

Minutes Eversley Neighbourhood Plan Meeting on Thursday 31st July 2025 at 7pm Venue: Eversley Village Hall

Attendees

Roland Moore (RM), John Chitty (JC), Fiona Dixon (FD), Rosie Twine (RT), Laura Donnelly (LD), Liz Batup (LB), Sally Plank (SP), Patricia Lambert (PL), Annie Clarke (AC)

Resignations

Ken McWilliam (KM), Karin Rutter (KR), Michele Chitty (MC)

1. Apologies Received

Wendy Lewis-Nelson (WLN), Nick Jones (NJ), Nick Sims (NS), Sarah Allen (SA), Karim Souissi (KS)

2. Discuss, amend, vote and approve previous minutes

Comments on the previous minutes were requested and have been updated. Further queries were mentioned, WLN to update previous minutes as requested.

ACTION WLN – make requested amendments to previous minutes.

3. Update on document sharing platform (Access/Navigation/Sub section management)

The document sharing platform is becoming the main library for information. Users can check activity by clicking an exclamation mark to see updates, such as agenda changes or file uploads. Documents from Yateley Town Council and related to Holly Bush Lane have been uploaded. Users can edit or comment on documents, and changes based on comments have been actioned (e.g., Fiona's document). The platform can synchronize the entire document store to local devices for offline access. Working subgroups have full admin access to their respective folders, while only four individuals have full unlimited access to the overall system. Documents, sheets, and slides can be created, and slideshows can be run for presentations, potentially for public meetings. Documents can be easily uploaded via drag and drop. Confusion was noted regarding the "fast track" plan, with a suggestion to rename the "full one" area just "the plan" and label the fast track as an example. The headings in the fast track were found to be less meaningful. SP suggested that The Hart District Plan's appendix four, which provides strategic policies for neighbourhood planning, was a useful starting point for headings to ensure alignment with the existing local plan. Yateley Town Council does not follow this logic. It was suggested that Locality might provide a template for the plan structure. The discussion also touched on referencing existing strategic policies and fitting the parish's plan within the broader Hart District framework. RM stated he is happy to restructure folders and documents as needed or create a new "working area" folder structure. A discussion took place regarding the use of AI tools like Google Notebook LLC for drafting documents. It was noted that while AI can provide a starting point and research uploaded evidence (up to 50 documents), it may not be entirely accurate or relevant to specific local history.

4. Update on current status of engagement with Locality.

Engagement with Locality is confirmed, and an online meeting link has been emailed out. RM clarified with Locality that any money spent on consultation and direction for the initial (fast-track) plan will be transferable and directly applicable to a larger, full plan later, without needing to spend again. It was suggested that the Teams meeting with Locality should be recorded, and a transcript requested. Dave

Chapman from Locality is expected to encourage interaction to gather as much information as possible, understanding that the group consists of "enthusiastic amateurs". The meeting's focus is on how to create the neighbourhood plan, not planning policy.

5. Update on the article for Parish Magazine. Adding to the Neighbourhood Plan Facebook and Eversley Matters Facebook.

The article has now been added to Eversley Neighbourhood Plan, Eversley Matters & Eversley Community facebook pages.

6. Report on progress on the public consultation/questionnaire/survey.

The first draft of the questionnaire received much feedback, leading to fixes such as enabling multiple choices per row. The intention was to allow individuals, households, or businesses to complete the survey. An individual response would ask about age, while a household response would ask about the number and ages of household members, and a business response would go directly to business-specific questions. All issues discussed will be fixed. The possibility of using a Survey Monkey license from the Parish Council (PC), Hart District Council (HDC), or Hampshire County Council (HCC) was raised, which would be a positive development if available under a corporate license. **ACTION – LB to clarify if PC/HDC/HCC have a Survey Monkey License we could use.**

7. Review of responses from other Parish Councils that have implemented a Neighbourhood Plan.

RM presented an insight review of four responses received from Winchfield, Hook, Odiham, and Yateley. Seven key common themes were identified:

Consultant Support: Acknowledged as necessary.

Evidence-based and Technical Studies: Need for evidence, though extensive technical studies might not be required for the first run.

Community Engagement: Has started with Facebook pages and the parish magazine, but needs more activation.

Project and Budgeting: Stuck at the moment, hoping for clarity after the Locality discussion. Grant funding was available for previous plans (e.g., £25-30k) but is no longer available. Budgets were typically grant-funded.

Use of Technology and Resources: Already being implemented.

Challenges and Lessons Learned: These included steering group composition (councillors, residents, communicator), consultant's vital role, evidence gathering (landscape characteristics, document collection), and public engagement methods (meetings, surveys).

Timeframe: Full neighborhood plans took 1-3 years. The group aims to create a quicker initial plan.

Funding, it was discussed that the group does not have a budget line and needs to approach EPC to get funding. Locality's charitable background might make them less commercially focused when discussing costs. The idea of crowdfunding or resident donations was discussed, noting that while the working group cannot directly crowdfund, the EPC could, with funds ring-fenced for the neighborhood plan. Cllr Dickens has previously suggested that future precept increases from new houses could fund the plan retrospectively. The general theme was that Locality was considered very useful by other councils.

8. Report on Parish Online System

LB provided an overview of Parish Online, a powerful and complex mapping tool that EPC has a subscription to. She demonstrated its capabilities, including displaying the parish boundary and Ordnance Survey data. It can show footpaths, all addresses in the parish, and land ownership. The system also shows flooding areas (Zone 1, Zone 2, surface water) from the Environment Agency data. Parish Online allows users to add lines, points, shapes, and polygons to mark out areas and can save maps as PDFs or for websites. The group acknowledged the tool's power but identified a need for training. It was proposed to first approach the subject matter expert at Winchfield Parish Council for help, and if not, organize formal training, potentially funded by EPC. The cost for 2-3 people for a full day of training was estimated at around £475. It was also suggested to inquire about a separate user license for the project. JC mentioned a free alternative mapping system called MAGIC which is thought to contain much of the same public access data. It was decided to investigate MAGIC as well to compare its ease of use and functionality with Parish Online.

9. Updates on Plan sections

Transport - No specific update provided for this meeting.

GreenSpace/Natural Environment - No specific update provided for this meeting.

Housing - JC is working on housing, becoming a "housing expert". The design aspect, including style and housing mix (starter, small family, larger family, retiree homes), could be integrated into the housing section. The section needs to address the lack of downsizing options in the village and the implications for residents like those facing "bedroom tax". It also needs to cover social, council, and affordable housing.

Employment - SP suggested the section should be referred to as Local Economy.

Community Facilities - No specific update provided for this meeting.

10. Volunteers for Plan Sections

Infrastructure: RM volunteered to pick this up. The Hart District Council (HDC) plan includes an infrastructure heading.

Design: Discussed as possibly part of Housing (see above).

Historic Environment: RM also volunteered for this section. Suggestions for sources of information included Cllr Philip Todd, Elizabeth Tipton (who took over from Sarah Beer, the former village archivist), and someone with old parish magazines and archives. This section is considered "very easy" to complete from existing information.

11. AOB

Meeting with the Alex Brewer MP: RM couldn't attend due to all slots being taken but is on a waitlist. The MP is driven by local issues and could be a valuable ally once a plan is in place. The frustration with the planning framework and increased targets affecting rural MPs was discussed. The MP will be in the parish for 60 minutes, likely allowing only 5 minutes per constituent.

Neighbourhood Plan Justification:

A question was raised about how to explain the need for a Neighbourhood Plan to villagers. The response should emphasize its role in influencing development, addressing needs, identifying service requirements, and controlling the pace, place, and type of housing. It will not stop development, but gives the community a say. Without a plan, the community risks being "ridden rough shod". Concerns were raised about infrastructure (doctors, dentists, hospitals, sewage) failing to keep pace with large housing developments

Planning Consultant Proposals:

RM has initiated conversations with Locality and will start similar conversations with ET Planning (recommended by former working group members) and one other consultant to ensure they are not caught unprepared if Locality's costs are high. The Parish Council requires three proposals. RM will also investigate who Finchampstead is using for their neighborhood plan. RM will find websites and links for potential consultants to facilitate selection.

Document Accessibility:

Daniel Hawes Hart DC sent a document on guidelines for submitting accessible documents to planning, emphasizing that scanned documents are not sufficient. Source documents are needed for inclusion in public web pages.

Membership Management:

The working group needs to manage its core members and potentially remove individuals who have stepped down or are not engaged, from email lists and Google Drive access. Rosie suggested changing the meeting evening or having Teams/Google Meet calls to encourage engagement from core members not currently attending.

12. Date of next meeting

TBA It was noted that meeting frequency might decrease over time, with working groups meeting via calls/video conferences. As part of EPC, 10 days' notice for meetings and 2 days' notice for the agenda are constitutionally required.

ACTION - RM will sort out a date and email everyone.