairman
David Smith (DS) Resident

_	Subject	Action
Ser		
1.	Welcome and Introductions	
	AF opened the meeting and welcomed the committee.	
2.	Acceptance of Note The notes taken from the Zoom catch-up on the 3 rd Jun 20 were agreed and adopted. Proposed by SW and seconded by DB.	
3.	Longstock Parish Council – update	
	SW advised that the last invoice presented by Plan-et had been approved and that payment would be finalised by 2 Jul 20, and forwarded by cheque to LB.	
4.	Finance / Grant – update AF advised that she had completed the initial expression of interest form with Locality which had subsequently been approved. A link to the application had been received. The Locality grant application had been completed with the exception of a quotation for the next phase of work from Plan-et. LB confirmed that a quote was being prepared and that it would be with us shortly. Once the quotation was received, AF advised she would submit the application for this FY's funding. BH advised that grant funding had increased from £9000 per plan to £10,000.	AF
	AF advised LB / BH that the SG had agreed that they would like to complete a housing needs survey. The results would be used to assist with establishing the numbers, types and tenures of properties required in Longstock over the life span of the NHP. BH advised that the SG could apply for a further technical support grant through Locality which would be specifically for this purpose. AF has taken an action to apply for a technical support grant. LB stated that if AF came across any difficulties in applying for the grant, Plan-et would be happy to assist in an advisory capacity.	AF

5.	Housing Needs Survey (HNS) Following on from previous discussions, the SG asked Plan-et for advice on the format / process behind a Housing Needs Survey. SB recommended approaching LPC in order to get a resolution and their support to move the HNS forward. AF to approach the Parish Clerk and ask for the HNS to be listed as an agenda item for the parish council meeting on 6 th July 20. BH advised that once the technical support grant had been approved, Locality would arrange for the HNS to be completed in isolation. The SG wouldn't have any input into the contents or questions contained within the survey so that it remained completely impartial. The SG would then receive a report with the findings from the survey. By completing a survey in this	AF
	support to move the HNS forward. AF to approach the Parish Clerk and ask for the HNS to be listed as an agenda item for the parish council meeting on 6 th July 20. BH advised that once the technical support grant had been approved, Locality would arrange for the HNS to be completed in isolation. The SG wouldn't have any input into the contents or questions contained within the survey so that it remained completely impartial. The SG would then receive	AF
	Locality would arrange for the HNS to be completed in isolation. The SG wouldn't have any input into the contents or questions contained within the survey so that it remained completely impartial. The SG would then receive	
	way the SG would be assured of receiving a completely independent report.	
6.	Community Engagement Events Due to Covid 19 restrictions, the two community engagement events scheduled for April 20 had been postponed. AF advised that as these events were essential to the NHP process, the SG had provisionally booked new provisional dates;	
	26th and 27th September with the 24 th and 25th October as a reserve	
	AF asked LB and BH if they could hold these dates free in their diaries. LB advised that she was free for the September dates but had a prior engagement for October.	
	SW also advised that Sarah Hughes from TVBC should be contacted and asked to put a placeholder in her diary. AF to action.	AF
	As AW wasn't present, it was unclear whether bookings for the village hall had been made. AF felt certain this was in hand, but advised she would mention it to Cllr Musters (as she holds the village hall booking diary) at the next parish council meeting.	AF
	AF stated that most of the plans from the April community engagement events would simply be carried forward into the Autumn events however, it was noted that the revised dates would be subject to further relaxation of the Covid 19 rules so the SG would continue to monitor the government guidelines on a regular basis.	
7.	Sub Groups LB advised that although sub groups were an important part of the NHP process, the SG's priority was to complete their draft vision and objectives. LB appreciated that due to the lockdown this may be proving difficult.	
	LB stated that the SG needed to look at the NHP's vision and objectives in the longer term;	

- The vision should provide guidance as to what the community wanted Longstock to look like by the end of the plan.
- The objectives would provide the way in which the vision could be achieved.
- The vision and objectives would then inform the policy contained within the plan, which would give guidance on how to get there.

LB advised that Plan-et had an infographic to depict this. BH advised she would forward this to the SG.

BH

LB stated that another important area to consider was Longstock's current Village Design Statement (VDS). SB advised that he and DS had already undertaken an initial review of the VDS. They had identified a number of areas which needed minor adjustments to bring the VDS up to date. Both SB and DS felt that these changes could be addressed through an addendum. LB stated that an addendum to the VDS would be fine as long as the changes weren't too significant. If the changes were too great then the amendments would need to be approved by the document owner (LPC).

LB advised that the contents of the VDS needed to tread a very fine line. The VDS shouldn't to be too prescriptive, conversely it also shouldn't be so ambiguous that it left scope for inappropriate development.

SW stated that Longstock's VDS had been adopted by TVBC and was used as a supplementary planning document. SW gave the example of a statement within the VDS which described Longstock as 'diverse'. This had led to very modern development (which sat in amongst more traditional buildings) being granted planning permission at borough level. This had caused concern that the village could end up with a hap hazard street scene.

LB recommended splitting the VDS into zones to attempt to make it more manageable.

SB advised that he would speak with DS to move the VDS forward. Track changes could initially be used to identify updates. LB advised that Planet would be happy to review the revised VDS once SB and DS had completed their initial evaluation.

SB/DS

8. Any Other Business

SW highlighted that as a SG it was our responsibility to ensure that the community were aware that the NHP covered more than just development. The SG needed to ensure that the many diverse topics covered by the NHP were all seen as being equally important. Elements such as protecting green spaces, improving footpaths, traffic calming and ensuring that the village thrived would all be considered during the planning process. The SG agreed that they were keen to promote these topics too.

SW gave an example of the lack of verges in many parts of the village. Although the width of roads throughout the village made putting in pavements difficult, perhaps there were other ways of improving the current situation. LB advised that this was certainly something that could be considered as a community aspiration.

DONM	Wednesday 12 th August 2020, Longstock Village Hall / Via Zoom - TBA	
	NHP. Traffic calming (priority to oncoming traffic) had also been another consideration. After discussions, the SG agreed that traffic / verges and pavements should be listed as a separate agenda item at the next SG meeting. AF to add to the draft agenda for August.	AF
	BH stated that in other parishes, solutions such as the painting white lines on the highway to create a faux pavements had been identified within their	