MINUTES OF THE LONGSTOCK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (NHP) STEERING GROUP MEETING – HELD 7PM, 3rd FEBRUARY 2021, VIA ZOOM.

In attendance:

Steering Committee: 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) - Representing Leckford Estate David Smith (DS)- Resident Liz Bourne (LB) – Plan-et Becky Hopkinson (BH) – Plan-et

Apologies

Beccy Soper (BS)- Vice Chairman Aly Warner (AW) – Secretary Sharon Fortune (SF) - Resident

Ser	Subject	Action
1.	Welcome and Introduction	
	AF opened the meeting and welcomed the committee.	
2.	Acceptance of Minutes	
	The minutes of the meeting from 6 th January 21 were agreed and adopted.	
	Proposed by SW seconded SB.	
3.	Longstock Parish Council - Update	
	SW advised that Longstock Parish Council (LPC) had expressed an interest in	
	developing a small parcel of land at the Chalk Pit.	
	The land was owned by LPC and had remained unused for a number of	
	decades. As the Chalk Pit sat outside of the defined settlement boundary, the	
	land would only be suitable for low-cost affordable housing.	
	Councillors were giving consideration as to whether the land would be suitable to provide a very small number of affordable homes (perhaps 3 or 4 dwellings)	
	which would belong in perpetuity to the parish council. SW advised that	
	discussions were still very much in their infancy, but she felt this information	
	was useful for the SG to be aware of.	
4.	Finance / Grant -update	
	AF advised that the group were coming to the end of the financial year for	
	their Locality grant. AF stated that due to the coronavirus, the group had been	
	unable to carry out a large proportion of anticipated tasks, so much of the	
	funding would need to be returned to Locality. As per last year, the group	
	would then need to reapply for funding for FY 21-22.	

 AF stated that an invoice of £468 (inc vat) had been received from Plan-et. This had been approved and passed for payment on 1st February 21. Housing Needs Assessment (HNA): As per last month's meeting, AF stated that as suspected, incorrect housing figures had been used by AECOM when creating a first draft HNA. AF had followed this up with AECOM and had been advised that the figures used, had been obtained from the social housing landlord via TVBC. AF stated that due to the geography of Longstock, the social housing landlord hadn't recognised that Roman Road formed part of Longstock parish, so the social housing numbers had inadvertently been missed off. For the same reasons it had also become apparent that properties in Houghton Road and Roman Road had been missed from the total number of dwellings within the parish. TVBC had revised both sets of figures and passed them to AECOM. AF went on to advise that following discussions at last month's meeting, LB had provided AECOM with a more focussed explanation of Longstock's property history. LB had highlighted that Version 1 of the HNA made reference to the high number of mortgage free / rent free properties wire directly linked to employment on each estate, rather than being second homes or holiday cottages as intermated. LB suggested that the group may wish to approach TVBC to find out more about affordable housing was brought forward in the future, this needed to be more clearly defined i.e. the use of rural exception sites. AF stated that as a result of these updates, AECOM had amended Version 1 of the HNA and provided Version 2. The updated copy had been circulated to group members on 28th January 21. AF advised that although the group had hoped to discuss the Version 2 in more detail at February's meeting, many group members had struggled to review this lengthy document prior to meeting. AF also commented that key members of the group had sent apologi
 5. Housing Needs Assessment (HNA): As per last month's meeting, AF stated that as suspected, incorrect housing figures had been used by AECOM when creating a first draft HNA. AF had followed this up with AECOM and had been advised that the figures used, had been obtained from the social housing landlord via TVBC. AF stated that due to the geography of Longstock, the social housing landlord hadn't recognised that Roman Road formed part of Longstock parish, so the social housing numbers had inadvertently been missed off. For the same reasons it had also become apparent that properties in Houghton Road and Roman Road had been missed from the total number of dwellings within the parish. TVBC had revised both sets of figures and passed them to AECOM. AF went on to advise that following discussions at last month's meeting, LB had provided AECOM with a more focussed explanation of Longstock's property history. LB had highlighted that Version 1 of the HNA made reference to the high number of mortgage free / rent free properties within the village. The text didn't make it clear that the vast majority of these properties belonging to farming estates in the area. These properties were directly linked to employment on each estate, rather than being second homes or holiday cottages as intermated. LB suggested that the group may wish to approach TVBC to find out more about affordable housing was brought forward in the future, this needed to be more clearly defined i.e. the use of rural exception sites. AF stated that as a result of these updates, AECOM had amended Version 1 of the HNA and provided Version 2. The updated copy had been circulated to group members on 28th January 21. AF advised that although the group had hoped to discuss the Version 2 in more detail at February's meeting, many group members had struggled to review this lengthy document prior to meeting. AF also commented that key members of the group had sent apologies, so the review would be held over un
 As per last month's meeting, AF stated that as suspected, incorrect housing figures had been used by AECOM when creating a first draft HNA. AF had followed this up with AECOM and had been advised that the figures used, had been obtained from the social housing landlord via TVBC. AF stated that due to the geography of Longstock, the social housing landlord hadn't recognised that Roman Road formed part of longstock parish, so the social housing numbers had inadvertently been missed off. For the same reasons it had also become apparent that properties in Houghton Road and Roman Road had been missed from the total number of dwellings within the parish. TVBC had revised both sets of figures and passed them to AECOM. AF went on to advise that following discussions at last month's meeting, LB had provided AECOM with a more focussed explanation of Longstock's property history. LB had highlighted that Version 1 of the HNA made reference to the high number of mortgage free / rent free properties within the village. The text didn't make it clear that the vast majority of these properties belonging to farming estates in the area. These properties were directly linked to employment on each estate, rather than being second homes or holiday cottages as intermated. LB suggested that the group may wish to approach TVBC to find out more about affordable housing was brought forward in the future, this needed to be more clearly defined i.e. the use of rural exception sites. AF stated that as a result of these updates, AECOM had amended Version 1 of the HNA and provided Version 2. The updated copy had been circulated to group members on 28th January 21. AF advised that although the group had hoped to discuss the Version 2 in more detail at February's meeting, many group members had struggled to review this lengthy document prior to meeting. AF also commented that key members of the group had sent apologies, so the review would be held over until next month.
 used, had been obtained from the social housing landlord via TVBC. AF stated that due to the geography of Longstock, the social housing landlord hadn't recognised that Roman Road formed part of Longstock parish, so the social housing numbers had inadvertently been missed off. For the same reasons it had also become apparent that properties in Houghton Road and Roman Road had been missed from the total number of dwellings within the parish. TVBC had revised both sets of figures and passed them to AECOM. AF went on to advise that following discussions at last month's meeting, LB had provided AECOM with a more focussed explanation of Longstock's property history. LB had highlighted that Version 1 of the HNA made reference to the high number of mortgage free / rent free properties within the village. The text didn't make it clear that the vast majority of these properties belonging to farming estates in the area. These properties were directly linked to employment on each estate, rather than being second homes or holiday cottages as intermated. LB suggested that the group may wish to approach TVBC to find out more about affordable housing was brought forward in the future, this needed to be more clearly defined i.e. the use of rural exception sites. AF stated that as a result of these updates, AECOM had amended Version 1 of the HNA and provided Version 2. The updated copy had been circulated to group members on 28th January 21. AF advised that although the group had hoped to discuss the Version 2 in more detail at February's meeting, many group members had struggled to review this lengthy document prior to meeting. AF also commented that key members of the group had sent apologies, so the review would be held over until next month.
 had provided AECOM with a more focussed explanation of Longstock's property history. LB had highlighted that Version 1 of the HNA made reference to the high number of mortgage free / rent free properties within the village. The text didn't make it clear that the vast majority of these properties belonging to farming estates in the area. These properties were directly linked to employment on each estate, rather than being second homes or holiday cottages as intermated. LB suggested that the group may wish to approach TVBC to find out more about affordable housing products, as references in the assessment seemed to misunderstand the rural nature of Longstock. As this would obviously impact on how affordable housing was brought forward in the future, this needed to be more clearly defined i.e. the use of rural exception sites. AF stated that as a result of these updates, AECOM had amended Version 1 of the HNA and provided Version 2. The updated copy had been circulated to group members on 28th January 21. AF advised that although the group had hoped to discuss the Version 2 in more detail at February's meeting, many group members had struggled to review this lengthy document prior to meeting. AF also commented that key members of the group had sent apologies, so the review would be held over until next month. 6. Housing Needs Survey (HNS)
 about affordable housing products, as references in the assessment seemed to misunderstand the rural nature of Longstock. As this would obviously impact on how affordable housing was brought forward in the future, this needed to be more clearly defined i.e. the use of rural exception sites. AF stated that as a result of these updates, AECOM had amended Version 1 of the HNA and provided Version 2. The updated copy had been circulated to group members on 28th January 21. AF advised that although the group had hoped to discuss the Version 2 in more detail at February's meeting, many group members had struggled to review this lengthy document prior to meeting. AF also commented that key members of the group had sent apologies, so the review would be held over until next month. Housing Needs Survey (HNS)
 the HNA and provided Version 2. The updated copy had been circulated to group members on 28th January 21. AF advised that although the group had hoped to discuss the Version 2 in more detail at February's meeting, many group members had struggled to review this lengthy document prior to meeting. AF also commented that key members of the group had sent apologies, so the review would be held over until next month. Housing Needs Survey (HNS)
 more detail at February's meeting, many group members had struggled to review this lengthy document prior to meeting. AF also commented that key members of the group had sent apologies, so the review would be held over until next month. 6. Housing Needs Survey (HNS)
AF confirmed that TVBC were still analysing collected data and compiling Longstock's Housing Needs Survey. A recent update suggested that a first draft would be released week commencing 8 th February 21.
7. Sub Group Updates a. Village Design Statement (VDS) - SB /DS.

	Update carried over to next meeting.	
	b. Open Spaces - SW /AW.	
	Update carried over to next meeting.	
	c. Footpaths/Verges/Hedges - AF	
	Update carried over to next meeting.	
	d . Traffic - AF	
	AF advised that plans to complete a traffic survey were on hold due to lockdown.	
	e. Listed Dwellings/ Buildings/ Gardens SB / DS	
	Update carried over to next meeting.	
	f. Historic Heritage Assets /Sites - SB/ DS	
	Update carried over to next meeting.	
	g. SSSI's -SB/DS	
	Update carried over to next meeting.	
	h. Village and Countryside Landscape features - DB	
	Update carried over to next meeting.	
	i. Media - SW / AW	
	Update carried over to next meeting.	
8.	Community Engagement Event - COVID 19 compliant delivery	
	Due to COVID 19, face to face delivery is on hold until further notice.	
9.	AOB	
	LB stressed again that the group needed to complete a further review of the	
	V&O's.	All
	LB and BH also highlighted that the group may wish to start tentatively looking	
	at site allocations. This element needed to consider the NHP's 30-year	
	lifecycle. LB stated that the group should include land already identified in	
	TVBC's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA – see Northern	
DONM	Test Valley (NTV) page 43) and any potential sites, such as the Chalk Pit. Wednesday 3 rd March 2021, Via Zoom	All