

**MINUTES OF THE LONGSTOCK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (NHP) STEERING GROUP
COMMITTEE MEETING – HELD 7 PM, 2nd OCTOBER 2019, LONGSTOCK VILLAGE HALL**

In attendance:

Steering Committee:

Angie Filippa (AF) – Chairman

Becky Soper (BS) – Vice Chairman

Alison Warner (AW) - Secretary

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

David Burnfield (DB) - Resident and Longstock Parish Councillor

David Smith (DS) - Resident

Simon Borthwick (SB) - Representative Leckford Estate

Liz Bourne (LB) - Plan-et (consultant)

Members of the Community: 3

Apologies:

There were no apologies of absences

Ser	Subject	Action
1.	Welcome and Introductions AF opened the meeting and welcomed committee members and attendees from the local community.	
2.	Acceptance of Minutes The minutes from the meeting on the 29th August were agreed. Proposed by SW, seconded by DS.	
3.	Longstock Parish Council -NHP designation Update from TVBC SW advised that TVBC were happy with Longstock’s application for designation and that they have confirmed accepted of Longstock’s application. Sarah Hughes of TVBC will be attending LPC’s meeting next week to address the PC. LB asked if LPC has applied for its NHP grant yet (as claims cannot be made retrospectively). SW advised the Longstock’s grant application was in progress, but not yet complete. LB advised she was happy to advise if required. SW stated that she will ask Sarah Hughes of TVBC to contact LB.	SW
4	Update from Village Fete Engagement DB and AW advised that the Neighbourhood Planning stall at the Longstock village fete had been well received. BS stated that they had handed out sweets, leaflets and stickers (containing the Longstock NHP logo) to raise awareness. AW advised that a broad spectrum of ages expressed interest, although not many people were interested in completing the SWOT forms. AF has taken completed SWOT forms for analysis. Further committee discussions took place regarding the use of SWOT forms to	All

	<p>engage with Longstock residents on a more formal footing i.e. leaflet dropping / door knocking. DB asked what percentage of responses the committee should be aiming to achieve when circulating questionnaires? LB advised it can be as little as 3% but on average around the 30% mark would be deemed as acceptable. AW suggested that in order to achieve the best results, house to house canvassing may be best. Committee members agreed. SW suggested approaching LPC to get an up to date electoral list. This would ensure that all households within the NHP designated area would be contacted.</p> <p>LB suggested passing completed responses to Plan-et for collation. Plan-et could then analyse responses to ensure NHP targets accurately reflected the wishes of the community.</p> <p>e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Type and size of developments - Preservation of green spaces - Effects of development on infrastructure <p>DS asked if Longstock's Village Design Statement (VDS) should be used as a starting point? LB advised that the Longstock VDS in its entirety could become an appendix of the NHP. The contents of the Local Plan could be expanded upon but conversely, items that are not in the Local Plan could be explored and incorporated. Plan-et would look to weave the objectives of the community into the plan and in addition to previously identified SHELAA sites (Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment), the community could also nominate additional sites.</p> <p>SW stated that residents had commented on the quality of verges / lack of verges in the village. SW asked if the NHP could be used to address this? LB advised that once the NHP was adopted, 25% of CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) would come to the PC which could be used for such projects. SB explained the policies of CIL in more detail.</p>	SW
5.	<p>Affordable Housing Grant</p> <p>LB provided outline details of a new grant that allowed the NHP committee to explore affordable housing in more depth. The grant could offer finance of between £10K to £50k to quantify the benefits / drawbacks of affordable housing and to determine the communities need. DS stated that affordable housing in this area is rarely is affordable so this would be something that would need to be looked into more closely.</p> <p>Definitions:</p> <p>Affordable Housing:</p> <p><i>Affordable rented housing is let by local authorities or private registered providers of social housing to households who are eligible for social rented housing. Affordable Rent is subject to rent controls that require a rent of no</i></p>	

more than 80 per cent of the local market rent (including service charges, where applicable).

Intermediate housing are homes for sale and rent which are provided at a cost above social rent, but below market levels subject to the criteria in the Affordable Housing definition above. These can include shared equity (shared ownership and equity loans), other low-cost homes for sale and intermediate rent, but not affordable rented housing. Homes that do not meet the above definition of affordable housing, such as 'low cost market' housing, may not be considered as affordable housing for planning purposes.

Rural Exception Sites: are small rural sites which are used for affordable housing in perpetuity where sites would not normal be permitted. Properties are built for people to part own or rent and will always be owned by the landlord /Housing Association.

SW questioned whether the rules relating to social housing are likely to be relaxed resulting in the value of homes on such sites becoming unaffordable when put on the open market. LB stated that all government parties were committed to Rural Exception sites rules, so it would be extremely unlikely that this law would change.

AF asked for clarification on the terms of the grant. If the grant was applied for but, for example, the committee decided not to pursue affordable housing would the committee be financially penalised? LB stated that the grant would be available for committees to explore the possibility of incorporating affordable housing into their Neighbourhood Plan. As long as there was evidence that research had taken place, the grant wouldn't need to be paid back, even if the committee concluded that it would not pursue affordable housing.

SW questioned what would happen if more affordable homes were made available than were required by our local community? LB stated that community need would have to be established however, policies could be put in place to release affordable housing to individuals or families with a local connection first. Once this list was exhausted, the Housing Association could release housing according to need.

SW questioned whether it would be possible for an entity, other than a Housing Association to manage affordable housing i.e. a Parish Council. LB stated that as long a Parish Council had Power of Competence this would be feasible. To qualify, the Parish Clerk would have to be CiLCA qualified and 80% of the sitting council would have to be elected rather than co-opted.

6	<p>Longstock NHP Project Planner</p> <p>AF reported that she has started to complete the project planner. LB advised that the project planner should be used as a guide rather than a rule book but acknowledged that it was a good way to keep track of progress.</p>	
7	<p>Communications</p> <p>i. Newsletter</p> <p>SW and AF advised that they had written articles on the Neighbourhood Plan for the Longstock newsletter which had been published in the latest edition. SW stated that she has asked for a regular (half page) feature so that residents could be regularly updated on progress.</p> <p>ii. Web-page /e-mail</p> <p>AF advised that an NHP email address had been set up for residents to contact the committee.</p> <p>SW advised that LPC was in the process of having a new website built which would incorporate a page for the Longstock NHP.</p> <p>iii. Social Media</p> <p>AF stated that she is in the process of setting up a NHP specific Facebook page however this was still a work in progress.</p>	
8	<p>Planning of Formal Engagement 26th /27th October - POSTPONED</p> <p>Following earlier discussions regarding approaching the community with questionnaires, LB suggested that the committee postpone the more formal engagement until questionnaire responses had been collected, analysed and visions and objectives formulated. LB suggested that a date in mid-January may be more appropriate. This would also provide the opportunity for the event to be more widely advertised i.e. in the village newsletter.</p>	All
9	<p>Dropbox update</p> <p>AF stated that the committee needed a way of sharing information between members and suggested that Dropbox may be the best way to achieve this. LB stated that she could assist with this, AW to discuss with LB off-line.</p>	AW
10	<p>AOB</p> <p>AF stated that committee members needed to provide agenda items for next month's meeting. SB suggested having standing agenda items with one or two discussion points may be the way forward.</p> <p>The committee discussed using or adapting the NHP contact form from the village fete as a starting point for a community engagement questionnaire. SW suggested an informal meeting on 8th October at her home address to look at this in more detail.</p> <p>AF thanked everyone for their attendance.</p>	All
DON M	Wednesday 6th November 2019 at 7pm Longstock Village Hall	All