

**Minutes of Neighbourhood Planning Meeting
Held in Cross House on 4th December 2013, at 7.00pm.**

Steering Committee Members present were: Malcolm Bell (Chair), Tony Durrant (Vice Chair), Bruce Ansell, Louise Hayling, Malcolm Knowles, Lucy Knowles; Chris Flooks, Keith Owen, Peter Hayes, George Zaidmann

Guests: Cllr Keith Chapman (HCC); Chris Holland (Bramley PC)

Apologies: James Hare. It was noted that Karen Readman had resigned from the group due to a change of job.

ITEM COMMENT

- 1.0** The purpose of the meeting was to raise issues and ask questions of Cllr Chapman concerning highways and transport issues. An agenda paper addressing these issues had been prepared by TD. MB outlined the progress towards the 4 key objectives for the Bramley NDP, of which Transport was one.
- 2.0** **Keith Chapman: position on HCC Highways/Transport.** Infrastructure is supported through developers' contributions (eg repairs to The Street). The former process was that, following planning applications and conditions, HCC (responsible for highways) put pressure on BDBC to provide the resource. Change in regulations means that HCC has no power to demand from BDBC who now receive all the grants to prioritise on infrastructure. The Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) receives government funding and decides on money allocated to infrastructure. Any scheme costed at £2 million is referred to the Secretary of State. KC also pointed out that HCC has no control over Railtrack. His view was that BDBC's lateness with the Local Plan had opened up opportunities to developers. A key issue was the 5 year land supply which must be provided annually.
- 3.0** **Traffic.** An NDP traffic/transport survey (conducted on 2/12/13) showed that the level crossing barrier was down 29 minutes in every hour, creating long tailbacks of traffic at busy times. KC said that a rational solution would be to create a tunnel under the railway (prohibitive cost). He said that it was Railtrack's policy to remove railway crossings. He suggested the PC/NDP write to Railtrack (copied to MP) about how to tackle the problem.
- 4.0** **Heavy vehicles on C32.** KC was asked to respond to the view that the C32 was a 'rat-run' and might be made access only, taking out many of the heavy lorries. KC reported on a trial in Kingsclere which was surveying large vehicles taking a route from the A339 to Whitchurch via the narrow streets of Kingsclere. If successful in enforcing vehicle restrictions the scheme could be replicated in Bramley.
- 5.0** **Road safety.** It was suggested that there was no safe route for pedestrians to cross the C32 eg the island refuge opposite Farriers Close was too small and deemed unsafe. KC thought that the cost of installing pedestrian controlled lights was very expensive (£100,000 per unit) and took the view that such crossings were unsafe if not used regularly as motorists assumed they would always show green. He thought that the school could afford a crossing warden where child safety was concerned. He would recommend street lighting for overall safety but Bramley PC had rejected this in the past. For traffic calming he preferred chicanes to road narrowing and pointed out that Pamber PC had funded the chicanes in Little London. An experimental 20 mph limit was being trialled in Whitchurch. CH said that there should be more regular maintenance of the C32 (potholes) and KC requested an e-mail about this.
- 6.0** **Off-road parking.** KC clarified that there was no further land available near the station; he thought that Minchens Lane was the best space. He said that the footbridge issue could be argued with Network Rail as there was space to achieve it from platform to platform (use of lifts).

7.0 Cycleways. KC: land availability is key. Cycle routes worked in, eg Chineham, because the parish was developed from nothing. All new developments should have provision for cycles

8.0 Rural lanes. CH raised the issue of the poorly maintained sate of the local lanes with rutted, dangerous verges. KC asked for an email about this.

KC was thanked for his contribution and left the meeting.

9.0 NDP issues and action points

- The NDP can be submitted prior to the Local Plan approval and its evidence base can inform planning decisions
- Have we identified what the community wants? Surveys give us the priorities – we can go back to the community to check these. We have 4 objectives: prioritise within these and limit the policies eg parking is not so important to residents
- 5 sites have been identified for assessment: Minchens Lane; Strawberry Fields; Land behind Village Hall; Land behind cottages E of Cufaude Lane; Land N of school. Outside the settlement: W of Cufaude Farm; N of the railway bridge on Cufaude Lane
- Ultimately we need to cover all bases – green sites within the parish.
- **ACTION:** Proceed with assessments of Minchens Lane and Strawberry Fields: LH to lead, with HP and PO. Transport to be added.

Next meeting: Wed 8th Jan 2014: 7.00 – 9.00.

The meeting closed at 9.20pm.