

**BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK PARISH PLAN**  
**MINUTES OF STEERING GROUP MEETING**

**Held in the Millennium Centre on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2015 at 1930 hours**

Present: Trevor Maroney (Chairman), Jeanette Kirby, John Tough, Colin Osborne, Lee Stewart, Mukund Patel, Tony Rudgard & Jackie Poole (Secretary).

Apologies: Robin Young.

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | <u>Introduction.</u> The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, and pointed out the emergency exits and procedures in the event of a fire.  |  |
| 2. | <u>Disclosure of Interests.</u> There were no disclosures.  |  |
| 3. | <u>Minutes of Meetings.</u> The minutes of the 18 <sup>th</sup> November 2014 were approved and signed.   |  |
| 4. | <u>Matter's Arising.</u> There were no matters arising.   |  |
| 5. | <p><u>Chairman's Report.</u></p> <p>a. Exhibition. He felt that the exhibition was very successful with over 600 visitors and was immensely impressed by the synergy generated by the team. He thanked everyone for all their efforts.</p> <p>b. Business Park near Conford. He had noted in the Liphook Herald that EHDC had bought Starbucks and the Metro Inn located in the northbound service station off the A3 and wondered if, apart from it being a business investment, if there were any other reasons behind the purchase. He reminded everyone of a suggestion, put forward by Frank Ogden, of a new business park on the north side of the A3 linked by road to the service station on the A3. This ownership might make such a scheme viable. JT pointed out that it would need a new bridge to link it to the southbound carriageway and was therefore impractical.</p> |  |
| 6. | <u>Treasurer's Report.</u> He confirmed the balance on the account was £1,590.41, and circulated a list of itemised expenditure on the exhibition amounting to £1,884.84. It was expected that the balance on hall hire due to the Parish Council would be written off by them; he hoped that they would also refund the deposit.   |  |
| 7. | <p><u>Exhibition Findings.</u></p> <p>a. Attendance Analysis. JP confirmed that the final number of visitors exceeded 620.</p> <p>b. Dot Analysis. JK's analysis was circulated prior to the meeting and she produced coloured graphs as a way of highlighting the most popular recommendations. This showed the provision of more new shops, followed by swimming pool and the impact of housing on infrastructure were the greatest concerns. It was noted with some surprise that the proposed drop-in centre wasn't very popular, even amongst the elderly. As members had insufficient time to assimilate the data it was agreed that this Item would be</p>   |  |

|     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
|     | <p>carried forward to the next meeting. It was agreed that we should bring out both the negative and positive findings from this analysis.</p> <p>c. Questionnaire Analysis. CO produced his analysis of the questionnaires. He noted that participation by the 20 to 59 age group, the ‘main working population’ was still low, despite the extra exhibitions. There was a brief debate on how we could have connected more with these generations by, perhaps, holding a late evening session. However, it was concluded that further efforts to illicit their views were unlikely to be fruitful. It was, however, agreed that this Item would be reconsidered at the next meeting.</p> <p>d. “What have we missed?” Analysis. CO’s analysis for the initial exhibition and JK’s from the latter two exhibitions concluded that there weren’t many new suggestions other than an ‘air hop’ – big air trampolining activity centre. This led to a debate on the lack of internal activity centres for the youth in the community, a point raised by youngsters in the youth survey: ice rink, bowling alley etc. From a commercial perspective the Chairman thought that a swimming pool linked to either of these two activities might make them both commercially viable. Members were asked to draw out any other salient points for the next meeting.</p> <p>e. Graffiti. The Chairman’s list of Graffiti comments were circulated prior to the meeting. These only covered the initial 2 day event as there were few points raised at the later exhibitions.</p> | <p>All</p> <p>All</p> <p>All</p>          |
| 8.  | <p><u>Lessons learnt from the Exhibition.</u> Members felt that the exhibition worked well, certainly much better and more controlled than the LIPS presentation. The Chairman pointed out that it wasn’t very profitable for the catering company, however they found it a useful advertising platform. It was felt that it should have been better advertised and, to catch commuters, should have been open until late on the Friday evening, unfortunately the only available time was on a film night.</p>   | All                                       |
| 9.  | <p><u>Update on Sections:</u></p> <p>a. Education. The Chairman explained that he needed to complete the Education and Training section now that he had visited Bohunt School; he owed it to JK who had kindly completed work on the under 5’s and the Junior Schools.</p> <p>b. Social Care &amp; Unemployment. JP explained that due to the Christmas period research on this section had been suspended.</p> <p>c. Church &amp; Faith. The Chairman explained that he needed to speak to church leaders to remind them that we still require their input.</p>  | <p>Chairman</p> <p>JP</p> <p>Chairman</p> |
| 10. | <p><u>Views on Neighbourhood Plan (NP).</u> CO led a debate on the Council’s support for a NP. He was concerned about the necessity for one bearing in mind EHDC’s draft allocation plan nominating Lowsley Farm for the 175 houses. He wondered who would prepare it and whether or not there would be vested interests involved. The general view was that it should be done when the next housing allocation had to be made – questions were raised about the rolling 5 year housing supply requirement – likely to be from 2025 onwards. It was felt that a NP was likely to encourage the next allocation to be brought forward, particularly the 2 proposed housing developments in the SDNP. Well aware of differing views on the subject, it was felt that housing in the SDNP would divide the community and as it was unlikely to comply with NPPF would be rejected</p>  |   |

|     |   |          |
|-----|---|----------|
|     | by the Park authorities. It was the general consensus that work on the NP should only be started upon completion of the Parish Plan (PP).   | All      |
| 11. | <p><u>Where do we go from here?</u></p> <p>a. The Chairman explained that the NP Steering Group (SG) would redraft completed sections on the PP in formulating its planning policies. After considering the merits of various housing developments it would then define what it felt the community needed in the way of infrastructure and facilities – the same exercise needed to complete the PP’s Action Plan. Furthermore, they would have a paid professional policy writer to complete this work on their behalf. It therefore made no sense in writing two different Action Plans when only one would be subject to a referendum. As the NP would carry more weight and be better funded the Chairman felt there was little point in completing the PP. He certainly was reluctant to continue researching and writing a plan which was being superseded by a more powerful document.</p> <p>b. The general view was that we needed to report back to the community on the Exhibition’s findings. It would be nice if we drew a line under the work by finalising the PP so far and highlighting the further work required. This would mean a ‘Wish List’ but no ‘Action Plan.’ As the Chairman explained, his Vision section, presented at an earlier meeting, had proved so controversial that he had withdrawn it. In his view it would take several meetings for an Action Plan to be agreed, sections from which would, in all probability, be unacceptable to some groups in the community. This would be avoided if the NP SG assumed responsibility for divining a plan that would meet the community wishes.</p> <p>c. In answer to a question on what needed doing to complete the Plan the Chairman confirmed the requirement for an Action Plan, Vision Statement and an Executive Summary. It would also require an appropriate foreword and an acknowledgement.</p> | All      |
| 12. | <u>Any other business.</u> The Chairman recorded his desire to step down from the chair and in writing the Plan, and asked for someone to take over. As there was no immediate volunteer he agreed to chair the next meeting.   | Chairman |
| 13. | <p><u>Next Meeting.</u> The date of the next meeting: 20<sup>th</sup> January 2015</p> <p>The meeting ended at 9.25 pm.</p>   |          |

Signed:

Trevor Maroney  
Chairman BLPP

Date:

Enclosures:

1. Agenda
2. Voting (Dot) Analysis.
3. Questionnaire Analysis.
4. What have we missed? Analysis.
5. Graffiti Analysis.