

Minutes of Neighbourhood Planning Meeting
Held in the Library Room of Cross House on 9th October 2013, at 7.00pm.

Parish Councillors present were:

Malcolm Bell (Chair), Tony Durrant (Vice Chair)

Steering Committee Members present were: Louise Hayling, Malcolm Knowles, George Zaidmann, Peter Hayes, Henrietta Pullan, Chris Flooks and James Hare.

Apologies: Lucy Knowles, Karen Readman and Bruce Ansell.

ITEM COMMENT

1.0 The purpose of the meeting was to discuss feedback from the Open Day on 28th September. Malcolm Bell referred to his summary of the day which was on the website, together with a map showing distribution across the village by attendees. 94 people dropped in (the majority from east of the railway line) which represented 2% of the village population – a disappointing figure.

2.0 Tony Durrant tabled an analysis of the 41 attendees who had used the parish map to indicate where they would choose to locate the 200 houses allocated to Bramley, with accompanying comments on infrastructure. For the Minchens Lane site, 26/41 (63%) indicated choice for some or the full 200 houses; for Strawberry Fields the figures were 10/41 (25%), with only 2 respondents selecting the 200 option. Some had spread the allocation across multiple sites without necessarily indicating numbers per site. 3 respondents said no more building at all.

3.0 **Housing issues.** Many people wanted retention of the ‘village factor’ in terms of possible density. Comparisons were made between the Campbell Road development of c.200 units and the smaller area of the Minchens Lane (ML) site. Reservations on the latter included: an ‘uphill’ build affecting the view (which could be ameliorated by a 2-storey cap) and the need to avoid the pylons at the northern end. Tony Durrant said that the ML site had been assessed for 200 houses and Persimmon Homes had plans to develop it: they would be talking to the Parish Council, the NDP Committee and a core of local residents. It was clarified that the boundary of the Strawberry Fields (SF) site would stretch from opposite Farriers Close to Folly Lane. Disposal of the MoD land was not felt to be in the 15-year plan, given its importance to the military.

There was further discussion of what the NDP housing policy might incorporate eg small developments on multiple sites; low density with a 2-storey cap; off-road parking.

4.0 **Parking and traffic density.** The ML site discussion led to consideration of extending the existing car park to serve those using the station. The yellow lines now painted on roads in the vicinity of the station had not solved the congestion problem as motorists were simply using the same roads but parking further away from the station. A reduction in side road parking possibilities was proposed. If a ML car park was developed to create 150-200 spaces, a charge could be levied and low-level lighting introduced as an aid to security. Tony Durrant indicated that car park charges cannot exceed the cost of managing the CP. A view against an enhanced car park was that it would encourage those from new developments in Taylors Farm etc to use it, rather than go to Basingstoke station CP. Another proposal was to improve walking facilities to the station, including better signposting and improved accessibility for cycles and pushchairs. James Hare pointed out that a ML car park would mean extra usage of the Minchens Lane bridge for those travelling to it from an easterly direction. Traffic lights at that bridge might discourage this use. It was queried how the electrification of the railway would affect the future of this bridge: the current plan would be to lower the railway so as not to affect the bridge structure.

The view that there should be car parking provision either side of the railway was strongly supported by the meeting. One site to the east could be north of the school, with improved footpath access. It was also agreed that any new CP facilities should cohere with the wider development plan.

5.0 Traffic survey and a station footbridge. There was discussion about finding out how much the station was used and where people were coming from to access it. Network Rail could provide data about journey destinations if this would be useful. Hampshire Highways could be asked to provide figures – via Keith Chapman – of traffic densities in the station approaches. In the various surveys, the need for a footbridge at the station had been regularly proposed by residents. It was stated that the cost would be 1.3 million and the village would need to contribute 50% to this; therefore its viability was questioned.

6.0 A (new) village centre? Logic suggested that this be on the east side of the railway to reflect the population density. It was queried whether more shops were needed, or, perhaps improvements to the existing shop's facilities. Malcolm Knowles proposed a survey of shop usage and where shoppers were coming from. Some people may be deterred from using it because of the parking restrictions there. Perhaps empty units in Campbell Road could provide an alternative site for a shop?

7.0 How to make inevitable development bearable? The issue of possible housing densities was reprised. The ML site could achieve 200 houses based on the 30 houses per hectare calculation: ML is 8-9 hectares. SF also meets the 200 projection but is larger: 13 hectares. However, it has more restrictions than ML; part of it is flood plain and there are protected views.

Malcolm Bell said that the PC would be holding a meeting next Monday evening (14/10) with Persimmon homes to see what they had on the table for development of ML. He expected that the developer was on the verge of public exhibitions regarding the ML site.

8.0 Further discussion concerning a meeting with Persimmon Homes. It was decided to accept the approach of the developer to NDP for a meeting on Wednesday, 16th October when the topic would be as to what the community are looking for with a new development, style housing, density, green spaces etc.

The meeting closed at 10.00pm

Written by P Hayes.

Malcolm Bell, Chair NDP