

## **Minutes of Neighbourhood Planning Meeting Held in Cross House on 8th January 2014, at 7.00pm.**

Steering Committee Members present were: Malcolm Bell (Chair), Tony Durrant (Vice Chair), Bruce Ansell, Louise Hayling, Chris Flooks, Keith Owen, Pilar Owen, Peter Hayes, George Zaidmann, James Hare.

Apologies: Malcolm Knowles, Lucy Knowles

### **ITEM COMMENT**

**1.0** Minutes of the last meeting (4/12/13) were accepted as accurate.

**2.0 Progress on the NDP.** MB referred to the document 'Bramley Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan – Building Evidence Base Advice (URS, Dec.13) from which he concluded that the Committee needed to employ a consultant, via Planning Aid, in order to help take matters forward. Locations such as Thame and Tattenhall with approved NDPs could also advise. From the URS report, MB recommended the Transport Planning Report (2008) and the Supplementary Planning Document (SDP). URS advised that economic issues needed to be addressed (in Bramley) and MB suggested that this might include a survey of households showing the extent of home working.

MB emphasized two fundamental points:

- There will be new housing, and infrastructure shortfalls can be addressed through developers' contributions. In 2015 Section 106 will be replaced by the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL): 25% of contributions will come to the PC if a Neighbourhood Plan is in place; if not it will only receive 15%.
- The NDP needs to look carefully at how, and with what range/depth of evidence, issues can be presented within the selected objectives.
- The area of Economic growth in the village was highlighted in the report as being missing. This to be more fully explored as to the requirements of the business community, working from home and those on sites. CF to explore and if necessary a questionnaire specific to this area

**3.0 Objective: Transport.** 'Evaluation of Transport Effects on Bramley Village (by BA and GZ) had been circulated before the meeting. GZ referred to possible off-road car parks: Minchens Lane; land to the N of the school. TD commented that no one will sell land for a CP: it would have to come as a result of development. He suggested that a policy could be to develop off-road parking with access to station, shop and school. People don't want to pay for parking but there should be parking enforcements in the restricted areas.

Other possible sites discussed were: behind Mekanix; behind the recreation ground in Bromelia Close; Jibbs Meadow – for the station and shop. In the recent survey on parking for the shop/station, 70% were found to be parking on the road. The shop has 4 places but 3 of these can be accounted for without the general public.

JH proposed: (there is) 'a parking problem.....the following sites may be suitable....the shop should be relocated...

TD queried if a new village centre would be viable. MB said that a new shop could only be tied to development.

**4.0 Paths and cycleways.** BA spoke to this issue, stating that safer routes to school was government policy. We need to separate traffic types: car; cycle; pedestrian. Our policy would need to include a footbridge over the railway; also a cycle (puffin) crossing to access the school across the C32. A footbridge for school access could be sited from Minchens Lane to the top end of Moat Close. For children's safety we should encourage non-vehicular transport options eg the 'cinder track' could be widened to enhance the

'separation' element. A network of pathways could lead to cars for school drop-off having a pull-in away from the immediate vicinity of the school. BA agreed to do more work to develop the policy.

MB concluded the traffic/safety issues by proposing a paper to Stella Scrivener to check if we were on the right track.

**5.0 Thames Water.** CF said that he would take this forward on the grounds of increased housing density and resulting additional sewage. He thought that the current facility could only stand 40 x 3-bed new houses.

**6.0 Site assessments.** LH reported on her work in progress. Strawberry Fields has lots of open visual views, but flooding is an issue in the middle area. Suggestion was to keep any development to the W and S of the site. The area to the N could be public green space. Housing to the W would be likely to adjoin the current housing. Minchens Lane had more of a rural aspect with pathways and lanes.

LH, CF and PO to identify further sites for assessment.

Next meeting: 5<sup>th</sup> February

The meeting closed at 9.15pm.