

**Minutes of Neighbourhood Planning Meeting  
Held in Cross House on 5th March 2014, at 7.00pm.**

Steering Committee Members present were: Malcolm Bell (Chair), Chris Flooks, Peter Hayes, James Hare, Pilar Owen, Louise Hayling

Planning Aid Volunteer: Philip Turner

Apologies: Malcolm Knowles, Lucy Knowles, Tony Durrant, Keith Owen, Bruce Ansell, George Zaidmann,

- | <b>ITEM</b> | <b>COMMENT</b>   |
|-------------|--|
| <b>1.0</b>  | <b>Chair's opening remarks.</b> MB said that there was a BDBC Local Plan Pre-submission meeting that evening. He suggested that the planning department would be sympathetic to developers coming forward to help meet the 5 year demand on the borough. Charles Church (CC) would be putting in an application for Minchens Lane development in March. James Hare clarified that the Stratfield Saye Estate was scoping opinion for a development on the Strawberry Fields site.<br>MB reported that £3,700 had been received from Locality which would pay towards consultancy support: this would be provided by Dave Chetwyn (Urban Vision) who had worked with Woodcote NDP. 22 days of his time were anticipated and he would be working through the process of taking the evidence to draft plan stage.   |
| <b>2.0</b>  | <b>Meeting with Thames Water.</b> A report had been previously circulated. It was clear that extra sewage capacity is needed in Bramley. Developers have to apply to Thames Water to connect to the sewage system, and a full drainage assessment should be submitted with their application (a Grampian style planning condition may be imposed). Sometimes developers try to by-pass this condition which may leave Thames Water having to pay the full cost.  |
| <b>3.0</b>  | <b>Site assessment update.</b> LH reported on the work that she and KO had carried out on a number of sites additional to Minchens Lane (ML) and Strawberry Fields (SF); all these assessments were tabled.<br>LH said that the assessments done on ML and SF by BDBC were desktop exercises which she and KO had adapted eg there was no proper traffic study which was the biggest constraint on ML; with SF there was a better perspective with most traffic predicted in the A33 direction. Both sites were negative on the rural aspect; some mitigation could apply to ML with more dense housing on the lower end of the site. But greater density would lead to more run-off of water, hence the need for an attenuation basin.<br>The highest density on existing developments was in German Road: 38.16 per hectare and, in places, ML would need to be this high (if 200 houses). LH recommended that ML should have only 130 houses if we wanted to protect what is desirable.<br>A question about green space on the ML site was raised: would it benefit the community? It was noted that there were no large communal areas to the east of the railway. |
| <b>4.0</b>  | <b>Other site assessments.</b> i) <u>Top of Cufaude Lane, behind Church Farm Cottages (No.8; 4.2 hectares)</u><br>100 houses were possible. Being south of the C32, there was backwards sloping, so not impacting on views. It was close to existing amenities but there would be a negative impact on transport.<br>ii) <u>Kings Copse – adjacent to Church Farm Cottages (no.6)</u> Not developable; planning permission had been previously refused. Only option would be 6 houses on low density.  |
| <b>5.0</b>  | <b>Housing policy.</b> There was further discussion of ML and SF sites. It was suggested that ML be scaled down to 130 houses. The Charles Church site map was viewed; there be a path on the eastern edge of Clift Meadow to link to the site. MB reminded that off-road parking was sought by the community. Although  |

provision for parking could be provided by CC it was open for discussion because without adequate monitoring of on-street parking, parking facilities would only add to the traffic problems facing Bramley by encouraging Train Commuters to use the station. He added that if the proposed development went to appeal and was upheld CC would not give extra money for facilities. The choice facing the PC was to oppose ML completely or negotiate what is best for Bramley.

Action points: MB to approach i)the landowner for site no. 8 (see above); ii) the MoD re releasing land on their site; iii) the PC re getting consultant help for dealing with Draft Plan.

**6.0 Other policy issues related to housing.** PT suggested looking at:

- Recommending smaller sites: self-build (no CiL provided); housing for older people; social housing
- A rural housing survey via CAH/HARAH. MB is already in touch with Mags Wylie from CAH. BDBC gave a figure of 72 for local housing need (2011 census). It was queried if this allowed for those people who want to downsize. MB said that 20-25% of people in the Parish Plan survey were dissatisfied with the provision for older people, a clear evidence of need.
- Density issues: 'lower density' means that houses are separate from each other; their gardens are good for wildlife/planting; long gardens can allow for heat pumps.

Action: LH offered to do a summary of the sites recently assessed.

Next meeting: tbc.

The meeting closed at 9.15pm.