

**MINUTES OF HASLEMERE VISION STEERING GROUP MEETING
HELD AT HASLEMERE TOWN HALL ON WEDNESDAY 14th December 2016**

- 1. Attendance and Apologies: Stewart Brown (Chairman)*, David Simmons*, Cyndy Lancaster *, Lesley Banfield *, Robert Silk *, Melanie Odell*, Crawford Christie (A), Liz Burton (A), John Moxon (A), Diana Vartan (A), Peter Isherwood (A), Stephen Mulliner (A), Jonny Fry (A), Vicki Purewal (A), Matthew Bowcock (A), Libby Piper (A), Simona Teresi (Secretary)*.**

*=Present (A) = Apologies

- 2. The Minutes of the Meeting held on 19th October 2016 were approved.**

3. Matters Arising:

- Item 5. (a): SB reported that Diane Moses was doing a great job of thoroughly checking the evidence base and data collection & collation.
- Item 5. (b): the sustainability grid had been circulated. CC, LBU & SB had started the process of looking at each policy against the sustainability criteria ~ this had proved a time-consuming process and they had now divided up the remaining task, working progressively to complete it as soon as possible.
- Item 5. (c): LBU had now circulated the draft summary of the NP

4. Update on Joint Meetings with HTC and on policy/ plan drafting:

- MO reported a good series of meetings ~ there were differing views on the issue of windfall control but on the other policies the issues raised by HTC were mainly editorial/minor rewording for succinctness.
- SB confirmed the issue of how to handle windfall was now the major outstanding issue between HTC and HV. HV felt that if the present rate of windfall development continued to 2032, the target of 830 houses could be substantially exceeded in a manner over which there would be little control. It was important to have the ability to refuse windfall applications or to have some kind of mechanism in place to control the absolute number of windfall developments if necessary. Members of HTC however had reservations about this. MO said that although on paper the housing numbers look achievable there are serious questions as to whether a number of the major sites on which this will depend will be developed during the plan period. As a result we may face a situation where we have to have more windfall development to reach the target numbers.
- SM & CC had drafted a policy/ mechanism for controlling windfall and felt it would be good to have one in place even if it was then not used. There were questions of terminology and whether the proposed mechanism could be enforced.
- Once all policies were agreed between HTC and HV, they would be put to Tony Burton (external consultant/ planner) for his views and advice, and thereafter to WBC.
- **Action: SB** to send the windfall policy to Tony Burton (external consultant/ planner) for his input and expert opinion on whether these would be enforceable

5. Next steps, future timetable & assignment of tasks:

- Once the policies have been agreed with HTC they would be circulated more widely.
- Informal soundings would be undertaken next with all relevant parties, including WBC, NT, Haslemere Society, C of C.
- HTC would then trigger the formal statutory consultation, a 6-week minimum process, probably to be completed in the first half of 2017. The Plan would be put up on the website for all to see and drop-in days would be organized for questions, with storyboards etc. **Action: MO** to look at how other NP groups have carried out/ delivered the statutory consultation and put forward a proposed process for the Haslemere Plan.
- Once any changes to the NP, resulting from the statutory consultation have been made, it would be put to the independent Inspector for review.

6. Follow-up to meeting on the future of Haslemere Vision:

- SB reported it had been a very good meeting, with attendance from representatives of a good cross-section of local community groups including 2 representatives from the Haslemere Society, 2 from the CLT, Nigel Quick from the NT Group, Malcolm Carter from HTC, David Goddin from the Chamber of Commerce.
- Summary notes of the meeting had been circulated.
- The broad conclusion of those present at the meeting was that the “aspirational” section of the NP would never happen unless there was some catalyst. And the relationship with HTC was the key issue that needed to be worked out. An “HV 2”, covering all issues, was probably not needed and it would probably be best to have a forum where members of the community and representatives from various organisations (eg. Hasl. Soc, Chamber of Commerce, etc) could discuss what action was needed on any particular issue and take it forward. MO pointed out that the memorandum of understanding of the democratically elected HTC already covered precisely this job, so there should normally be no need for another body such as HV. However if something came up from time to time that was not in HTC’s remit or that could be done better by non-councillors, then this could be an appropriate role for HV ~ for example opportunities giving rise to community groups being formed to make a particular aspect or project happen.
- SB suggested a good first step would be an informal discussion with both HV and HTC, and hoped such a meeting would be set up in due course.

7. Progress on the need for an SEA:

In the absence of CC there was no update. A meeting would take place on Thurs 15th December with Matthew Ellis from WBC to explore how to limit the scope of the SEA if it turns out that one is needed.

8. Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday 18 January at 8.00pm at the Town Hall.

Meeting ended at 9.40 pm