

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

## **APPENDIX H**

### **Additional Local Evidence Base**

For Community Consultation and Survey Results, Bramley Neighbourhood Plan

## **CONTENTS**

SECTION A1.....Neighbourhood Planning.....	Page 2
SECTION B1.....Marmite Quiz .....	Page 3 - 4
SECTION C1.....Bramley Village Plan.....	Page 5 – 17
SECTION D1.....Words Cloud, Marmite Quiz.....	Page 18
SECTION E1.....Bramley Neighbourhood Questionnaire.....	Page 19 - 23
SECTION F1.....Survey Results for 28 <sup>th</sup> September 2013.....	Page 24 - 26
SECTION G1.....Comments on Open Days, 7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> March 2014.....	Page 27 - 36
SECTION H1.....Open Days, 15 <sup>th</sup> and 22 <sup>nd</sup> May 2014.....	Page 37 - 42
SECTION I1.....Site Assessments.....	Page 43 - 47
SECTION J1.....Housing Survey September/October 2014.....	Page 48 - 59
SECTION K1.....Hampshire County Councils Road accident data for Bramley; Traffic Count in Bramley.....	Page 60 - 65
SECTION L1.....SEA Screening Requirement.....	Page 66 - 67
SECTION M1.....Bramley Historic Buildings.....	Page 68 - 71



Neighbourhood Planning for Bramley

## NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING

### *Influencing Future Development in your Community*

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council is supporting Bramley in creating its own Neighbourhood Plan, recognising that the village should have a say in how it is developed in the future.

The next step in producing a Plan is to form a Planning Group from the Bramley Community.

To find out how you can get involved, be heard, or just find out more, Please come along to:

Open public session, Friday 8th March 2013

**We'll be in the Bramley Room at the Village Hall-** and you can drop in anytime between 3.30pm until around 7.30pm

**IT'S YOUR VILLAGE SO HAVE YOUR SAY AS TO ITS FUTURE DEVELOPMENT**

If you are interested in joining Bramley's Neighbourhood Planning Group,  
Please contact Cllr. Bell [msb7814@gmail.com](mailto:msb7814@gmail.com), tel. 0750 222 2818 for more information

# Neighbourhood Planning

## Section B1

Page 3




### MARMITE QUIZ

 <p>Village Green      Love      Hate</p>	 <p>Large Estate      Love      Hate</p>
 <p>Village School      Big enough?      Yes      No</p>	 <p>RBL Site. Do you think the village should have say as to what is built here?      Yes      No</p>
 <p>Village Hall      Love      Hate      Good Enough</p>	 <p>Industrial Estate      Love      Hate      More Of</p>
 <p>Position of Village Shop      Love      Hate</p>	 <p>Open View Across Green      Love      Hate</p>
 <p>View Across Fields to Green      Love      Hate</p>	 <p>On Street Parking      Love      Hate</p>



# Neighbourhood Planning

The two sided  
Marmite Quiz  
presented to  
the Community  
on the 7<sup>th</sup>  
March 2013

 <p><b>Open View across Clift Meadow Could be Affected by Housing Development . Love Hate</b></p>	 <p><b>Open View Across Strawberry Fields could be affected by Housing Development Love Hate</b></p>
 <p><b>Small Developments Love Hate</b></p>	 <p><b>Do you mind Driving Delays Yes No More Houses, more cars</b></p>
 <p><b>Want More Places to work Yes No No Need</b></p>	 <p><b>Want More Playing Fields Yes No More Football, Cricket, Tennis</b></p>
 <p><b>What do you think are the challenges that the NDP needs to consider when deciding where new developments should go?</b> (E/W of Level Crossing. Open Fields. Small/Large Developments. Schooling. Relative to shop)</p>	<p><b>Other Ideas.....</b></p>
<p><b>Interested in Helping to draw up a NDP, envisaging the future of Bramley through your eyes, your vision, your wants, your needs ?</b></p> <p><b>Join the NDP STEERING COMMITTEE, or Contribute ideas.</b></p> <p><b>WE NEED YOU</b></p>	<p><b>Personal Details</b></p>

### The Village Plan Questionnaire, Snap Analysis

## Bramley Village Plan

### Where do you live?

This Questionnaire is anonymous, but in order to make the best use of the data we collect, we would like to know in which area of Bramley you live. This is obviously important for looking at issues like traffic and street lighting, for example. We have divided Bramley into distinct areas: you should be able to see your street mentioned under one of the headings below. If you cannot see your street mentioned, please pick the area that most closely corresponds to where you live. For those people who live in an individual house away from the village there is a special category at the end.

#### Q1 Where do you live?

<b>Coopers Lane:</b> including Ellen Gardens, Cooper's Court, Europa Court, The Maltings, Richardson Gardens, Apple Dene .....	57..	(9.6%)
<b>The Street:</b> including Oakmead, Pheaben's Field, Ringshall Gardens, Pounds Close, Minchens Lane, Beaurepaire Close, Churchlands, Locksbridge Lane, Vyne Road, Tudor Close .....	121..	(20.3%)
<b>Campbell Road:</b> including Holman Close, Wallis Drive, St James Close, Sims Close, Officers Row, Taylor Drive, St Mark's Close, St John's Close, St Mary's Avenue, St Mary's Court, Bartlett Close, Herridge Close, Illingworth Close, Thornton Close, Deerfield Close, St Barbara's Close, The Limes, Woodland Drive, The Mews, Oaklea Gardens .....	112...	(18.8%)
<b>Bramley Green Road:</b> including Forge Close, Holly Close Yew Tree Close, Pigeons's Close, Olivers's Close, Beech Close, Pond Road .....	52..	(8.7%)
<b>German Road:</b> Beckett Gardens, Hills Way, Garside Close, Kirby Drive .....	47..	(7.9%)
<b>Forge Field:</b> including Farrier's Close, The Smithy, and Anvil Way.....	36..	(6.1%)
<b>Lane End</b> .....	10..	(1.7%)
<b>Sherfield Road:</b> including Dollis Green, Marguerite Close, Longbridge Road, Jibb's Meadow ...	53..	(8.9%)
<b>Strawberry Fields:</b> including Osler Close, Tottenham Close, Meitner Close .....	26..	(4.4%)
<b>Bramley Lane:</b> including Bromelia Close, Brown's Close, North Row, Moat Close .....	45..	(7.6%)
<b>Individual houses around the village:</b> only use this if you don't see your location in any of the above areas. ....	36..	(6.1%)

### Community

#### Q2 Thinking about the way in which you find out what's going on in the village (for example, fetes, shows, sales etc.) how do you rate the following sources of information?

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Not aware of this	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
The Bramley Magazine-Church (annual subscription delivered monthly)	98 (18.0%)	236 (43.3%)	165 (30.3%)	39 (7.2%)	7 (1.3%)
Church Newsletter (weekly from church service)	24 (5.1%)	80 (16.9%)	343 (72.4%)	18 (3.8%)	9 (1.9%)
Notice boards provided by the Parish Council	34 (6.4%)	355 (67.1%)	53 (10.0%)	74 (14.0%)	13 (2.5%)
Parish Council Newsletter (twice yearly)	36 (6.8%)	312 (58.8%)	117 (22.0%)	57 (10.7%)	9 (1.7%)
Bramley Parish Council Website (www.bramleypc.co.uk)	22 (4.6%)	176 (37.1%)	224 (47.3%)	41 (8.6%)	11 (2.3%)
Event posters and other signage	49 (9.2%)	362 (67.9%)	61 (11.4%)	47 (8.8%)	14 (2.6%)

# Neighbourhood Planning

**Q3 Have you ever attended either a monthly Bramley Parish Council meeting or the annual parish meeting, both of which are open to people in the parish?**

152 (26.0%) *Yes*

432 (74.0%) *No*

**Q4 Do you feel you're elected representatives (parish and borough) are sufficiently aware of local concerns and feelings?**

274 (49.7%) *Yes*

277 (50.3%) *No*

**Q5 Thinking about decisions and projects that affect the village as a whole, how satisfied are you that local people are consulted sufficiently?**

8 (1.4%) *Very satisfied*

195 (33.4%) *Dissatisfied*

140 (24.0%) *Satisfied*

51 (8.7%) *Very dissatisfied*

190 (32.5%) *Neither satisfied or dissatisfied*

**Q6 Thinking about facilities for the whole community, how satisfied are you with the following:**

	<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Very dissatisfied</i>
Village facilities for sports for all ages	22 (3.9%)	223 (39.3%)	193 (34.0%)	114 (20.1%)	16 (2.8%)
Shops that meet your needs	35 (6.0%)	260 (44.4%)	97 (16.6%)	140 (23.9%)	54 (9.2%)
Health center facilities	213 (36.5%)	261 (44.8%)	80 (13.7%)	27 (4.6%)	2 (0.3%)
Dispensing and collection of prescriptions	237 (40.5%)	229 (39.1%)	93 (15.9%)	21 (3.6%)	5 (0.9%)
Facilities for special needs (e.g. adapted access for wheelchairs)	10 (1.8%)	104 (18.8%)	415 (75.0%)	21 (3.8%)	3 (0.5%)
Library facilities (the mobile library - fortnightly service at Clift Meadow)	11 (2.0%)	146 (26.0%)	359 (64.0%)	35 (6.2%)	10 (1.8%)
Facilities provided by Clift Meadow Pavilion	40 (7.0%)	255 (44.4%)	257 (44.8%)	21 (3.7%)	1 (0.2%)
Facilities provided by the Village Hall	48 (8.3%)	265 (45.9%)	233 (40.4%)	25 (4.3%)	6 (1.0%)
Facilities provided by Cross House	34 (6.0%)	214 (37.8%)	300 (53.0%)	15 (2.7%)	3 (0.5%)
Places of worship	71 (12.4%)	223 (39.1%)	268 (46.9%)	7 (1.2%)	2 (0.4%)
Facilities for meetings	40 (7.0%)	245 (42.6%)	266 (46.3%)	17 (3.0%)	7 (1.2%)

**Q7 Would you like to see any of the recreation facilities listed below available in the village? Tick all that apply**

<i>Skateboard park</i> .....	107. (24.0%)
<i>BMX track</i> .....	78 (17.5%)
<i>Bowls</i> .....	142 (31.9%)
<i>Squash court</i> .....	86 (19.3%)
<i>Swimming</i> .....	249 (56.0%)
<i>Jogging track /running circuit and outdoor exercise facilities</i> .....	245. (55.1%)
<i>Other</i> .....	45
	10.1%)
<i>If other (please specify)</i>	96 (100.0%)

**Q8 Thinking about the future growth of the village, say ten years or more from now, which of the three following options would you prefer to see? Tick only one**

<i>A large new community facility with everything under one roof</i> .....	189 (31.9%)
<i>Continuing development of the existing facilities</i> .....	270 (45.6%)
<i>Leave things as they are</i> .....	138 (23.3%)

## Neighbourhood Planning

**Q9 The following health care services are either not currently or not widely available in the village. If they were and the need arose, how likely would you be to use them?**

	<i>Very likely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Very unlikely</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Dentist	255 (43.5%)	185 (31.6%)	96 (16.4%)	40 (6.8%)	10 (1.7%)
Physiotherapist	64 (11.7%)	158 (28.8%)	188 (34.3%)	89 (16.2%)	49 (8.9%)
Reflexologist	32 (6.1%)	71 (13.5%)	227 (43.2%)	162 (30.8%)	34 (6.5%)
Dispensing chemist	194 (35.2%)	199 (36.1%)	84 (15.2%)	54 (9.8%)	20 (3.6%)
Chiropodist	84 (15.1%)	128 (23.0%)	169 (30.4%)	129 (23.2%)	46 (8.3%)
Sports massage	45 (8.5%)	90 (16.9%)	193 (36.3%)	165 (31.1%)	38 (7.2%)

**Q10 Thinking about the various aspects of policing in Bramley, how satisfied are you with the following:**

	<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Very dissatisfied</i>
Enforcement of traffic regulations	24 (4.1%)	171 (29.1%)	144 (24.5%)	152 (25.9%)	97 (16.5%)
Enforcement of parking regulations	15 (2.6%)	135 (23.0%)	174 (29.7%)	166 (28.3%)	96 (16.4%)
Responsiveness to requests for assistance (999 and 101 calls)	25 (4.5%)	138 (24.6%)	345 (61.6%)	38 (6.8%)	14 (2.5%)
Attendance and support of local events and meetings	19 (3.4%)	201 (35.5%)	310 (54.8%)	28 (4.9%)	8 (1.4%)

**Q11 If you have any comments on community facilities, please record them in the space below:**

134 (100.0%)

## Services for children

**If you have children under the age of 18, please answer the following series of questions:**  
(If not please go to Q18)

**Q12 Did you get the school of your choice for your children?**

Yes..... 153 (88.4%) No ..... 11.6%

**Q13 Thinking about the available choice of schools at various stages of your children's education, how satisfied are you that there is or was:**

	<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Very dissatisfied</i>
Adequate provision of places for pre-school children (0-5) in the village	36 (19.7%)	70 (38.3%)	49 (26.8%)	21 (11.5%)	7 (3.8%)
Adequate provision of places for primary school children (5-11) in the village	25 (14.1%)	81 (45.8%)	43 (24.3%)	22 (12.4%)	6 (3.4%)
Sufficient educational provision (outside the village) for Bramley secondary school (11-18) young people	12 (6.7%)	62 (34.8%)	51 (28.7%)	32 (18.0%)	21 (11.8%)

# Neighbourhood Planning

**Q14 Where do your children attend school?**

**Page 8**

169 (100.0%)

**Q15 If still in education - where do children over 16 attend?**

81 (100.0%)

**Q16 Thinking about village youth organizations, are/were your children ever in any of the following (please tick all that apply):**

Beavers.....	40	37.7%
Cubs .....	37	34.9%
Scouts.....	28	26.4%
Rainbows .....	52	49.1%
Brownies .....	59	55.7%
Guides .....	32	30.2%
Other.....	15	14.2%
If other (please specify)	24	(100.0%)

**Q17 If you have any comments on services for children, please record them in the space below:**

77 (100.0%)

## The environment

**Q18 Thinking about the mix of different housing types in the village, please tell us how satisfied you are with the provision of the following:**

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Adequate and affordable housing in the village for people who want to live here after they leave home e.g. starter	83 (14.7%)	167 (29.6%)	221 (39.1%)	72 (12.7%)	22 (3.9%)
Adequate and affordable housing in the village for senior citizens who want to stay here but downsize during their retirement years	46 (8.1%)	137 (24.1%)	252 (44.3%)	114 (20.0%)	20 (3.5%)
Independent but sheltered housing for those with mobility or other issues	45 (8.1%)	82 (14.8%)	334 (60.2%)	78 (14.1%)	16 (2.9%)
Affordable housing e.g. housing association	103 (18.9%)	154 (28.3%)	220 (40.4%)	43 (7.9%)	24 (4.4%)
Affordable family homes	75 (13.4%)	224 (39.9%)	189 (33.7%)	58 (10.3%)	15 (2.7%)
Large detached/Executive housing	82 (14.8%)	214 (38.7%)	214 (38.7%)	32 (5.8%)	11 (2.0%)

**Q19 Thinking about housing development, please tick as many of the following statements with which you agree**

New developments are inevitable because of the national housing requirement, as long as the local community can influence the location .....	109	(18.4%)
New developments are fine as long as village facilities (school, doctor, buses, shops etc.) grow at the same pace .....	242	(40.9%)
I don't mind small new developments of no more than half a dozen on the same site .....	163	(27.5%)
There has already been too much new building in Bramley and I don't want to see any more .....	395	(66.7%)

**Q20 Thinking about the design and style of new developments and considering the rural nature of Bramley, please indicate the importance of the following to you**

Very important	Important	Indifferent	Not important	Not at all important	Don't know
----------------	-----------	-------------	---------------	----------------------	------------



## Neighbourhood Planning

Parking - sensible off road drives and garages that cars can fit into	394 (67.2%)	170 (29.0%)	15 (2.6%)	2 (0.3%)	2 (0.3%)	3 (0.5%)
Closeness to neighbors	127 (22.4%)	186 (32.8%)	162 (28.6%)	63 (11.1%)	14 (2.5%)	15 (2.6%)
A varied mix of housing types (e.g. houses, flats, bungalows)	114 (20.0%)	230 (40.3%)	147 (25.7%)	49 (8.6%)	22 (3.9%)	9 (1.6%)
Public open space (e.g. greens)	402 (69.0%)	157 (26.9%)	12 (2.1%)	7 (1.2%)	1 (0.2%)	4 (0.7%)
Private open space (e.g. gardens)	300 (52.0%)	231 (40.0%)	33 (5.7%)	6 (1.0%)	2 (0.3%)	5 (0.9%)
Variety of external finishes coloured rendering brick wood cladding etc.	96 (16.9%)	163 (28.6%)	197 (34.6%)	73 (12.8%)	33 (5.8%)	7 (1.2%)
Bin and recycling storage	226 (39.0%)	268 (46.2%)	70 (12.1%)	10 (1.7%)	4 (0.7%)	2 (0.3%)
Traffic calming	226 (39.0%)	212 (36.6%)	73 (12.6%)	37 (6.4%)	29 (5.0%)	2 (0.3%)
Limitation on the height of new housing	249 (43.2%)	199 (34.5%)	89 (15.4%)	30 (5.2%)	7 (1.2%)	3 (0.5%)
A linked network of foot and cycle paths	281 (48.5%)	224 (38.7%)	52 (9.0%)	10 (1.7%)	9 (1.6%)	3 (0.5%)

In the following questions about street lighting, the level of lighting means both the distances between lamp posts and the brightness of the light

**Q 21** Thinking about street lighting in the area of the village where you live, which of the following statements best fits your view?

There is street lighting and I am happy with this .....	327 (54.5%)
There is street lighting and I wish there was not .....	51 (8.5%)
I have no strong opinion about street lighting in my road.....	51 (8.5%)
There is no street lighting and I wish there was .....	59 (9.8%)
There is no street lighting and I am happy with this .....	121 (20.2%)

**Q 22** Thinking about street lighting in other areas of the village, which of the following statements best fits your view?

I am happy with the current levels and locations of street lighting in other areas of the village.....	262 (45.5%)
I am happy with existing levels of street lighting but would like to see other locations added (Please specify in the box below).....	101 (17.3%)
I have no strong opinions about street lighting in the village .....	121 (20.5%)
I am not happy with either the levels or the locations of current street lighting in the village (Please use the space below to expand on your answers) .....	110 (18.8%)
Comments:	221 (100.0%)

**Q23** Would you be in favour of street lighting being switched off at, for example, midnight for environmental reasons?

Yes.....	455 (77.0%)	No .....	147.. (24.9%)
----------	-------------	----------	---------------

**Q24** If you have any comments on the environment section in general, please record them in the space below

104 (100.0%)

## Maintenance of the Village

**Q25** Thinking about the appearance and maintenance of the following public areas and facilities in the village, please make one selection for each location

	Well maintained/ pleasure to look at or use	Presentable	Ok / adequate	Needs attention	Not acceptable / shabby / run down / disgrace
Clift Meadow	276 (47.8%)	217 (37.6%)	64 (11.1%)	13 (2.3%)	7 (1.2%)
Bramley Green (Bramley Green Road & immediate area)	100 (17.8%)	261 (46.4%)	148 (26.3%)	41 (7.3%)	12 (2.1%)
The Village Hall	80 (14.1%)	233 (41.2%)	176 (31.1%)	60 (10.6%)	17 (3.0%)

## Neighbourhood Planning

---

The Allotments	52 (10.7%)	188 (38.8%)	216 (44.5%)	24 (4.9%)	5 (1.0%)
Churchyard	112 (21.1%)	244 (45.9%)	148 (27.8%)	23 (4.3%)	5 (0.9%)
Verge and hedge maintenance	43 (7.4%)	183 (31.6%)	173 (29.8%)	141 (24.3%)	40 (6.9%)
The pond on Lane End	19 (3.6%)	73 (13.7%)	117 (22.0%)	199 (37.4%)	124 (23.3%)
Bramley Frith (near Electricity Lane)	47 (9.0%)	147 (28.1%)	249 (47.5%)	71 (13.5%)	10 (1.9%)

**Q26**      **Would you like to see more decorative and ornamental displays (plants, flowers, monuments etc.) around the village?**

Yes.....346 (59.3%)    No .....237 (40.7%)

**Q27**      **How satisfied are you with the care and preservation of trees in the village and surrounding areas**

<i>Very Satisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Very Dissatisfied</i>
36 (6.0%)	294 (49.2%)	165 (27.6%)	74 (12.4%)	28 (4.7%)

## Footpaths-pedestrian and rural

Page 11

### Q28 How satisfied are you with:

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Maintenance of rural footpaths	21 (3.6%)	214 (36.8%)	131 (22.5%)	180 (31.0%)	35 (6.0%)
Maintenance of existing village pavements	27 (4.6%)	250 (43.0%)	112 (19.3%)	160 (27.5%)	32 (5.5%)
Clearly marked and well signposted off-road and rough footpaths/bridleways through the fields around the village	17 (3.0%)	235 (41.1%)	185 (32.3%)	123 (21.5%)	12 (2.1%)
Adequate provision of pedestrian footpaths through the village	31 (5.4%)	298 (51.6%)	118 (20.5%)	106 (18.4%)	24 (4.2%)
Provision of pedestrian crossing places (e.g. the central islands at the Smithy, Campbell Road etc.) on the main routes throughout the village	36 (6.3%)	277 (48.8%)	149 (26.2%)	81 (14.3%)	25 (4.4%)
Footpaths to other villages	11 (1.9%)	89 (15.7%)	164 (28.9%)	178 (31.4%)	125 (22.0%)

### Q29 Please suggest improvements to footpaths and/or maintenance of the village in the box below 242 (100.0%)

## Traffic and road safety

### Q30 Do you think there should be a pedestrian crossing installed by the village school?

334 (56.9%) Yes      77 (13.1%) No      179 (30.5%) No opinion

### Q31 How satisfied are you with the standard of the following services in Bramley?

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Road surface maintenance -e.g. pothole repair	6 (1.0%)	71 (12.0%)	44 (7.4%)	248 (41.8%)	232 (39.1%)
Roadside care / street cleaning	24 (4.1%)	256 (43.4%)	171 (29.0%)	89 (15.1%)	57 (9.7%)
Road surface water drainage	12 (2.1%)	132 (22.7%)	113 (19.4%)	197 (33.8%)	137 (23.5%)
Winter weather service (snow/ice clearance)	13 (2.2%)	147 (25.1%)	144 (24.6%)	182 (31.1%)	105 (17.9%)

### Q32 Are you aware that there is a helpline - 0845 603 5633 - for reporting problems with any of the issues in Q31?

93 (15.7%) Yes      499 (84.3%) No

### Q33 Have you used this service?

50 (8.5%) Yes      539 (91.8%) No

### Q34 Thinking about traffic in the village, please indicate whether you think any of the following are an issue:

	Is an issue	No opinion	Not an issue
The number of large/HGV vehicles passing through the village	354 (60.5%)	121 (20.7%)	110 (18.8%)
The speed of vehicles passing through the village	447 (75.5%)	47 (7.9%)	98 (16.6%)
The management of traffic flow	325 (56.0%)	127 (21.9%)	128 (22.1%)
The enforcement of traffic regulations	314 (54.0%)	139 (23.9%)	128 (22.0%)
Traffic signs	125 (21.9%)	185 (32.5%)	260 (45.6%)

### Q35 Do you think there are some areas around the village that would benefit from 20mph speed limits?

300 (53.1%) Yes      268 (47.4%) No  
If yes, where?      297 (100.0%)

# Neighbourhood Planning

## Q36 How satisfied are you with the following

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
That cyclists are adequately catered for around the village	13 (2.3%)	122 (21.2%)	218 (37.9%)	166 (28.9%)	56 (9.7%)
With the provision of on-street parking around the village	8 (1.4%)	118 (20.6%)	200 (34.8%)	180 (31.4%)	68 (11.8%)
With parking availability around your home	112 (19.4%)	262 (45.5%)	86 (14.9%)	77 (13.4%)	39 (6.8%)
That there is adequate parking available in local public places, e.g. church, allotments and village hall	39 (6.7%)	272 (47.1%)	175 (30.3%)	76 (13.1%)	16 (2.8%)
The level of parking available at the Clift surgery	18 (3.1%)	204 (35.2%)	130 (22.4%)	195 (33.6%)	33 (5.7%)
The availability of car parking for Bramley Station	10 (1.7%)	61 (10.4%)	66 (11.3%)	235 (40.1%)	214 (36.5%)
Amount of parking available at Bramley Primary School at drop off and pick up times	10 (1.8%)	28 (5.0%)	241 (43.0%)	133 (23.8%)	148 (26.4%)

## Q37 How satisfied are you with existing traffic calming measures in use approaching and through the village

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Speed limits	53 (9.0%)	275 (46.9%)	71 (12.1%)	121 (20.6%)	66 (11.3%)
Pinch points (near Strawberry Fields)	24 (4.2%)	245 (42.5%)	117 (20.3%)	119 (20.7%)	71 (12.3%)
Colored surfaces and speed markings on road surface	23 (4.1%)	250 (44.2%)	178 (31.4%)	76 (13.4%)	39 (6.9%)
Vehicle activated signs - speed warning signs	44 (7.6%)	229 (39.5%)	153 (26.4%)	108 (18.6%)	46 (7.9%)
Yellow lines	25 (4.3%)	209 (36.1%)	177 (30.6%)	103 (17.8%)	65 (11.2%)
Width/weight restrictions for HGVs (such as Vyne Road/Cufau de Lane)	27 (4.6%)	181 (31.2%)	163 (28.1%)	113 (19.4%)	97 (16.7%)

## Q38 If you have any comments on traffic and road safety, please record them in the space below: 242 (100.0%)

## Recycling and domestic waste

## Q39 How satisfied are you with:

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Facilities to recycle domestic waste from your home	262 (44.0%)	263 (44.2%)	28 (4.7%)	32 (5.4%)	10 (1.7%)
The number of public recycling facilities in Bramley	98 (16.9%)	236 (40.6%)	132 (22.7%)	91 (15.7%)	24 (4.1%)
The frequency of the collection of the black domestic rubbish bins	315 (53.0%)	252 (42.4%)	16 (2.7%)	8 (1.3%)	3 (0.5%)
The frequency of the collection of the green recycling bins	274 (45.8%)	266 (44.5%)	19 (3.2%)	30 (5.0%)	9 (1.5%)
The number of litter bins in Bramley	69 (11.7%)	233 (39.5%)	161 (27.3%)	105 (17.8%)	22 (3.7%)

## Q40 If there was a FREE collection of glass as part of the domestic waste collection would you use it?

547 (93.8%) Yes 36 (6.2%) No

## Q41 If there was a FREE collection of garden waste as part of the refuse collection services would you use it



# Neighbourhood Planning

543 (91.9%) Yes

48 (8.1%) No

Page 13

**Q42** If you have any comments on recycling and waste, please record them in the space below:  
146 (100.0%)

## Provision of utilities

**Q43** How satisfied are you with the provision and supply of the following in your area?

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Electricity	200 (33.7%)	302 (50.9%)	38 (6.4%)	42 (7.1%)	11 (1.9%)
Gas	222 (38.4%)	292 (50.5%)	53 (9.2%)	2 (0.3%)	9 (1.6%)
Water	227 (38.5%)	289 (49.0%)	47 (8.0%)	18 (3.1%)	9 (1.5%)
Fixed line phone services	175 (30.1%)	300 (51.5%)	66 (11.3%)	32 (5.5%)	9 (1.5%)
Mobile phone network coverage	49 (8.5%)	186 (32.2%)	76 (13.1%)	173 (29.9%)	94 (16.3%)
Broadband services and speed	15 (2.6%)	92 (16.1%)	48 (8.4%)	166 (29.0%)	251 (43.9%)
Drainage and sewage	122 (20.7%)	278 (47.2%)	101 (17.1%)	53 (9.0%)	35 (5.9%)

**Q44** Please explain your response to Q43 (e.g. details of operators etc.)  
335 (100.0%)

**Q45** Have you ever experienced interruptions to the power supply to your home?  
527 (88.7%) Yes 84 (14.1%) No

**Q46** If yes, please indicate the frequency  
251 (48.2%) Occasionally 20 (3.8%) Weekly 45 (8.6%) Monthly 133 (25.5%) Quarterly 112 (21.5%) Yearly

**Q47** If yes, please indicate the average time of outage  
393 (100.0%)

## Noise/light pollution

**Q48** Are you bothered by any of the following types of disturbance?

	Never	Occasionally	Daily	Weekly	Monthly
Traffic noise	286 (48.8%)	214 (36.5%)	79 (13.5%)	5 (0.9%)	2 (0.3%)
Social noise	197 (33.6%)	301 (51.4%)	43 (7.3%)	33 (5.6%)	12 (2.0%)
Military noise	180 (30.7%)	263 (44.8%)	55 (9.4%)	73 (12.4%)	16 (2.7%)
Train noise	319 (54.9%)	180 (31.0%)	68 (11.7%)	7 (1.2%)	7 (1.2%)
Building and construction and other mechanical noise	290 (50.4%)	256 (44.5%)	11 (1.9%)	6 (1.0%)	12 (2.1%)
Alarm/home security systems	211 (36.1%)	339 (58.0%)	5 (0.9%)	12 (2.1%)	17 (2.9%)

## Transport

**Q49** How often do you use the local train services?  
81 (13.5%) Daily 99 (16.6%) Weekly 105 (17.6%) Monthly 287 (48.0%) Occasionally 43 (7.2%) Never  
If never, please indicate why in the space provided 41 (100.0%)

**Q50** How satisfied are you with:

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
The local train services to Basingstoke and Reading	208 (35.9%)	267 (46.1%)	53 (9.2%)	43 (7.4%)	8 (1.4%)
The station facilities at Bramley	91 (15.8%)	256 (44.4%)	117 (20.3%)	94 (16.3%)	19 (3.3%)

## Neighbourhood Planning

### Q51 Would you like to see a footbridge at Bramley Station?

448 (75.5%) *Yes*

86 (14.5%) *No*

59 (9.9%) *No opinion*

### Q52 How often do you use the local bus services?

11 (1.8%) *Daily* 30 (5.0%) *Weekly* 13 (2.2%) *Monthly* 136 (22.8%) *Occasionally* 406 (68.1%) *Never*

*If never, please indicate why in the space provided*

269 (100.0%)

### Q53 How satisfied are you with:

	<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Very dissatisfied</i>
The local bus services to Tadley	6 (1.3%)	49 (10.7%)	354 (77.3%)	33 (7.2%)	16 (3.5%)
Basingstoke (via Sherfield)	8 (1.7%)	78 (17.0%)	312 (67.8%)	46 (10.0%)	16 (3.5%)
Basingstoke (via Sherborne)	5 (1.1%)	44 (9.9%)	323 (72.9%)	40 (9.0%)	31 (7.0%)
The provision and location of bus stops	19 (4.1%)	142 (31.0%)	264 (57.6%)	26 (5.7%)	7 (1.5%)
The provision and location of bus shelters in Bramley	12 (2.6%)	111 (24.1%)	275 (59.8%)	49 (10.7%)	13 (2.8%)

### Q54 If you DO NOT currently use the bus service, please indicate if any of the following improvements would encourage you to use it (tick as many as apply)

*Different routes* ..... 96 (33.4%)    *Cheaper fares* ..... 110 (38.3%)    *Timetable and scheduling improvements* ..... 149 (51.9%)  
*Greater frequency* ..... 184 (64.1%)    *Access for those with disabilities* ..... 19 (6.6%)

## Economy

### Q55 How satisfied are you with the services provided by the village sub-post office?

103 (17.4%) *Very satisfied*

273 (46.0%) *Satisfied*

136 (22.9%) *Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied*

54 (9.1%) *Dissatisfied*

28 (4.7%) *Very dissatisfied*

# Neighbourhood Planning

**Q56 How often do you use the post office in Bramley? Page 15**

26 (4.4%) *Daily* 155 (26.1%) *Weekly* 121 (20.4%) *Monthly* 257 (43.3%) *Occasionally* 40 (6.7%) *Never*  
*If never, please explain your reasons why*  
 59 (100.0%)

**Q57 If you use the post office-for what services? (please tick all that apply)**

*Stamps, postage and packaging requirements* 550 (97.5%) *Cash withdrawal* .....190 (33.7%)  
*Pensions* .....18 (3.2%) *Foreign currency*.....49 (8.7%)  
*Banking services* .....55 (9.8%)

**Q58 How likely would you be to use a village market if one was established to run periodically in the parish (a farmers' market)?**

340 (57.6%) *Very* 224 (38.0%) *Maybe* 34 (5.8%) *Not at all*

**Q59 If a farmers market (or similar) came to Bramley - what frequency would you recommend?**

148 (25.6%) *Fortnightly* 338 (58.4%) *Monthly* 112 (19.3%) *Quarterly*

**Q60 How satisfied are you with the number and type of eating/drinking establishments in the village?**

28 (4.8%) *Very satisfied* 164 (27.8%) *Dissatisfied*  
 155 (26.3%) *Satisfied* 94 (16.0%) *Very dissatisfied*  
 169 (28.7%) *Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied*

**Q61 How often do you use the following:**

	<i>Daily</i>	<i>Weekly</i>	<i>Monthly</i>	<i>Occasionally</i>	<i>Never</i>
The Bramley Inn	2 (0.3%)	33 (5.6%)	51 (8.6%)	251 (42.5%)	254 (43.0%)
Indian Restaurant (adjacent to the Bramley Inn)	0 (0.0%)	15 (2.6%)	67 (11.6%)	243 (41.9%)	255 (44.0%)
The Bramley Bakery	6 (1.0%)	108 (18.1%)	100 (16.8%)	320 (53.7%)	62 (10.4%)
Mobile fish and chip van	0 (0.0%)	11 (1.9%)	11 (1.9%)	88 (15.3%)	466 (80.9%)
Ice cream van	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.5%)	9 (1.5%)	152 (26.0%)	420 (71.9%)

**Q62 If you have any comments on the village economy, please record them in the space below**

146 (100.0%)

# Neighbourhood Planning

## About you

### Q63 How many people including children live in your household?

Aged 0-4.....	92 (100.0%)
Aged 5-10.....	87 (100.0%)
Aged 11-16.....	82 (100.0%)
Aged 17-18.....	33 (100.0%)
Aged 19-24.....	66 (100.0%)
Aged 25-44.....	191 (100.0%)
Aged 45-59.....	239 (100.0%)
Aged 60-64.....	82 (100.0%)
Aged 65-74.....	97 (100.0%)
Aged 75-84.....	42 (100.0%)
Aged 85+ .....	16 (100.0%)

### Q64 Why do you live in Bramley? (Please tick all that apply)

Local to family .....	132.. (22.8%)
Family roots here .....	59 10.2%)
Work .....	167 (28.9%)
Location and access to main road and rail networks.....	285.. (49.3%)
Lifestyle/rural location & access to open spaces.....	389.. (67.3%)
Availability of housing.....	90.. (15.6%)
Availability of affordable/social housing.....	27 (4.7%)
Other.....	37 (6.4%)
If other (please specify)	79 (100.0%)

### Q65 Is your property:

515 (87.3%) Owned	59 (10.0%) Rented (housing association)
20 (3.4%) Rented (private)	

### Q66 Are you in a Neighbourhood Watch scheme?

184 (31.2%) Yes	346 (58.6%) No	64 (10.8%) Don't know
-----------------	----------------	-----------------------

### Q67 How long have you lived in Bramley?

Less than a year .....	25 (4.2%)	26-50 years.....	73 12.3%)
1-5 years.....	..123 (20.7%)	51+ years.....	9... (1.5%)
6-15 years.....	..236 (39.7%)	Whole life .....	13 (2.2%)
16-25 years.....	..120 (20.2%)		




## Neighbourhood Planning

---

**Q68 As far as you know, how long do you intend to stay in Bramley?**

<i>Less than a year</i> .....	10	( 1.8%)
<i>1-5 years</i> .....	109	( 9.3%)
<i>6-15 years</i> .....	139	( 24.6%)
<i>16-25 years</i> .....	67	( 11.9%)
<i>26-50 years</i> .....	30	( 5.3% )
<i>51+ years</i> .....	18	( 3.2% )
<i>Whole life</i> .....	212	( 37.6%)

**Data Protection:** Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council confirms that any data it receives in response to this survey will be processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. To request a copy of the information the council holds about you write to the Data Protection Officer, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Civic Offices, London Road, Basingstoke, RG21 4AH or email [dpo@basingstoke.gov.uk](mailto:dpo@basingstoke.gov.uk)



The Words that stand out from the comments of the Marmite Quiz are, VILLAGE, FACILITIES, DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE, TRAFFIC, SCHOOL, SHOPS

## Bramley Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire

Please fill in details clearly

### Household details:

Name:..... Email

address:.....

Home Address: ..... number in Household.....

Please provide the above details so that we avoid duplication and it will allow us to keep you updated on developments.

On Behalf of the Bramley Parish Council, the Bramley Neighbourhood Steering Committee has put together this questionnaire asking residents of our village to rank on scale of 1 to 10, 1 being not important, 10 being very important, the issues seen as being of importance to Bramley in the future. You can add comments in the free space provided. Please complete and return it to the collection points listed in the attached brief no later than the 9<sup>th</sup> June. This is an opportunity for all household members to give a collective response. Alternatively, all individuals are invited to complete their own. Copies of the questionnaire can be downloaded from web site

[www.BramleyNDP.org.uk](http://www.BramleyNDP.org.uk) or can be completed on-line. There are 9 topics, rank each

on scale of 1 to 10:-

Example: How important is it to you to have a red car?

4

Not very Important

### HOW IMPORTANT IS IT TO YOU.....

**Housing:** .....To influence the design and location of new developments?

**Transport:** .....To have ease of movement in and out of the Parish?  
e.g. Public Transport, Private cars etc.

**Education:** .....To have schooling facilities in Bramley?

**Environment:** .....To live in a Rural Community, have open spaces and  
Commuter access?

**Communication:** .....To have faster Broadband and mobile connectivity?

**Medical Services:**.....To have timely access to medical services in the  
Parish? **Recreational Facilities:** To have facilities for all age groups?

**Safety Security:**.....To feel safe and secure in and around Bramley?  
e.g. at home and in Public spaces.

**Employment:** .....To have Local employment facilities?

### Other Comments or feedback;

.....  
.....

Information supplied on this form will be analyzed and used for the purposes of the Neighbourhood Plan. If you have any queries please contact Malcolm Bell, Chairman of Steering Group on: [chair@BramleyNDP.org.uk](mailto:chair@BramleyNDP.org.uk)

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

## Comments made by residents on the Questionnaire

Page 20

### Paper Applications:-

#### Housing:-

There are too many houses-cars crowding small resources and roads

Development to be in line to existing village and its amenities

Few New additional housing in Bramley

Bramley is big enough. No more housing.

If houses are to be built, make sure they fit in to the village atmosphere.

No further development in the centre of the village, only on the periphery

Stop the destruction of Green Fields. Overcrowded and lack of Wild Places through development which has to be stopped.

Limit No of new houses and keep Bramley a Village.

With all the development, becoming one with Reading and Basingstoke with no improvement in Infrastructure to back it up. The over exposure to Social housing led to issues of dog fouling, litter. Fly tipping and general disrespect of property.

Too much housing development in our rural community with no improvement in the Infrastructure

Any new housing comes with improved infrastructure

Lack of Infrastructure in Bramley for existing housing let alone any new housing

Remember this is a Village and not a town.

The village infrastructure cannot cope with increased housing. The village will be swallowed up.

High priority to higher architectural and planning standards. Been the case for many years

#### Transport:-

Improvement in Road access out of Bramley through the railway crossing is imperative

Essential parking for the Station, not on nearby streets.

Less heavy traffic on Silchester Rd

Fixing of Potholes

Commuter access low priority

Potholes in the lanes to a minimum

Restricted parking in Coopers lane with yellow lines.

Railway Parking. Dangerous with parking around the station

With C32 blocked by railway, needs to be way of easing traffic once gates are open.

Parking near the One Stop blocks Traffic, and people turning into bakery from the west side is dangerous and selfish.

No commuter parking in Bramley. Need Rail stop in Chineham. Bramley is becoming a car park during the week for people that do not live here.

Ticket Machine on Platform 1

Widen the C32 to take account of more traffic

Parking at/near the Station needs sorting

With Diversions in place at times, the lanes around Bramley left in an awful state. Passing positions required.

Adequate parking for station and drop off for the school avoiding nuisance for those living near-by.

Improved footpaths and cycling tracks

One bus per hour into Basingstoke is not good enough. Require every 30 minutes.

Roundabout at the end of Campbell road

Very bad road facilities through the village and the volume of traffic is problem

Too much housing affected the road.

Better bus services to Tadley

Pinch Points should be removed as dangerous and distracting, and the money spent in restoring road like folly lane.

Barriers down 10 to 15 mins when there are frequent trains. Barriers should be reprogrammed to be down minimum time.

#### Medical Services:-

Surgery is becoming User Friendly. It must be enlarged or upgraded as matter of urgency

Have Access to Chemist



## Environment:-

Have we a Landscape Plan for the Public Open Spaces, to enhance the village and village life.  
Priority has to be given to protecting the Green and Recreational Areas  
Upkeep of Pavements, footpaths and grass verges  
The Shop insufficient to meet needs. More shopping facilities- antique warehouse with restaurant  
Maintenance of green open spaces, Longbridge Road site for recreational purposes for Children  
Retain wonderful countryside, keeping trees as much as possible  
Bramley to remain a village and not become a small town.  
Needs amenities for the elderly to enjoy and socialise  
Hedges and Trees cut back,  
Facilities and Infrastructure to support new development  
No easy commuter access so that Bramley becomes a dormitory Village  
Infrastructure needs to be addressed, more shops and larger school  
Communication:-  
Faster Broadband  
Love fast internet  
Fast Internet access for Business, crucial for success and prosperity.  
Rural community over the past 15 years has been destroyed by 75%.  
Need Fibre Optic Broadband

## Facilities:-

With large amount of housing, another shop on the west side of the railway  
Another Shop, supermarket.  
Bramley keeps growing but there is no improvement in the Infrastructure.  
More shopping facilities  
Need a recreation centre and a better pub, a better shop and cheaper tea shop as that is expensive.  
Lack of good shops is a problem  
Lived in Bramley for 8 yrs, and despite repeated Questionnaires, building increased, transport declined, facilities remained stagnant.  
Someone get a grip of things.

## Safety:-

Street lighting  
Station Footbridge required  
Like to see less street lighting, especially in Coopers Lane  
Require good pathways  
Footbridge over the Rail  
Ease movement can conflict with safety and nobody wants the C32 widened.  
Footbridge required  
Footpath to Sherfield  
Children Safety issue at present  
Footbridge  
Pelican crossing across the main road.  
Footbridge over the level crossing  
A car turning right from the west over the level crossing holds up traffic and is dangerous. Needs addressing  
Need for Footbridge  
Footbridge over Rail crossing  
No Street Lights  
Traffic Speeding is far too prevalent  
Footbridge Required

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

## Recreational:-

No facilities for teenagers in the village

If facilities for teenagers are not provided, do not be surprised that they wander the streets and get into trouble

Facilities for continuing dancing for youngsters.

Bramley has one registered VILLAGE GREEN, No VG243. HCC established it as a play area. When are the PC going to take responsibility for the area

## Education:-

Educational facilities need to be good quality with access to secondary schools

Too much development has adversely affected the school

Bramley School is under Special Measure as a result of poor increase in facilities with development. Someone get a grip of things!!!

## Comments from On-Line Survey Results May 2013

- 1) Bramley does not have the infrastructure to support further development. The existence of the railway station is not a reason to fill the village with even more houses. One shop, overcrowded surgery and poor bus service
- 2) The traffic flow would be better if there was no right turn from train into the village bakery, and further if cars outside the shop were prevented from contravening road traffic rules and not park on the pavement. The village could benefit from Traffic bumps to slow traffic down and a crossing near the shop to be able to get into Bramley Lane for the school.
- 3) Unsure of the value of the Questionnaire. Suspect everyone would answer 10.
- 4) Just thanks for the effort. Bramley is a great community and we should want to protect and grow the village in harmony with the needs of the people. Lack of Speed enforcement is important.
- 5) The services are already stretched; school, surgery and further development will stretch it to beyond capacity. Parking is issue, particularly down Coopers Lane, and as queuing when the barriers are down. Broadband and mobile communication is vital. Feeling safe and secure is also area of concern with members of the travelling community using and destroying the village on a weekly basis. Medical services congratulated on the service provided.
- 6) Pedestrian Bridge over the crossing as you can wait 10 minutes for 3 trains to go through.
- 7) The issue of no-residents parking near the railway is problem. Why not have parking permits for residents of Bramley. Parking restrictions around the station will cause people to park near the school.  
Why are all the facilities near the railway or on the West side of the rail? Recall for some form of Community Building on Farriers Close?  
Can we include plans for an all-weather footpath between Bramley and Sherfield?
- 8) Want Bramley to remain Rural.
- 9) Bramley Apple (the logo) is named after an area of Leeds in Yorkshire, not Bramley in Hampshire.
- 10) Fix the potholes in the road.  
Can we also do something for cycle/footpath between Bramley and Sherfield?
- 11) It is extremely important that the village stays safe place in which to live with real sense of community and village status i.e. Surrounded by fields and space and one village does not merge into another with housing development.
- 12) With increase in housing there needs to be dramatic increase in the infrastructure. Recreation facilities insufficient for all age groups (bowling green, badminton facilities etc. required). Parking is great concern both at the shop which endangers pedestrians and at the station which causes misery to nearby residents.
- 13) Road in Bramley is too busy.  
There should be no more big housing estates.  
Bramley School having to expand to take extra children but parking is chaos around the area. Secondary schools are not near.  
Traffic calming measures are pointless.
- 14) Very important that residents have say as to where new developments are sited. If new housing, it needs to be spread across the whole of Bramley.
- 15) Other items, Street lighting, passenger footbridge, increased measures to slow speeding traffic, more investment in road infrastructure.

16) BDBC cannot be trusted. At Taylors farm mature trees were cut down with excuse that they would be able to bypass Cufaude Lane and provide a direct link to the industrial estate. BDBC are not able to use common sense.

17) Want new residents to be involved in Parish life, not just using the village to commute along the A33. We feel it is extremely important for the Parish Council to be aware of the parish boundaries and the impact new developments anywhere in the parish will have on Bramley.

18) Hard concrete passing places along Folly Lane to avoid the destruction of the verges.

19) Better station Parking. Pedestrian footbridge.  
The village cannot sustain further development.

20) Schooling facilities in need of finance and updating.

21) Footpath between Bramley and Sherfield. No new housing in the village that will destroy the village, rural community. No need for Employment facilities or recreational facilities if it means we become a small town.

## Survey Results for the 28<sup>th</sup> September Original Material From the Site Consultation

	none	RBL site	Church farm cottages	North of School	North & NW Village hall	Minchens Lane	East of Folly lane	Strawberry Fields	Carpark Clift/minchens	Comments
1						100		100	Yes	footbridge Footbpath to Sherfield Widen Minchens lane
2						200			Yes NW of surgery	footbridge on station south end of platform or subway Shop at german Road
3		20	50		50	80			Yes	Station/clift meadow as village centre
4						200			Yes	cycle way and bypass north of village
5					200				Yes	no development if possible otherwise Village Hall More outdoor recreational facilities
6						200				Bypass north of village Lights along C32 east and west railway line warning of level crossing closed
7						200			Yes	car park northern end under pylons
8			50			150			Yes	
9						200			Yes	no roundabout at Campbell road
10					x	x			Yes	x = split but not quantified maintain views north of Bramley green no development East of railway line Centre of village Clift meadow/station area
11						200			Yes	no roundabout at Campbell road
12		x	x	x	x	x				Footpath to Sherfield
										bowling green pool youth facility
13								200	Yes Yes	no roundabout at Campbell road reduce lighting coopers lane swimming pool
14						200				Minchens /clift to be centre
15		x							Yes	cycle path to sherfield Football pitch on Clift Meadow
16						200			Yes	cycle path to sherfield Football pitch on Clift Meadow



# Neighbourhood Planning

	none	RBL site	Church farm cottages	North of School	North & NW Village hall	Minchens Lane	East of Folly lane	Strawberry Fields	Carpark Clift/minchens	Comments
17	x								Yes	take out pinch points reduce lighting in the village
18		x	x	x	x				Yes	x= small developments Footpath to Sherfield
19						200			Yes	Village hall at Strawberryfields German road community facility No razors Farm or Cufade farm development traffic calming sherfield road east of Campbell road
20						200			Yes	Move surgery to football pitch
21							200			footbridge on station
22			x		x				Yes	x=split not quantified protect views north at minchens and Strawberry field shops at RBL site footpath from carpark east of oakmead through rail work area. relocate football field north of Clift Meadow
23						200				Minchens/Clift as centre preserve Strawberry field protected views
24						100		100		Facilities east of railway
25						100		100		
26		x			x	x			Yes	x= split not quantified improve roads north of C32 Shops north of clift meadow
27					x	x				x= split not quantified clift /station as centre shops in the west Carpark behind Bromelia close
28				x					Yes	Clift /station a centre more shops
29						200				minchen/clift as centre
30						100		100	Yes	facilities east of railway line footbridge on station

The Charts give the answers to the question asked, faced with 200 houses allocated to Bramley through the Emerging Local Plan, to be sited by Neighbourhood Planning, "Where do you think they should be sited".

	none	RBL site	Church farm cottages	North of School	North & NW Village hall	Minchens Lane	East of Folly lane	Strawberry Fields	Carpark Clift/minchens	Comments
31							x			x= develop east of folly lanr at Green Farm.
32						100		100		more shops
33							x	x		x=split not quantified
34						125		75	Yes	Strawberry fields detached private homes Minchens to accommodate balance +all affordable houses footpath to Sherfield move station
35	x									Street lights along all of the C32 Better public transport links to Basingstoke Do not destroy conservation areas and protected views
36										Footbridge on station Better outdoor recreational facilities
37			x		x				yes	x=split not quantified
38			x		x				Yes	x=split not quantified
39		x	50 x	x	x	100 x		50	Yes Yes	x=split not quantified
40										protect views from Bramley Green
41								200		protect view across minchens Strawberryfields can feed off existing services infrastructure "Dutch style" cycle route Preserve the west side of the railway as a "heritage area" with no development, keep it rural.
42										Crossing is dangerous and closed for tooo long. Parking in Coopers Lane and around school needs some more control
43									Yes	Bramley over developed No footbridge wanted Against roadside Traveller defences. Find a solution to traveller "visits" Centre at Clift Meadow area More off road carparking Shop parking a problem No rounabouts within the settlement boundary

Comments made at the Open Day 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> March, 2014.

### COMMENTS, listed in titles, March 2014

1. ROAD, Water and Sewage Infrastructure; Poor road maintenance; Infrastructure not take more; Village is creaking; Impact on Local services; Parish infrastructure need improving; Sewage issue; water and sewage stretched;
2. Doctors Surgery; Needs to expand; Needs to expand; Surgery running at capacity; Expand medical facilities; doctors full; more surgery; overloaded surgery;
3. Village Facilities; Facilities need to improve; Infrastructure needs improving; improvements in village infrastructure; Infrastructure poor; Sparse village facilities; Service infrastructure; New infrastructure; improve infrastructure; infrastructure need improving; improve facilities and infrastructure; infrastructure problems; good balanced benefits for existing community; insufficient infrastructure; improve infrastructure and facility benefits;
4. School better facilities; School cannot cope; Requires improvement; School packed; Lack playing area at school; school full; expand school; overloaded school;
5. Lighting near the station and One Stop
6. Parking Problem; Public transport and Parking; Roads over congested; Parking problems around school; Roads cannot handle more traffic; Parking around the station; Minchens lane improvements; Roads, barrier down time, Parking; Parking at station, traffic problems; Road network and level crossing; Better roads; Parking chaos at the station.; traffic problems at crossing; lack parking at the station; inadequate bus service;
7. Traffic Congestion; Traffic and roads; traffic on the lanes; improvement to surrounding roads;
8. Single shop with poor parking, causes congestion and safety problems; only one shop with parking problems; another shop; Shop/restaurant;
9. Speeding problems

10. Narrow footpaths; Cycle/footpaths, going to Sherfield; better footpath cycle ways; cycle paths;
11. Dentist
12. Community centre; Community facilities
13. Station Footbridge; footbridge;
14. Recreational facilities for all age groups, bowling green; Social facilities.; better recreational for all age groups; bowling green, croquet ;
15. Style housing fitting for village; Density of dwellings, not 3 storey; retirement homes for downsizing; sheltered housing; houses that blend in with existing housing, village; New housing in keeping with village properties; Meadows and open spaces; lower housing density;

### COMMENTS FROM THE Parish Council Questionnaire:-

- I note the statement that "Bramley is at risk from any developer submitting a planning application etc. ... because of [among other things] lack of a Borough local Plan (being prepared).I've lived here 6.5 years and the noddies who are doing that plan were talking about it when I arrived ! They take over 5 years to do the 5 year plan! Ha - ha. It's all so pathetic.
- I think it's inevitable that there will be further housing developments in Bramley so would prefer it be done with negotiation on all sides.
- There are lots of things that need to be taken into account before any building takes place. Road, water and sewerage infrastructure. The impact on the doctor's surgery and other village facilities. These could all be discussed any maybe a solution that meets everyone needs would be the outcome. Maybe a bit of rose tinted spectacles there but one can but hope.
- However much people fight it, the truth is that this country needs more housing. If this deal

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

means that Bramley will have done its bit to take 200 by 2027 or whenever then let's do it with the maximum influence on the developers. If we have taken our 200 then things can go quiet and the PCC can say no to every other application for many years.

- As an aside I am getting pretty fed up with the Bramley attitude to planning and development - which seems to be "the answer is NO, now what was the question/"
- We do not appear to have received the Parish Council Magazine which may include more details of the development - whilst in favour of negotiation would be interested in understanding what the implications of this development will be for other growth in the village.
- Bramley is currently a 'ribbon' development. It would be good to have building in the centre of the village rather than more straggling out at the extremes.
- We need to provide the school with better facilities for its increasing number of pupils and the doctors' surgery needs to have room to expand.
- The doctors' surgery needs room to expand.
- The village needs lighting near the station and 'One Stop'.
- Bramley is not a small village anymore; facilities need to improve to make it a good place for everyone to live.
- The village has to accept some housing (even if only to ensure a supply for children of existing villagers). This seems a reasonable site. It's in the centre of the village, close to the station, shops, school etc. It also strikes me the visual impact is limited. It will also add to the accessible green space in the village (fields are not accessible to ordinary people).
- My concerns would be impact on local services etc. However, it seems to me that these are things that can be negotiated on, with a view to getting something good for the village.
- Overall therefore I support negotiating.
- I am quite opposed to the development on the basis of it not helping Bramley retain its

character as a rural village community and also particularly due to the increased traffic through the village. However it seems likely that it will get the go ahead so the PC should aim to get as many possible benefits, as per the proposed neighbourhood plan.

- Whilst there is any chance that development will go ahead despite the wishes of the local community (as seen by central government over turning most planning refusals), we need to negotiate the best deal possible for Bramley. Any developer offering 'benefits' for Bramley in return for support must provide a written contract for those benefits. If any developer appears to be ignoring the wishes of the local community, then regardless of any loss of benefits, we must oppose all such proposed developments as best we can.
- Good for village
- We need more house but to built a few retails units for local people i.e a dentist or another shop community centre etc. etc.
- While I have concerns about any further building within the Parish of Bramley I am of the opinion that consensual allocation of houses with the benefit of improvements in village infrastructure is preferred as against enforced housing allocation without any benefits. I am concerned however that since arriving in the village in 1994 I have seen a large number of houses built within the village with little or no improvement in facilities. The increase in traffic through the village and parking around the station has long been a serious concern and steps need to be taken to improve the situation if more housing is to be built. In addition, with the increase in traffic a cycle/footpath between Bramley and Sherfield-on-Loddon is required as a matter of urgency. I have seen a number of cyclists come close to being involved in and RTC owing to the speed and volume of traffic using the road.
- The Local Plan allocates 200 houses to Bramley. Because developers have this opportunity to apply before the LP and the NP are in place like other Parishes, then we have to face up to the fact that 200 houses will get built, so let Bramley this time benefit from improvements to lifestyle through improved recreational facilities for all age groups, and improvements to social, medical facilities

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

whilst maintaining as much as possible a Village Environment with Open spaces and protected Countryside views through extra benefits negotiated with the developer

- Minchens Lane will need attention
- I support this development if this is the only development in Bramley in the next 5 years.
- I support the development on the basis that the improvements to the highway are carried out. I am however worried about increased car traffic to the school. I would suggest that the residents of Strawberry Fields are protected by school hours permit parking or similar scheme.
- As there is no realistic chance of stopping the development altogether it does not make sense to oppose it
- Roads, Barriers, Parking >>> Major Issues
- There must be understandable concern about the effect on Bramley infrastructure which is poor and will be aggravated with 200 extra families: especially with limited road access, sparse village facilities and compromised access due to the railway crossing.
- I reluctantly agree that a negotiated agreement must be pursued with the Minchen Lane developers as the alternative is- Strawberry Fields: where I live!
- The community would benefit from extra resource such as shop and restaurant/take away. Ideally would prefer no further housing as will lose village feel and green areas which are so appealing in Bramley but if we fight we won't get anything! Please do not build behind me!!! I brought the house because of the openness and wildlife!
- We must accept some housing somewhere and if this development will fulfil our commitment for a few years then it would at least allow us some input. If the houses built had a style fitting to the village - such as the Beaurepaire style, then that would be excellent. The design could also help to make the village less of a ribbon development with a better village centre. An improved railway crossing would also be very helpful.
- Let's maximise the benefits for the village by co-operation rather than lose improvements
- Impact of traffic in the village needs to be addressed despite what the developer paid - of traffic impact study. Youth club good. Table football / Ping pong / Rather than hi-tec toys
- Naturally against development.
- However, reluctantly central government will pass/approve regardless, so better to negotiate.
- 3 points I think we need to seek to influence :-  
Density of dwellings, preferably not 3-storey  
Use of community fund for community benefit
- % of affordable housing
- To negotiate for protected areas for wildlife, better roads, footpaths, community facilities, a footpath over the railway would help. Drainage must be able to cope.
- Main concern is the traffic and roads. They need to be improved to cope with the increased traffic.
- I'm concerned with drainage / flooding with too intensive building. Infrastructure needs upgrading - water, power and telecomms. Too many vehicles at the moment
- What is the developer offering to do for Bramley as a whole, or simply put: "What's in it for us?"
- I was originally opposed but I understand it needs to happen. I have it on the back of my home so I am concerned about the heights of buildings. Can we get some better roads, local markets, cycle paths and better bus service to Tadley Pool and the hospital? Another pub as well.
- To oppose is futile, let's get the best funding for the village.
- Or alternatively, oppose and then negotiate.
- This keeps housing near the centre of the village. As a result the council and developers should develop village centre and improve facilities and infrastructure
- Prepared to accept development if various criteria's are set e.g. improvement of roads, pathways, recreational facilities etc. Will all homes be for families? Retirement homes are

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

need in Parish as families downsize and don't want to leave area.

- Option of negotiation on the conditions:
  - Infrastructure problem that already exist is properly addressed.
  - Something legally binding for developers to honour in regards to help the village.
- Negotiate only if we have 100% assurance that the developer will give serious consideration to our concerns and only build what is acceptable to the PCC
- Sheltered housing for senior citizens / retired (folk)
- We do not need another German Road situation, so strongly feel that negotiate will be to the benefit of the village rather than oppose it and risk of future developer appeal with no incentive for the village.
- Good balanced development with benefits for the existing community. If we're to get development, let's have a say in it. Good work.
- Some reservations but we suspect it would happen anyway if taken to sec of state. Better to negotiate to get value for the village.
- Keep lines of communication open
- I accept the 200 houses proposed but I would strongly object to more than that in a short period of time, due to the infrastructure issues.
- The current plan offers no core infrastructure improvement to Bramley. The surgery is a private/financial concern. The PC must negotiate a better deal for the village.
- We would like to see a development that blends in with the existing village's buildings as far as possible (if it really has to happen!) TWO VOTERS
- We would like to see a development that blends in with the existing village's buildings as far as possible (if it really has to happen !) TWO VOTERS
- Keep up the good work

- Very important that the design of the new houses is in keeping with the village properties, i.e. interesting, characterful design with lots of difference with + meadows - nature of field to be retained

- We cannot avoid further development unfortunately in Bramley, therefore I believe it is in the best interest of the community to negotiate with Charles Church to secure the best deal available. Plenty has been muted for the youngsters in the village but what about the older villagers for example a bowling green or croquet lawn?

I am very worried about the traffic implications, particularly around the level crossing.

- We will no longer be a village, just more of a sprawl, but it seems inevitable that we have to accept more houses so it would be better to work with any developer to negotiate the best outcome for our community.
- As there are 200 houses in the Local Plan, I think it would be prudent to negotiate and not risk a repeat of the German Road development. Nonetheless, I do feel the proposed development at Minchens Lane appears to exceed the capacity of the infrastructure. One example being the increased volume of traffic directed onto Minchens Lane (single track), which in turn increases volume over the level crossing. To avoid the level crossing at rush-hour, drivers will take the alternative route which could increase traffic past the school, possibly impacting on child safety?
- Whatever happens development will take place so better we develop where we can have a say and get something back into the community. It is very sad that what was once a lovely village is turning into a sprawling unfriendly housing estate.
- This village cannot easily support another 200 houses. There is already significant stress on the community and with only one main road in and out of the village which is already horribly backed up when the train barriers go down (with increasing frequency).



# Neighbourhood Planning

---

- There will need to be significant improvements made to the surrounding area in order for this estate to be built.
- I do have two major concerns; firstly I cannot believe Strawberry Fields is also being discussed as an alternative location on the eastern side of Bramley when residents this side of the railway line have already had to endure near on 300 houses being built on German Road within the past 5 years. Rightly or wrongly, I do think it is only fair that we should seriously consider a site to the west of the line to take up this additional housing. Secondly, the whole parish and PC need to be strong and make it very clear that we should not be expected to be allocated a further 200 homes within the plan period as this becomes totally unjustifiable and to think that near on 700 homes could have been placed upon our small village within a 10 year period.
- We have to protect our village lifestyle and plans I have seen from Charles Church on Minchens Lane seem to make the best of a new development in keeping with our village surrounds and way of life.
- It seems that will most likely end up with this development anyway so I would prefer to opt for the route that means the village may get additional infrastructure and facility benefits.
- Development in Bramley seems inevitable and we would rather have the power to negotiate with a respected and desirable Developer like Charles Church, than have some other option forced upon us. Let's work together with Charles Church to ensure that the Rural Village community is retained as much as possible.
- It is a shame that more housing is planned for Bramley. Our concern is for the strain the extra housing will put on services within the village notably on the school and on the surgery. We object to the building of more houses but understand that building is likely to happen if not here then somewhere else within the village. And if building is inevitable then the PC and the community should be involved in making the best out of it.
- Whilst I would rather not see the development go ahead I believe we need to be realistic that given the lack of local plan this is likely to go ahead. Having the opportunity to influence is critical to Bramley's future and any hope of retaining what matters to residents. Significant thought needs to be given to traffic, the 'countryside' and amenities given the increase in people and traffic,
- This way we should be able to have some measure of input into what happens in future. If further expansion is proposed we will also have more chance of blocking, if not considered appropriate, having accepted this proposal.
- It is disheartening that this development is so close to the existing surgery as this would be an opportunity to insist a second surgery, servicing the increasing population of Bramley, be built. A footbridge crossing the railway line should be installed as a matter of course. Minchens lane is too narrow for the increased traffic and developer needs to widen it prior to any work being carried out.
- Clearly there is pressure for additional development within the Bramley area. I believe that the better option is for the Parish Council to negotiate and as stated seek "enhanced community/ recreational facilities" for the benefit of the whole village. If areas of Bramley are to be developed this looks like the best option with limited impact on other villagers from this location compared say the potential development of Wellington land next to Strawberry Fields. The area to the east of the railway has already had significant development with Bramley Green and further development needs to be balanced across the village location.
- Due to BDBC neglect we find ourselves in a position of weakness against developers, best, therefore would be to negotiate with them as opposition would be hopeless.
- We have all to gain and nothing to lose.
- The open day presented us with false information and it felt as though they were manipulating the facts to get us to agree. The site is prime for development but I feel there are too many houses proposed for this site. The houses should be two storeys maximum and have adequate parking to stop the horrors that currently occur in new estates.

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

- Development is too close to the centre of Bramley, it needs to be further out. The proposed location will amplify the current traffic issues around the country lanes and level crossing, the school and roads cannot support the numbers of new residents.
- Parking issues for the station potentially impacted as those living at the furthest end of the development will drive down and park closer to the station.
- Further traffic issues around the local school as new residents will just take the back roads rather than taking their chances with the level crossing
- The roads are in a poor condition and this will get worse.
- Bramley is becoming less and less of a village, the community spirit is already diluted, will make it worse; we are losing the village lifestyle we came for 16 years ago.
- Bramley cannot support further development and retain its character as a rural village community.
- The Parish infrastructure is already under too much pressure with damaged and flooded roads, an ever busier main road through the village with the additional problems the barriers bring when down. Where will run off water from the proposed site go, straight into the brook that a few years ago flooded and cut off the whole North side of the village including all routes to the school, the work that was done has stopped this happening, if we build more houses it may not cope with heavy rain again.
- The village has 1 shop which has some parking of sorts but a large no's of people choose to park in the road anyway and only 1 pub, all facilities including the strange idea to build yet another new building next to the other buildings on Clift Meadow are at one end of the village which creates more traffic towards the centre of the village anyway? We have issues with parking around the school and further problems with speeding due to inadequate speed reduction measures and narrow footpaths by the main road.
- There is also now a survey been done for an additional 200 houses by Strawberry Fields mix in the masses of people from outside the village that love to park their cars for free to use the station without paying anything to the Parish Council and we are slowly heading for meltdown.
- We took the houses for "Bramley Green" and they didn't even have the courtesy to change the name of the development despite been asked to and couldn't even sell anywhere near as many as they wanted to privately so why should we just accept more houses into the Parish?
- For all the houses already built in our village we have seen no benefit to us. Building more will just make matters worse, especially parking, traffic, school and shops.
- Issues already present Public transport and parking
- Traffic issues at peak hours due to level crossing
- Primary school that 'requires improvement' (Ofsted) so why place more strain on it? Traffic congestion at the school at dropping off/picking up time.
- Poor road maintenance
- Single general store with limited off road parking causing congestion & risks of accidents. Potential increase in traffic with Cufauddale lane development
- Failure of developers to put in infrastructures previously proposed e.g. a new exchange. GP surgery running at capacity
- Minchens lane gets flooded so problems accessing surgery.
- Bramley and surrounding area has already undergone substantial development
- What about development at Manydown farm? Why not develop the other side of the M3 i.e. Cliddesden area this could have easy access to the M3 and a better balanced access to Basingstoke.

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

- As a resident, I feel the infrastructure could not take more; traffic, trains and the school certainly will suffer.
- Application is a cynical attempt to pre-empt the local plan. Bramley is already big enough. School is packed, roads are now seriously congested in the mornings and village is creaking.
- The Parish infrastructure is already under too much pressure with damaged and flooded roads, an ever busier main road through the village with the additional problems the barriers bring when down. Where will run off water from the proposed site go, straight into the brook that a few years ago flooded and cut off the whole North side of the village including all routes to the school, the work that was done has stopped this happening, if we build more houses it may not cope with heavy rain again.
- The village has 1 shop which has some parking of sorts but a large no's of people choose to park in the road anyway and only 1 pub, all facilities including the strange idea to build yet another new building next to the other buildings on Clift Meadow are at one end of the village which creates more traffic towards the centre of the village anyway? We have issues with parking around the school and further problems with speeding due to inadequate speed reduction measures and narrow footpaths by the main road.
- There is also now a survey been done for an additional 200 houses by Strawberry Fields mix in the masses of people from outside the village that love to park their cars for free to use the station without paying anything to the Parish Council and we are slowly heading for meltdown.
- We took the houses for "Bramley Green" and they didn't even have the courtesy to change the name of the development despite been asked to and couldn't even sell anywhere near as many as they wanted to privately so why should we just accept more houses into the Parish?
- Bramley is a small village and only has the infrastructure to cater for such.
- Recent enormous developments have been approved while the infrastructure has not increased. There is no need, and no possible justification, for this extra development in Bramley
- With the large amount of development we have already experienced in Bramley the infrastructure cannot possibly take any more houses - further building will put a strain on an already stretched infrastructure and we are beginning to lose the village feel.
- The recent weather has shown the frail nature of the infrastructure. The proposed site has appeared waterlogged with access cut off from a number of angles (Cufau de Lane, Bramley Road, etc.) due to flooding. We live around the corner from Minchens. The development would impact us dramatically in terms of cars using the Lane as a way of avoiding the level crossing. Before a vehicle even gets to that point though, they would have had to traverse the single track road that is Minchens. There will be significant congestion. Single track (or otherwise roads that are not designed for 2 cars) are a feature of the countryside in this area. Our fear would be that the next step would be to increase the volume of tarmac, adding with it a further impact. The county and country need more housing. We are not opposed to that concept. We are keen that the appropriate process takes place to establish the best possible site. And that the neighbourhood (through the NDP) leads that process.
- The idea of further homes and extra traffic in Bramley is ridiculous. The roads cannot handle the traffic; the infrastructure is not in place and cannot be adapted to cope with further development.
- Minchens Lane is a nightmare as it is without extra traffic, Commuters use all the side roads as parking to use the station, we already wait in line for ages for the train barriers, queues stretch out down the roads each way, idiots overtake the line ups to get to the bakery & Bramley Lane. Extra Houses = more traffic. This development must be OPPOSED
- Concern that the primary school has just been extended, and is now full again. There is a lack of playing area at the school already.

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

- If Minchens lane gets more traffic, the back road will have even more potholes
- Bramley has had disproportionate housing development for many years. If the houses need to be built, build them somewhere else.
- If they are built squeeze the maximum S106 contributions from the developer and spend the money on a station footbridge. Chaos already at the level crossing - 200 further houses will be intolerable.
- The traffic flow in Minchens Lane is already excessive for the narrow lane and awkward bridge, due to the level crossing. The inevitable extra traffic would be dangerous without major reconstruction.
- Our main concerns relate to service infrastructure; rural character of the village, environmental impact. Drainage and sewerage would be an issue. Minchens lane is subject to flooding. Ditches were full this winter. A Victorian sewage infrastructure would be overloaded. 200 houses above the village only leaves one way for sewage to flow: down towards existing properties. Minchens lane is used as a rat run to avoid level crossing. Increased traffic creates a safety hazard for the school.
- We are concerned about:-
- Traffic, vehicle movements, parking, station parking ( lack of )
- The development is in a meadow (used as a storage of flood so where is the water going?) additionally how will the development affect the soil of the surrounding properties, the developer had no idea at their open evening! - It is unknown therefore planning is inappropriate.
- The article refers to new infrastructure but no confirmed detail of the new infrastructure has been confirmed and therefore no a valid option, furthermore if we don't have the development we don't need any additional infrastructure.
- Minchens Lane is totally unsuitable for high volume of traffic 200 houses will generate.
- Bramley simply cannot support another 200 families - both school & doctors full to capacity. The offices opposite Clift Meadow and homes along the street flooded in the past. Building houses on the fields around will exacerbate this causing water ingress to many more properties.
- Any building should be spread through the village, not concentrated in one place. The proposed development irreparably damages the rural feel of Bramley.
- No infrastructure / no highway capacity Not in keeping with the area
- Infrastructure can no cope with more houses. They are not required in Bramley
- Bramley cannot sustain 200 more properties. The roads are already a hazard, 200 more families filtering into the lane will be the final straw.
- Flooding is also a concern as the flash floods of 2007 stand testament. Properties on Minchens Lane and the Street have already been subjected to this
- Current infrastructure, road network & level crossing couldn't sustain 200+ households more. This must be improved first, not as a throw away addition to development.
- Strongly against 200 houses (if that is what CC are proposing) is unsuitable on that site, and this number would better distributed across 2-3 sites. The 'compensation' will not in itself compensate adequately for the loss of green fields.
- Developer has not committed to sufficient enticements. PC should have a definite long list of requirements.
- To buy time - other developers are expressing interest in other sites. Exploit the competition this could create
- Any delay or best case a complete denial of any new development will be best for the village. School, surgery, parking, chaos at railway track is already beyond stretched - more houses will make it worse and an unpleasant place to live.
- Bramley does not have sufficient school places and doctor's facilities will be completely overstretched. The level crossing already

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

causes traffic jams. Think of flooding, shopping facilities are limited and we desperately need a station car park. No more houses.

- Insufficient infrastructure within the village, access via Minchens Lane too limited
- Negotiation does not guarantee that there will be added benefits.
- I have concerns about the school. It has been messed around with enough already. I don't want it to grow any more. Traffic levels and the railway crossing concern me. Also the loss of fields around the village. I don't think Bramley can cope with more people and traffic.
- This proposed development will destroy the heart of the village, put unmanageable levels of traffic on the lanes around Bramley + add to the already chaotic traffic through the village. Other sites are more appropriate.
- No more housing can be sustained given existing services.
- The C32 is overloaded already. The Highways dept. is failing to maintain it in a safe condition and the junctions at both ends suffer long delays every morning - plus the problem at the railway crossing. Another 300 + vehicles would make this situation even worse. Has an assessment be made as to the likelihood of flooding at the bottom of the hill?
- Bramley is a large enough village. Minchens Lane is a small lane which can't cope with extra volume of traffic. The village is being ruined by over development.
- New building should be spread out thru the village and be within the village boundary
- Bramley does not have the infrastructure to support ongoing development:-
  - An already overloaded doctors' surgery.
  - The school is full.
  - Lack of parking for the station
  - Additional pressure on roads and transport

- Inadequate bus service - 1 per hour, no Sunday service.

- I think that siting the 200 houses Bramley is required to provide, on Minchens Lane is completely wrong. Presuming the 200 occupants each have at least one car and work, they are going to seek the shortest route possible to either Basingstoke or Reading which will, with the track record of the barriers being down 29 minutes out of 60, take them through the already over-utilised lanes. It therefore makes sense to site them on the other side of the track allowing access to A33 and also presuming they have families, puts the village school in walking distance.
- Although I think Minchens Lane may be the best location for future development, this proposal is on too large a scale and selfishly eats up the 200 house allocation in the local plan, meaning that over the next 5 years many more than 200 homes will be built.
- When negotiations are undertaken with eventual developers, the Minchens Lane junction should be made a roundabout to slow traffic..
- Bramley does not have the capacity in terms of public infrastructure (i.e. transport, shops) to support a new development. There is already long and frequent waits for traffic on the railway crossing. Addition of 200 houses will make it worse. I would like to know what kind of negotiation can be done with builders to improve community and recreational facilities? I do not think whatever is negotiated will solve all the extra burden to infrastructure that will be created by the additional homes.
- I chose to live in Bramley because of the village feel. This is being lost and I don't feel the village could sustain more development. The school will have no playing field left to build on to accommodate extra children. The train crossing is already ridiculous, waiting up to 15 minutes sometimes, with more development and cars in Bramley the wait will be unbearable.
- We are opposed to any further housing being imposed on Bramley. We did not oppose the German Road brownfield development but are strongly opposed to the proposed greenfield

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

developments. Bramley has taken its fair share of development. The proposed Minchens Lane development will endanger changing the rural character of Bramley, west of the rail crossing. STOP THE URBAN SPRAWL. The proposed development of Minchens Lane will force more traffic on to small country lanes unsuited to heavy volumes of traffic and will endanger cyclists and pedestrians who use these lanes. The infrastructures such as the roads, level crossing, school, surgery, water and sewerage treatment are already stretched. The focus for development in North Hampshire should be on Basingstoke and west side in particular with new junction to M3.

- Bramley must retain and enhance its character as a Rural Village Community'. If the village is required to accommodate more housing then this should be in the vicinity of previous new build projects thereby keeping this end of the Village rural and expanding on the new estates. Allowing this project to go ahead would lead to further building projects on adjacent arable farming land and will destroy totally the Rural Village Community.
- Traffic generation along with noise and disturbance in a quiet part of the existing village. Road access will be an issue with Minchens Lane being used to a larger extent and the back roads as a cut through.
- Hello, I am against the proposed development - due to lack of infrastructure (roads / train barriers already causing major traffic jams). In addition, there is only one shop in Bramley (which is sited on the opposite side of train barriers). And the Bramley Parish has already seen an over population of the area with a higher than average increase in housing in recent times. Kind regards.
- With no local plan closed by BDBC it is not clear how many house we must take. Has a need been demonstrated yet?
- A 2nd site off Strawberry Field for 200 houses is also in the works so we as a village should consider the merits of both locations at the same time.
- Having housing so close to the super grid is a concern. This would blight the development if the green spaces are essentially unusable.

Such space might be fine for agricultural use but for public use it is not.

- On the plus side this location is at least more central to the village cf. German Road. and is more honest in that sense rather than being hidden away as if it does not exist.
- I oppose the proposed development in Minchens Lane. We live near to the proposed site and it would impact both us and the village dramatically as the level of traffic would therefore increase, plus more drivers would use Oliver's Lane and surrounding lanes to avoid the level crossing. Bramley's infrastructure simply cannot sustain this proposed development. For example: Minchens Lane as well as Oliver's Lane, by Oliver's Farm, have been waterlogged during the recent weather resulting in traffic congestion. Thank you for responding on our behalf.
- The Strawberry Fields site is more suitable due to better access to the A33 meaning cars are not crossing the railway
- We should oppose any planning application for development outside the settlement boundary until such time as the Basingstoke local plan is fully approved and the community has had its chance to fully digest the said plan. There is little room for negotiation with the developer anyway. 200 houses is far too many on the site (max 125 is all the site will take at a density of 15 dwellings pha) and we are not getting car park. We risk traffic, road, and other infrastructure chaos to say nothing of the loss of the environment, views and so on, which no amount of developer contributions will mitigate against if 200 houses are built. Views are lost forever. If a planning decision is delayed and then it goes to appeal this could buy us an extra 12 months for the BDBC plan to come in.



Open Day 15<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2014




Figure 5 (a) Sites Assessed

- BR02 Kings Copse, Land adjacent to Church Farm Cottages
- BRAM05 Minchens Lane Site
- BRAM010 Strawberry Fields
- BR07 Royal British Legion, Site of Derelict Club House
- NP01 Land adjacent to Church Farm Cottages and bordering Cufau de Lane
- NP02 Land to the west of Tudor Farm
- NP03 Land adjacent to Church Farm
- NP04 Land to rear of Middle Farm
- NP05 Land to rear of the Village Hall
- NP06 Land adjacent to NP05 and NP07
- NP07 Land behind Minchens Court and Clift Surgery
- NP08 to NP 12 Land to West of Minchens Lane
- NP13 Land opposite Barefoot House
- NP14 Land to North of Moate Close
- NP15 Holly Cross Farm
- NP16 Land behind Oliver's Farm
- NP17 Green Farm
- NP18 Land off Lane End, Beech Farm Cottages within the Conservation Area

### Comments made under the different headings

*"If you think the proposed vision and aims are not what you would like to see, please say why"*

Are these aims in priority order? The implication is they are. I would like to see BSA4 a higher priority.
First, thanks very much for your work on this project.
Proposed vision needs to protect countryside views, as now enjoyed in Clift Meadow when one looks north. This of course will become a housing estate. :(
I agree with the vision, but oppose further development as we have already had a huge development with German Road and now we are told it is likely to be another 400 houses! I cannot support this so will fight against any further large development,
yes but aims and direction are two different things
I disagree with the Strategic aims as we have had vast increase in housing over a very short period (Campbell Rad, Bramley Green and Cufaud lane). Before I disagree with BSA1 & BSA2.
The Vision is going to be hard to achieve with the present. With the Aims then Bramley should be a better, more comfortable place to live
Whilst I agree most of the aims I don't support development in the form which seems likely. I chose Bramley for its rural location and have already seen the village life eroded and my journey to work made more difficult because of development. The village cannot take more housing without spoiling the rural feel and making commuting even more difficult. E.g. I can rarely park when I go to work at 7 and when I leave my car parked on the road it has been deliberately damaged twice or I get verbally abused. This will only get worse with more people using the station unless there is adequate provision. We also enjoy cycling and more housing will further ruin the lanes.
On the basis that we seemingly have no option but to accept that at least 200 additional houses will be built - this being something I strongly disagree with having moved to Bramley because of its rural location and feel. The proposed vision and aims go some way to minimizing its impact.
On BSA1, only as much as Bramley is forced to take new developments
Whilst I agree with the vision and aims it is with the proviso that the number of houses planned is kept as low as possible otherwise I feel that Bramley will no longer be a village but a suburb of Basingstoke
Do not agree with BSA1 new homes area over developed infrastructure is already stretched. The rural life style is becoming more endangered. Enough is enough.
I agree with the vision, however like any resident am hesitant to encourage any development that changes the characteristics of the central village.
I object to any additional development and Bramley and will probably move away. Perhaps a protest blocking the A30 would get some attention. All the housing that is needed should now be built West and South of Basingstoke. End of.
I think it is a waste of time as the German Road Development proved that Developers and Governments dump houses here and ignore community views.
I strongly think it could, but not sure that it will. I have an underlying concern, not based on facts that Bramley gets very little, certainly on the recreation front from B & D. When I have some time I plan to follow this up through a FOI request. Hence - great that we will have a youth facility, but it will be on land donated to the village and B & D appear to be contributing nothing. Also I think there needs to be some concrete proposals as to what the village needs, in terms of facilities, as it continues to grow, so it grows as a community rather than batches of new housing with ad hoc improvements.
Potentially not radical enough to improve the village appearance and facilities

### Question:

*"What kind of new development does Bramley need?"*

Mix - no issue with affordable housing - I think it would benefit the village to encourage young professionals buying their first homes.
We don't need our beautiful rural spaces built on. Building on Strawberry fields would be an utter disgrace and we should all be ashamed if we let this happen. How has this site made it on to the short list? It has a flood plain through it and it borders the Bramley Green conservation area with protected views across it. The reason it is on the short list is because the Stratfield Estate wants it there. Yes, we have to have development in Bramley but Strawberry Fields is not where it should be.
Family housing. not blocks of marionettes or flats or tall three storey houses.
a mixture of homes
Only small developments of up to 15 houses at a time spread out over the next 15 years... If the developers don't feel this is worth their while then they need to go and build elsewhere!
Affordable homes for first time buyers that would enable children of family members to remain in the village, or to return to their birth village/area.
Small pockets of development rather than 200+ in one location
there has been heavy development to the east of the village, this should be balanced with more located to the west of the railway in this phase
Rural style type of buildings in an area that will provide adequate parking unlike the New Bramley Green development
Small as possible.
Small Developments & infill with access to amenities, without impacting existing busy roads. As only one main road through village and already larger nature of village, 200 maximum without negatively impacting the existing population further.
Commercial and Food store
Bramley needs to develop the Royal British Legion land into a community space or a Business area.
Improvements in the infrastructure, safety on the roads, parking, recreational facilities for all ages whilst maintaining a village atmosphere
Good quality housing with planned open space. Any development should contribute towards the needed expansion of the school and surgery plus the provision of additional services e.g. dentist Better shops and road transport links.
Local facilities such as a car park which can support the resident commuters and facilities such as shops. The roads need improving which is a form of development. The school needs improving. Development of housing if it has to happen should be near the center to minimize impact on roads and the station.
Any development should be as near to the center as possible to minimize impact on the roads and station parking.
A few medium sized developments (plus some small ones) rather than one huge development
Preferably low density housing with no three storey houses. Housing in keeping with the countryside.
A small one if any
Preferably nothing as I do not want to live in a town!
No comment (RG26 5AE)
Bramley needs moderate development, in keeping with the general style of houses in the village. It should help support local families that are growing, rather than an influx of commuters who become associated only with the railway station. It must remain a village, which does not mean wrapping a ring road around it and destroying the fabric of the countryside around it.
More 2 bed smaller houses
Facilities for children/teenagers. Better traffic management.
Minimal additional housing, footbridge over level crossing
Small not encroaching on too much open countryside please. We love seeing open countryside like at Green Farm!
The minimum we have to accept along with, enough addition to infrastructure as is needed to support it. ie size of school, car park for station, sufficient road network to allow easy access to and from the village etc.
Less small dwellings (crammed on top of each other) and larger homes for people / families who want to live in a lovely village but can also afford it.

# Neighbourhood Planning

Low cost family homes
fine as it is
Where possible, development (and any further amenities) should be developed away from the existing train station and surrounding area. Although the schools are nearby the volume of traffic, coupled with the frequency of the crossing barriers being active, brings the center of the village to a standstill. Drivers often opt to overtake/drive on the wrong side of the road to get where they want to be. Increasing traffic in the centre of the village would only lead to inevitable accidents and injuries.
If the village is to grow successfully, it will need improvements to the road network and possible even an option to cross the railway line for pedestrians (not necessarily cited near to the bakery, but somewhere along the line with access to schools/homes).
In terms of amenities; One Stop could grow however it is more than sufficient alongside the bakery. If the population grows rapidly, a similar bread/milk/paper/food/drink/essentials shop would be necessary.
Affordable 3-4 bed homes for second steppers who want to stay in the village. Larger gardens. Incorporated children play areas.
Starter homes, family homes
A better shop with off road parking.
Small developments of good quality decent sized homes, not social housing.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The local community needs houses that our young people will be able to afford to buy. Local people need to have priority over the housing; we know that the cross rail link to Reading has made property in this area attractive to international property investors. How can we be assured that this will not happen in Bramley?</li> <li>2. Bramley also needs more facilities for young teenagers (ages 13 to 17).</li> <li>3. Cycle path/ footpath to Sherfield - 'Millennium Footpath'?</li> </ol>
None
A few smaller developments, with housing that young people can afford, but that still keep the village feeling. Infrastructure must be improved.
Executive
executive only
It doesn't.
Improve road safety near the school and railway. Better shop and further preschool facilities.
School, shops, bridge, Green space, No social housing
Small developments filling in rather than using green field sites. I am not opposed to the development at Minchens Lane if that's all there is going to be as at least it is towards the center of the village rather than extending the village boundaries creating a sprawling housing area. The village needs maintained roads including the lanes, cycle routes, chemist, butchers, bank or proper post office, up market coffee shop and restaurant, some independent outlets. A bridge over the railway. A school that's big enough to
Accommodate the new families without losing the only green play areas they have left after the last development. A proper car park for the station with permits for villagers. A skate park and BMX track for the youngsters. All of these things go hand in hand with a large village/small town which is what we will be with 580 new homes. New homes need to appeal to commuters who will raise the profile of the village; they will bring wealth to the village and the school. No more large low cost housing developments which again swing the social balance. Let's try and attract others to the village that will give something back, not just be used as a place to move problem families to from Popley and other areas which is what happened with the last large development. Let the housing be designed in a style that fits with a rural village, not 3 storey town houses piled in on top of each other.
Small pockets of development near existing housing, using where possible brown field sites.
<p>Developments appear inevitable, so I surely we need to focus on ones that provide Bramley with decent infrastructure, i.e.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Streetlights on the main road (dangerous currently with cars doing silly speeds when children are walking / riding bikes to school in winter)</li> <li>* A proper shop with parking</li> <li>* Additional bar/club perhaps part of a decent football/cricket club pavilion with bar etc. (e.g. like Ropley)</li> <li>* Proper station car parking with a footbridge</li> <li>* Pavement link to Sherfield</li> </ul>
Either small pockets within the village but not resulting in the loss of open green space e.g. RBL or if larger then similar to Sherfield Park so it's actually self-supportive and away from the actual village and not dependent on all the immediate village facilities and infrastructure. Youth facilities need to be built both ends of the village not pointless further development on Cliff Meadow especially when as part of the Farriers development land was set aside for exactly this purpose but the PC seemed to think that Cliff Meadow was a sensible place to build yet another building on a site that already had a perfectly good building and forget about the other parts of the village that may benefit.
<p>My first priority would be a scout/guide den/hut. We have volunteers and we have had waiting lists for years. Doing this work without a designated base is very hard work and the community loses out.</p> <p>Scouts/Guides provide excellent structured activities for children and there is a strong community aspect to the scouting programme. I'm less sure about the guiding side.</p>

# Neighbourhood Planning

New shops - fast food/retail
Any development has to sit sympathetically with the village's vision, including any impact on infrastructure
Bramley need to spread the huge influx of lawless individuals throughout the village to give respite to those who have to endure the antics of the German Road residents and the St John close residents and visitors.
I don't think Bramley needs any new development. If development is imposed then I think more needs to be done for the older community such as bungalows in close proximity to the station, pub and shops where local residents could downsize and stay within their village community. A development such as the one in Sherfield by the allotments would be ideal and would fulfil a local need without putting a large amount of additional cars on the road or creating undue pressure on the school. We must also ensure that we protect and if possible enhance our conservation areas, listed buildings and protected views or the vision of the "attractive village with strong rural character" will be lost forever.
local shops facilities for local sports and recreational groups footbridge over railway line footpaths linking nearby villages
It is important to keep the village as a village and not a town suburb.
Another shop, cafe, restaurant/pub especially to west of the village. More free parking

## Question:

*"If you have any other comments, please say what they are"*

I think basing on growth since 1981 is a bit disingenuous due to impact on figures of 2 or 3 larger developments e.g. German Road. So if we are going to have houses I think a lower number is more appropriate.
I don't think we should even state that Bramley growth would be 580 by 2029 if the rate of growth continues as it has been. Some may simply view this as acceptable, after all Bramley has coped so far with the growth hasn't it?
Bramley should not be responsible for BDBC failure to agree a local plan.
200 dwellings by 2029 are 13 houses per year..... I would support smaller developments to make up this number over the next 15 years, but not 200 all at once, then another 200 straight away after... then who only knows!
The figures of 580 have been inflated by the extra development put upon Bramley when German Road was forced upon the village. Given that at one point, the Local Plan almost afforded us respite, we should pick a figure that reflects as low as possible number in order to retain our rural image, whilst providing enough development to support improvements in infrastructure. (Zero development implies zero funds available). Bramley must grow, but in proportion to the rest of the country. We must fight for the average development across the UK/Hampshire (or as appropriate) and fight unacceptable increases above other areas.
Why is there only the option to vote on 6 sites when there are 21 potential sites? I would vote for other sites but don't have that option
We have just had a serious amount of houses built in the New Bramley green Area which has had a huge impact on the village, school, roads, doctors etc. so a further 200 should be the maximum as the village can't sustain the other objectives of cycle ways, resolve problems of on street parking and protect the rural character of the village if we allow more houses.
As few as possible as limited infrastructure here. Particularly the roads and school.
infrastructure and facilities cannot even sustain 200 in the right place
There should be no increase in further development as we have had vast increase in housing over a very short period (Campbell Rad, Bramley Green and Cafaude lane).
Eventually Bramley will be targeted for more development and this is where the Neighbourhood Plan can have its say, in the future of Bramley. Improvements to the infrastructure needed urgently to cope with the existing developments and definitely with new developments. Should be in place before further developments.
See comments above. Bramley cannot support any more homes without making the lives of those who already live here more difficult.
As a maximum.
We should minimise the number of new homes, regardless of financial benefits of allowing more to be built. Footbridge at station is high priority. Also the road layout on East side of crossing should be looked at to see if (using some of the grassed area on the North) extra queuing lanes for traffic wanting to turn into Bramley Lane and Bakery respectively could be provided, to improve flow.
Ideally I would prefer no further development as the infrastructure is not sufficient to support more houses, people and cars. The east side of the village has borne the brunt of development over the last years so I cannot support any development on this side in the foreseeable future.
Bramley has already had more than its fair share of development. It is getting too big. The roads too busy and often congested.
The village is a village - not a town and that is what it is turning into.

# Neighbourhood Planning

A Bigger shop  
Alternative to barriers at the level crossing

The 'Vision for Bramley' refers to 'an attractive village'. Villages can range in size from larger than a hamlet to smaller than a town. But we need to consider how the village originated and cannot simply allow it to grow and grow. Bramley should never become a town, and the creep of increasing development could establish a more town-like feel. Part of the destruction of village life will be a continual build process over many years. I note the comment that Bramley could support more than 200 houses. It could, but any large-scale build will clog up our village both during and after the build. The concept of building more homes to generate more money for local facilities seems to not question fully the impact the additional build will have on the village in the future.

Bramley is a village and overbuilding will lead to a destruction of the vision that has been set out, i.e. to 'be an attractive village'. We cannot simply build more and more homes to be able to fund facilities - think of the surrounding areas that will be destroyed during and following the build. Bramley is a village and cannot support, schooling being one issue, an excessive level of new build.

The developer contributions can provide/improve local facilities, however increased volume of traffic on the same roads at the same junctions will always increase congestion. In particular with a level crossing situated in the middle of the village which can't be changed!

No more homes!

I believe it to be important to develop Bramley in keeping with its rural village feel. The existing Bramley Green development is a great example of how Bramley has grown but the central village remains vastly unchanged.

As a country we need to build vastly more homes than we do now. If we don't my children will never be able to afford anywhere to live let alone somewhere in Bramley. 580 homes are not enough.

I do not feel that the current infrastructure would cope with too many new houses. Traffic through the village particularly at the level crossing would cause additional delays. Can the schools cope with an increase in pupils? Will the present water supplies cope with the additional residents?

None

Even 200 additional homes would have a significant impact on the already overloaded infrastructure, so thought must be given to how the lives of the existing residents will not be ruined by 'dumping' a load of extra houses on the village. School, Doctors, not to mention the existing gridlock around the station/shop.

I would rather have 0 new homes

Too many homes now

The impact on the school and on the village is not sustainable - the current housing is too much for our "rural" village as it is.

The village is at a huge stretch already. Any more housing would ruin the village and hugely disadvantage us with the lack of facilities and secondary schooling.

Bramley is either a village or a town. If we stay as a small rural village then we can't accept any more new homes as the balance between housing and facilities would be heavily weighted towards housing, turning this area into another Chineham. If we have more homes then the village needs to grow in all areas so that we have a thriving village community with a center and a heart that still retains a village feel. We don't want a mini modern shopping center like Chineham or Tadley stuck in one of the new developments.

The PC formerly argued that Bramley had too much development recently and required a pause before any more, and it did not have the infrastructure to support further development. I strongly support this view, and cannot see that anything has changed recently to conflict with this. Bramley has been allocated 200 new homes in the Local Plan SPREAD OVER the next 15 years and this is what we (including the PC) should plan for, no more.

The number is pretty much irrelevant given answer above

Bramley has had its fair share of development attached to the past few years within the actual village unlike other areas e.g. Sherfield or Sherbourne St John who seem to have their developments build away from the actual villages?

Really as above. The village has grown a great deal, so to maintain a village, rather than a suburb character, we need to be able to improve the village facilities as the numbers grow. If we fail to do this, we just become a suburb. This applies to employment as well as amenities/facilities.

I don't think extrapolation of growth since 1981 should be used as an indication of natural Bramley growth going forward given that the growth in Bramley has been far in excess of the rest of the borough and includes the 277 homes in German Road which were imposed by the Secretary of State and which were surplus to the requirements of Bramley at that time. The homes growth options in this questionnaire also exclude the possible housebuilding numbers in the south of the parish (Razor's and Cufaude farms) which would easily bring the total number to considerably in excess of 580 by 2029. Developer's contributions of £1.7 million are irrelevant compared to the destructive effect on the village of a larger scale of development and if past history is a guide the money would not be spent on any improvements of substance to the village infrastructure or facilities.

In recent years Bramley has massively expanded/developed without ANY improvements



# Neighbourhood Planning

## Section I1

Page 43

### Site Assessment

The site assessments were carried out against certain criteria that were circulated via the Bramley Magazine to all the community. The steering group completed an assessment of the sites against the criteria, the results of which are listed below.

BRAMLEY NDP CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF HOUSING SITES													
SITE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	COMMENTS	BR005	Score	BR010	Score	BR02	Score	NP01	Score	NP03	Score	NP04	Score
Is the site available for development?	Is the landowner willing to release the site for												
· In 1 – 5 years	Yes / No	Y	1	Y	1	Y							
· In 5 – 10 years	Yes / No							Y	1		0		
· In 10 – 15 years	Yes / No												1
Does the site contain or adjoin any ecologically or environmentally sensitive areas that would prevent or limit development?	If yes, does the statutory designation prevent, limit or affect the viability of development?												
· Habitat, nature conservation (SINC) or SSSI designations; within 400 metre zone of potential influence	Yes / No	Frith Wood/Withy Copse/Holdens Copse	1		1				1		0	Frith Wood	-1
· Tree preservation orders	Yes / No	tbc	1	tbc	1	tbc	tbc	tbc	1	tbc	1	tbc	1
· Archaeological designations	Yes / No		1		1	0		0	1		1	0	1
· Conservation areas	Yes / No		1	Bramley Green Barracks. Granary	-3				-1	Conservation area Middle Farm; Church	-4	0 conservation area Adjacent to middle	-3
· Listed buildings	Yes / No	Stocks farm and	0		-1	Middle Farm		Church	-1		-4		-1
· Landscape characteristics e.g. Impact on rural character of Bramley/Open rural views (limited ability to mitigate)	Yes / No	YY	-1	YY	1	Y			-1	N	1	N	1
Is the site a greenfield site or a brownfield site?	Yes / No	Y	-1	Y	-1	Y		Y	-1	Y	-1	Y	-1
Is the site Grade 3a agricultural land or better? scrub=1; pasture=0; 3a=-1; 2=-2	Yes / No	3a	-1	2	-1	N		N	1	3a	-1	3a	-1
Does the site have any infrastructure deficiencies that would affect the viability or practicability of development?	Yes / No					tbc	tbc			tbc possible from main r-track to narrowd		tbc	
Does the site have a risk of flooding?	Yes / No	Access onto country lane & Drainage issues	-1		-1			ACCESS	-1		-1	Access difficult by side of V Hall	-1
Is the site easily and safely accessible from the highway network?	Yes / No	Y	-1	Y	-2	N		N	1	N	1	N	1
Will the local traffic impact be acceptable in terms of the capacity of the exiting road network? Can it be made acceptable?	Yes / No	Y	-1	Y	1	Y		Y	1	N	-4	N	-2
Are community and social facilities reasonably accessible from the site?	Yes / No	NN	-2	N	-2	N		NN	-2	NN	0	NN	-1
Exclude if the issue cannot be addressed.													
Score			0		0						0		0
· Healthcare facilities		Y	1	Y	1	Y		Y	1	Y	1	Y	1
· Local shops		Y	1	Y	1	Y		Y	1	Y	1	Y	1
· Public transport – bus stops and train station		Y	1	Y	1	Y		Y	1	Y	1	Y	1
· Community facilities		Y	1	Y	1	Y		Y	1	Y	1	Y	1
· Local schools		Y	1	Y	1	Y		Y	1	Y	1	Y	1
Does the site lie within or adjoin the existing Settlement Policy Boundary? Isolated from the village/extending into countryside	Score	Y	-1	Y	-1	Y		Y	-1	Y	-1	Y	-1
Adjoins=0; Within=5; Outside=-5	Sites within the SPB score higher.												
Are there any other planning or policy restraints which might affect the development of the site?	Provide details		-1		-1			SOCIAL	-2		-1		0
What is the capacity of the site taking all the above considerations into account?	How many dwellings can the site support?	162	162	200	216	5-6		1	75-80	40	40	72	72
Would development of the site present opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the village?	Score	N	-2	N	-2	N		N	-1	N	-3	N	-1
Would development of the site present opportunities to enhance the sustainability of the village?	Score		-1	Y	-1	N		N	-1	N	-1	N	-1
Would development of the site present opportunities to create community benefits?	Score		1	Y	1	N		Y	1	Neg	-1	N	-1
<b>TOTAL</b>			-2		-4		0		1		-13		-5
<b>SIZE of site Hectares</b>		9.0		13.2		0.4		4.3		2.2		4.0	
Density assumptions		18		18		18		18		18		18	
Removing Q9			-5		-5				-5		-5		-5
Answering Q9 as positive +1 on all sites			1		1				1		1		1
Score would be			-6		-8				-3		-17		-9



# Neighbourhood Planning

NP13	Score	NP14	Score	NP15	Score	NP16	Score	NP17	Score	NP18	Score	BRAM 007	Score
										Y		Y	
					1			Y	1				
					1				1				
tbc		tbc		tbc	1	tbc		tbc	1	tbc		tbc	
0	0	0		0	1	0		0	1	0		0	
					1				-1	Bramley Green			
Barefoot Farm /Barn		Barn,Holly Cross farm		Barn, Holly Cross farm	1	Folly farm		Granary	-1	Beech Farm			
	T		E	YY	1	YY	I	Y	1		I		A
Y	O	Y	L	Y	-1	Y	S	Y	-1	Y	N	N	R
	O		E				O						M
3a		3a	C	2	-1	2	L	2	-1	N	C	N	Y
tbc	F	tbc	T	tbc		tbc	A	tbc		N	O		
Access onto country lane	A	Access onto narrow rd	R	Access onto country lane	-1	Access onto country lane	T		-1		N	No current access, Rd is MOD owned	R
N	R	Y	I	Y	1	Y	E	Y	-1		S		O
N		N		Y	-1	N	D	Y	1		E	N	A
NNN Rural road	O	Y	P	NNN	-1	NNN Rural road		N	-2		V	N	D
	U		Y								A		
	T		L		0				0	tbc	T		
			O								I		
Y			N	Y	1	Y		Y	0		O	Y	
N		Y	S	Y	1	Y		Y	1	N	N	Y	
		N		N	-1	N		Y	1	Y		Y	
N		Y		Y	1	Y		Y	0	Y		Y	
Y		Y		Y	1	Y		Y	1	Y		Y	
N		N		N	-1	N		Y	-1	Y		Y	
				LIMITED	-1			FLOODING	-1				
142		Pylons cover the whole site		80		130		167	144	21		12	
N		N		N	-1	N		N	-2	Y		Y	
Y		N		N	-1	Y		Y	-1				
Y		Neg		Y	2	Y		MILL WALK	1				
					4				-3		0		0
7.9		4.4		15.8		17.2		9.3		1.15		0.7	
18		18		18		18		18		18		18	
				Reduced to 5 ha on land closest to school									
					-3				-3				
					1				1				
					2				-5				

# Neighbourhood Planning

BRAMLEY NDP CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF HOUSING SITES		
	SITE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	COMMENTS
1	Is the site available for development?	Is the landowner willing to release the site for
	· In 1 – 5 years	Yes / No
	· In 5 – 10 years	Yes / No
	· In 10 – 15 years	Yes / No
2	Does the site contain or adjoin any ecologically or environmentally sensitive areas that would prevent or limit development?	If yes, does the statutory designation prevent, limit or affect the viability of development?
	· Habitat, nature conservation (SINC) or SSSI designations; within 400 metre zone of potential influence	Yes / No
	· Tree preservation orders	Yes / No
	· Archaeological designations	Yes / No
	· Conservation areas	Yes / No
	· Listed buildings	Yes / No
	· Landscape characteristics e.g. Impact on rural character of Bramley/Open rural views (limited ability to mitigate)	Yes / No
3	Is the site a greenfield site or a brownfield site?	Yes / No Score Brownfield sites higher.
4	Is the site Grade 3a agricultural land or better? scrub=1;pasture=0;3a=-1;2=-2	Yes / No Exclude good quality agricultural land
5	Does the site have any infrastructure deficiencies that would affect the viability or practicability of development?	Yes / No
6	Does the site have a risk of flooding?	Yes / No
7	Is the site easily and safely accessible from the highway network?	Yes / No
8	Will the local traffic impact be acceptable in terms of the capacity of the exiting road network? Can it be made acceptable?	Yes / No Exclude if the issue cannot be addressed.
9	Are community and social facilities reasonably accessible from the site?	Yes / No Score
	· Healthcare facilities	
	· Local shops	
	· Public transport – bus stops and train station	
	· Community facilities	
	· Local schools	
10	Does the site lie within or adjoin the existing Settlement Policy Boundary? Isolated from the village/extending into countryside Adjoins=0;Within=5;Outside=-5	Score Sites within the SPB score higher.
11	Are there any other planning or policy restraints which might affect the development of the site?	Provide details
12	What is the capacity of the site taking all the above considerations into account?	How many dwellings can the site support?
13	Would development of the site present opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the village?	Score
14	Would development of the site present opportunities to enhance the sustainability of the village?	Score
15	Would development of the site present opportunities to create community benefits?	Score
TOTAL		
SIZE of site Hectares		
Density assumptions		
Removing Q9		
Answering Q9 as positive +1 on all sites		
Score would be		

The sites surrounding the village of Bramley were assessed and scored against the criteria above. The assessment produced the results above, highly negative scores against all the sites principally because they are nearly all located to the North, East and West of the C32 where they adjoin open countryside and agricultural land. Most of the agricultural land in the parish is graded as 'Good' to 'Moderate' in quality in DEFRA's Classification of Agricultural Land.


There are some areas of Very Good quality agricultural land just to the north east of the village south of Oliver's Lane, to the west and east of Folly Lane. Bramley village has agricultural land on its northern, western and eastern side, with the MoD-owned Bramley Camp on its southern side. This land south of Bramley village is classified as non-agricultural land and has been progressively developed over the last 30 years to the extent that there is little scope for further development.

To the north of the village there is an area of open clay farmland which rises gently towards an area of farmland and woodland. From the Conservation area in Bramley Green there are extensive views along the ridgeline adjoining Oliver's lane. The Landscape Capacity Study (2010) concluded that these open agricultural areas to the North, East and West had a low capacity for change and mitigation of the effects of development on views and land would be very difficult.


A large number of sites are considered unsuitable on these grounds that they have substantial environmental impact (including impact on conservation area) and over half of the sites are also unsuitable due to their lack of proximity to the SPB or due to access limitations. Whilst there are a small number of sites that fall adjacent to the SPB, it was nevertheless considered inappropriate at this time to put forward any site as having development potential due to the negative scores received for the reasons above and for reasons of the negative impact on other infrastructure and traffic issues.

## Housing Survey October 2014


### Postal Codes



Postal codes for answers of 50 houses Max




Postal Codes for answers of 100 houses Max




Postal Codes for answers of 150 houses Max

Postal Code for 200 Houses Max



# Neighbourhood Planning



**Postal Code of those in the "Other Category"**

**Postal Code of those with Invalid Answers**

## Comments Made

### Comments from Answers for 50 houses maximum

- No further developments around the railway station unless significant plans to upgrade road infrastructure and community amenities.
- "Keeping green spaces together maintains the rural aspect of the village. So fields, rather than houses, around Clift Meadow make that area seem larger and more attractive.
- Development where possible needs to be on the c32.
- Thanks very much for your work on this project"
- "If Bramley is to stay a rural village community the amount and size of new developments has to be limited now and in the future.
- With the recent developments in and around the village I believe Bramley has had its fair share of development."
- Bramley cannot support further large housing developments, we do not have the appropriate development land or infrastructure. Several smaller developments over 15+ years would enable Bramley to adapt as well as retain its rural character to the benefit of all residents.
- Do not want Bramley becoming over populated. I moved here because it was more quiet than other areas. If I wanted to live in an over populated placed I would have stayed living in town
- When is a village no longer a village? Answer, when there are no open spaces left for all of us to enjoy.... Please, for goodness sake stop using Bramley as a dumping ground for housing.... I've lived in Basingstoke since 1970 and in Bramley since 1988 so feel justified in making this comment.... Please stop building vast impersonal housing estates which will ruin Bramley, and any kind of village life forever....!!
- No town style houses or big estates, only small cul de sac type developments I believe are fitting with being a village.
- "There are already too many houses in Bramley. The roads, school and shops cannot support what we have, let alone anymore.
- We moved to this village because it was rural. In the past 16 years that we have been here we have watched the quaint little village be taken over to the point it is no-longer a village and quickly becoming a large housing estate. There are so many houses that are vacant across the country. Surely it makes sense to utilise these rather than ruin the countryside adding more houses."



# Neighbourhood Planning

---

- Please do not destroy our open countryside views!
- "No more pastiche please. Housing yes. People with no intention of working - no thank you. Gardens yes. Off road parking yes. More trees and cycle paths.
- Think Stratfield Saye and not Popley in the design."
- I believe that Bramley has come to the limit of the number of households it can cope with, especially in regard to the traffic congestion caused by the level crossing. If Bramley is to continue to be a village rather than a 'dormitory' town then any further housing development should be kept to an absolute minimum.
- The current size of the village with the relevant infrastructure services is pretty much at capacity. Additional housing would break and stress facilities, schools etc. too far. Bramley is rural and significant additional housing will change the entire village in to more a housing estate like Taylors Farm rather than a defined, individual, location.
- Several smaller developments would be more in keeping with the character of the village.
- "I would ideally have said ""none"" but, if there have to be new houses built in Bramley, the numbers should be strictly limited. Bramley village has grown considerably in the past few years and does not have the infrastructure to cope with any more development.
- There are numerous Brown Field sites situated around Reading and this area is already geared up to carry heavy traffic. For once, could sense not triumph over bureaucracy?"
- Currently Bramley is being developed without proper reference to infrastructure. An obvious opportunity currently being missed is the possibility of more parking for the station on the proposed development north of the pub and cricket field. If it is ever allowed it should include a large public car-park for the station connected by a foot-path via the site of the old signal box to the road adjacent to the up (London bound) platform so that the need for commuters to cross the level crossing to access their train is avoided.
- The plan provided shows very clearly the way in which the relatively large developments which have already been constructed are eroding the rural character of the village. Whilst Bramley may be able to absorb some relatively small developments in the future, we should try to resist the wholesale urbanisation of our environment.
- Even that is too many given the recent German Road development. Bramley infrastructure cannot cope with anymore
- "I believe that large scale housing developments in Bramley cannot be approved by the Council without significant investment in local infrastructure and by that I mean investment in roads, schools and leisure facilities.
- The current infrastructure just cannot support further development. For example: Bramley Primary School is already much larger than the national average and is running out of space to expand, Sherfield Road is heavily congested during rush hour and there is little in the way of leisure facilities for adults in the village."
- Developments of 50 homes would have less impact on short-term traffic flow (and other village services) and I'd suggest produce more of a community spirit than large developments like German Road.
- The current infrastructure - roads, schools, shops, doctors and frequency of the level crossing closure - mean any substantial increase to the current level of new homes would cause major problems to the village. Safety is already an issue at the level crossing with people overtaking the stationary traffic to go down Bramley Road. Bramley is a rural area, I moved here to live in the country surrounded by fields and trees so I want to see development kept to an absolute minimum.
- The traffic through the village is very heavy at peak times. There is already significant concern about the safety of pedestrians walking through the village and crossing the road. Additional housing will only exacerbate the problem.

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

- New developments should have the housing spaced out with a reasonable area of garden around each, and with adequate driveways for off road parking for a minimum of 2 cars. They should not be built like town-house style developments so as to keep the rural feel of the village. Likewise they should not be 3-storeys high as this is inappropriate in a rural setting. Residential roads should be wide enough for vehicles to pass through even if cars are parked on either side to avoid cars being parked on pavements.
- With particular reference to road usage the Strawberry Fields proposal will have a major impact on traffic numbers and safety.
- Village life in Bramley has changed considerably since the completion of the last housing development. It has impacted the school, general safety and in particular the traffic. At present during the rush hour, when the level crossing is down. The tailback of traffic goes all the way down to The Smithy/Farriers. Building additional houses would only worsen the situation.
- Preferably zero
- I feel very strongly that only a limited no of houses should be built. Parking around the station is already a nightmare, more homes will only add to this making Bramley undesirable to commuters
- 0 to 50 max
- Preferably 10
- Ideally no more developments for several years/ The large German Road Development is not what is needed in this village
- PREFER NONE
- Fewer in some sites. Would prefer no future development in Bramley whatsoever!!!
- As few as possible
- In the range 0 to 50
- Prefer max of 25
- The Village is losing its character due to large scale building
- It is not possible for the present infrastructure to support even 50 houses successfully. The transport/traffic flow problems will be increased to unacceptable proportions if no upgrade is completed BEFORE any development is commenced. It is sheer stupidity to wait until major problems arise before considering, accessing and completing REQUIRED improvements. Also the school has already been enlarged and is full to capacity.
- The "village" has expanded significantly since we chose to live in a village 15 years ago. We would have chosen Chineham if we wanted to be surrounded.
- Low density housing to keep to a rural aspect for the village.
- The quality of life in the village is already heavily impacted by the amount of development. Any more housing will just course more problems. The infrastructure of the village has already been assessed as not being able to support further development.
- Low density housing to keep to a rural aspect for the village.
- Low density housing to keep to a rural aspect for the village.
- Prefer sites of 30 houses

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

- In fill housing only
- Depends on the size of the plot
- Ideally none, no more.
- Infrastructure not able to cope with any more. School is overcrowded, roads and services not suitable for additional development
- 40 preferable
- Keep all future developments to relatively small size and preferably spread throughout the village (keeping the size and shape of Bramley proportionate - i.e. no big developments in one area)
- I would prefer any future developments to be kept small so as not to massively change the surrounding areas.
- Bramley is currently looking overdeveloped with few facilities. The lack of an appropriate Basingstoke Plan seems to mean that the village will be unable to prevent the developments at Minchens Lane and Gleeson's next to Strawberry Fields - with that in mind a cap of 50 houses would be appropriate. If those developments do not go ahead 200 would be reasonable
- I would like Bramley to stay rural, ideally no future expansion is needed.
- Answer is based on preserving Bramley as a village rather than a suburb of Basingstoke. I also think that thought needs to be given to the needs of an expanding village with a changing demographic in addition to just housing numbers. This to maintain and improve quality of life and meet the needs of children, families, singles etc.
- There is a big problem with not only the sewage capability of the area but also the increased traffic additional housing would have on the small main road through the village. Also the additional inhabitants would put even more pressure on the doctor's surgery and primary school. Aside from these main issues the essence of a "village" would be lost along with exceptional country landscape .
- "Smaller developments would be integrated into the village more easily, instead of being a self-contained unit. Smaller developments also allow neighbours to become acquainted more easily, promoting a feeling of community.
- Having answered 50 maximum, I am not in favour of any near-future development at all, as I do not feel that the problems of schooling, shops, parking, and other amenities have yet been resolved following the new housing at German Road."
- Need to ensure any new houses are evenly distributed either side of the railway crossing, to spread out the impact of any congestion.
- Local infrastructure and services cannot cope with any further development and all services and village facilities are located at 1 end of the village ( although central on village boundaries not by population ). LIF funds should be used to provide facilities to other parts of the village not just Clift Meadow and surrounding area.
- Keep a "village" status and consider limited amenities. School already under reviews, ensure children receive best education

## **Comments from answers for 100 houses**

- I'm not so concerned with the number of houses in a new development so much as the housing density within them and their size. 100 homes in a large area with low density is not an issue, 100 homes at high density is more of a problem and is likely to have increased impact on current local facilities.
- I am of the view that we cannot stop development in Bramley as the problems underlying the challenges we have in our village are reflected nationally. This is due in part to the outdated planning laws and equally outdated building practices we allow the major builders to follow and the belief that all building and development is bad. I would like to see a

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

neighbourhood plan that truly reflects the needs of the village in terms of the mix of property and that the infrastructure supporting any plan has equal relevance and importance.

- Not sure how to answer. Developments will be dependent on site size and type of housing. Perhaps more important will be the infrastructure requirement to support any further developments.
- "A pedestrian crossing for the level crossing is badly needed in Bramley, especially if more housing is going to put more people using the train.
- Any development should include upgrades to the roads and pavements, the infrastructure (drains, phone lines/exchange etc.) and should include additional buildings for extra doctors' surgery, dental practice, retail units and community/sports facilities.
- Flooding is a real concern and no development should be undertaken without appropriate flood defences both for the development AND for any other areas that will be affected by the reduction in water absorbing area resulting from said development."
- We need to keep our villages and green spaces, for environmental reasons, AND for the health of our people. If we wanted to live in a built up area, we would have bought a house in town!
- They should be spread out in small plots and areas
- Bramley has already absorbed considerable new development in recent years without any improvement to the existing infrastructure. Our wish is to live in a rural village, not on the edge of an urban sprawl. If we do not resist the ever increasing demands for new housing now, then my fear is that there will be a continuous flood of development requests over the coming years.
- I understand that new houses need to be built somewhere and Bramley will have to accept a number of them but taking into account the facilities we have in the village, the capacity of the school and the doctors' surgery as well as the limitations of the road network through the village, I feel very strongly that more than 100 dwellings would put an unacceptable strain upon our community. I do not believe that any developer would choose to incorporate improvements in the infrastructure.
- Generally I would like to see only small-scale development in Bramley during the next decade or so. (But I know this is unrealistic.)
- Max of 25 dwelling per site. Max of 100 in total
- Please don't forget the large developments already planned for Cufaude Lane.
- The issue at hand isn't really the number of new houses, it is the facilities to go with them, in terms of school places, infrastructure, shops etc. We could support 500 new houses if the facilities were provided, but with no investment the village cannot support many more families.

## **Comments from answers for 150 houses**

- Bramley doesn't have the infrastructure for more intensive building; it is served only by country lanes. Housing developments should be centred on the Chineham/Sherfield area where there is closer access to the A30.
- I favour several smaller developments over time rather than 1 or 2 much larger developments.
- The unfortunate reality is that new homes are needed nationally and Bramley has to be part of that. However, adding new homes without the infrastructure is detrimental to all.
- I feel Bramley could cope with another 150 houses at a maximum before infrastructure is over capacity, roads, schools etc.

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

## Comments from answers for 200 houses

Page 54

- The information provided showed numbers, not density, of the existing developments. We should provide for the type and density of dwellings sought by people who WANT to live in Bramley. Not for people who want a home 'anywhere'
- Whatever housing is planned it should be a good mix of property. As we are constantly being told that we are living longer thought needs to be given to the needs of older people who may not wish to live in 3 story 4 bedroom properties. Families, professional couples(whatever that may mean), social housing and affordable seems to be the main focus.
- "Large developments make it easier to do the necessary significant infrastructure upgrades and can create a better area (e.g. surrounding open space) than small piecemeal development of the village.
- We remain of the view that significant housing development is need to ensure all our children have somewhere to live"
- Shops plus Parking required.
- It would be preferable to locate all the housing requirement in Strawberry fields which has the best access to the A33 and avoids the level crossing for the majority of traffic. To be completed in stages, so that BDBC do not then lump more houses on Bramley.
- Razors farm is in Bramley and has been given permission so Bramley already has its quota.
- 100 max per site

## Comments from answers for "OTHERS"

- There has been enough large scale building in Bramley. More housing will not benefit current population or be supported by existing infrastructure,
- Sufficient already
- Infrastructure inadequate to take more housing
- Enough is Enough
- No More Houses
- It's a village. It should stay a village! No more developments !!!!
- It's always just a few more. Enough is enough. When will there be a maximum
- NO MORE
- No more houses! The doctor's surgery, level crossing congestion! School parking already struggling
- No More
- As a Rural Village, Bramley is overcrowded already. I am not prepared to collude with the Council to build more.
- How will the additional requirements i.e.: school, roads, community amenities be dealt with. Until these questions are answered nobody should be able to make a judgement on numbers. What is an acceptable number. What considerations have been given to certain development on the environmental impact of the new properties and the impact on existing properties, no-where in any information are we seeing consideration for the impact on the existing community. Until these questions are answered it is unfair to expect residents to answer loaded questions.
- Zero housing

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

- Zero, none
- Zero
- None. Since 1980 all developments (major) have been east of the level crossing which is getting too Much!
- None
- Bramley has had its share of house development and greenfield sites should not be built on
- Zero
- None
- Nil, none
- None
- None-None
- NONE
- NONE
- Developers are taking advantage of the absence of a local plan, misleading residents and wanting to build in a village that does not have the resources to cope with the existing population. Environmental concerns have also been ignored. Development should be controlled , linked to improvements in facilities and ultimately decided by residents
- Developers are taking advantage of the absence of a local plan, misleading residents and wanting to build in a village that does not have the resources to cope with the existing population. Environmental concerns have also been ignored. Development should be controlled , linked to improvements in facilities and ultimately decided by residents
- "Following the construction of the German Road development (Which I believe was regarded as unsustainable by an independent government advisor prior to it being approved by another minister). I am concerned that the infrastructure of Bramley is not able to support this continuing development i.e. schooling, power, sewage/drainage and road structure to cope with volume of traffic and jams that may occur due to a railway level crossing that is down for 37 mins out of every 60.
- I moved here in 2000 to live in a rural area and my concern is that Bramley, Sherfield, Sherfield Park and Chineham will end up blending into one urban sprawl and that farm fields north & south of Sherfield Road will be developed, as the development will not stop at the proposed Minchems Lane and North of Sherfield Road sites and once done there is no going back and Bramley will be just part of one big soulless urban development."
- Bramley has quite sufficient houses, the infrastructure cannot cope with any more.
- No more houses please, we are full.
- Bramley is already overcrowded. We have only recently had 270 new homes built and there is still only one school, one GP surgery, one shop and one pub.
- No more please, the village cannot cope.
- Bramley has suffered enough development already
- We believe Bramley has been developed enough, the infrastructure cannot take any more houses. This is a village NOT a small town and needs to remain so.

# Neighbourhood Planning

---

- None - the village can't cope with more development.
- I don't see why Bramley should support any further large developments
- The village does not have capacity for extra housing. The train station is already struggling to meet the needs of current residents due to the lack of a foot bridge.
- max of 10 per year
- 10 to 20 range acceptable
- 15 Max
- Rather have small pockets than 1x100
- There are too many large projects - keep Bramley a Village - Build by all means but in small numbers
- Preferably less than 20
- Bramley has already had so many large scale developments and it is out of keeping with the village, smaller developments spread throughout the village would be much more in keeping
- I feel the village has supported as much big development as it can without really affecting the rural nature and the local infrastructure cannot cope with the village increasing further in size. The road through is often congested, the doctor and school is full.
- Bramley is a rural village and as such I'd like to see it remain that way. The fields and open spaces are the reason we moved here 12 years ago. In this time we have already seen to our detriment the impact large housing development has had on the village.
- Small independent developments to preserve the village status.
- There is no need for large developments, they ruin the fabric of village life. An even spread of development reduces traffic congestion and the likelihood of assisted housing issues.
- I strongly believe that all new developments should be limited to a smaller number of properties (certainly less than 50). I believe limiting the numbers per development would help to encourage improved infrastructure as well as allowing time to see the overall impact the new development has on the area.
- Housing developments must take into consideration the upheaval they bring to the community together with the wishes of the people that have chosen to live in Bramley because of its current level of housing and rural aspect. Villages should not be expected to fill the gaps created in housing development from poor decisions made elsewhere in the County.
- Current infrastructure is already stretched too far. Any new developments must have reinforced infrastructure in place BEFORE work starts on new housing.
- 70 max
- "Not sure if this means the total sum of dwellings regardless of number of developments or total number of dwellings for each development.
- If it is the later, I think timescales should be brought into it. My answer in that case would be max of 100 every 5 years - 100 being the sum of all developments"
- Bramley needs houses to support our economy.



# Neighbourhood Planning

---

- Build small streets not large estates
- Preferably max 10. Must retain rural character of the village
- "Existing property owners have bought in a small village for that reason.
- Property prices will decrease for those already living in the area.
- Our services, shops, doctors, etc... are already stretched.
- When new developments are built there will be a number of social housing projects, how will our investment be recognised.
- We look after our property and gardens.
- We stretched our finances to live here, to raise our children in a nice village.
- The area will go downhill and our quality of life that we have saved and paid for will decrease."
- "Existing property owners have bought in a small village for that reason.
- Property prices will decrease for those already living in the area.
- Our services, shops, doctors, etc... are already stretched.
- When new developments are built there will be a number of social housing projects, how will our investment be recognised.
- We look after our property and gardens.
- We stretched our finances to live here, to raise our children in a nice village.
- The area will go downhill and our quality of life that we have saved and paid for will decrease."
- "All the development in Bramley in recent years and almost all of the new proposed sites are at the Sherfield end of the village.
- Why are there no plans to build in other areas such as along the Silchester Road heading towards Little London. Why does all the new building have to be in the same area as before?"
- Family of 4
- 40-75 per site. Maximum of 200 until 2029, say in 4 developments of 50
- Bramley needs houses for younger families to keep the community going.
- Keep a "village" status and consider limited amenities. School already under reviews, ensure children receive best education
- "There should be no more new houses until such time as the infrastructure can support the development.
- Tracks require upgrading to support the development and provide a bypass to the railway crossing."
- Fighting this development in the senseless belief that it will go it elsewhere as it has no merit. Thinking that another site will take to no-development of Bramley is just plain absurd. The UK needs over 200,000 houses in the next 10 years. Failing to meet this will cause a drop in the UK's prosperity. Wrecking the plans is just not British!

### Very important update concerning our NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

### WE NEED YOUR HELP NOW!



Please complete the survey on the bottom of this page and return to the Parish Clerk using the pre-paid envelope provided or find details of how to complete online at <http://bramleyndp.org.uk>

Bramley Parish Council is producing a Neighbourhood Plan which will enable the local community to influence how the parish will grow over the next 15 years. We are at the final stage of getting our **Evidence Base** to write the Policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. We need the views of the community on future housing developments in Bramley in line with the requirements as laid down in the Local Plan.

Two key aims of the Neighbourhood Plan are *"to ensure that all new housing developments complement and enhance the rural character of the village"* and *"to protect the rural character of the village and its setting and to minimise the environmental impact of new development"*.

The NDP Steering Committee has reviewed the site assessments against a range of criteria and considered the feedback from the community and has concluded that a better approach concerning the future housing in Bramley would be to specify a maximum number of dwellings for any site development.

This survey is seeking local people's views on what the maximum number of new dwellings in any individual development should be. The results will form the basis for a policy in the Neighbourhood Plan which limits the size of individual housing schemes that will have to be within or immediately adjacent to the village settlement boundary.

**Q1 All future new housing developments in Bramley should be limited to a maximum of ..... dwellings.**

50 max ☐ 100 max ☐ 150 max ☐ 200 max ☐

Other  (state number or range)

*Please tick the box which best represents your view, or give a range/number for the maximum you prefer.*

**Contact Details**

Postcode  \*required

Name  (optional)

Email  (optional)

**Comments**

Completed forms should be returned to the Parish Clerk using the pre-paid envelope provided. Alternatively you can complete an electronic version of this form which is available on the Neighbourhood Plan website <http://bramleyndp.org.uk/>

Completed forms should be posted or emailed to [survey@bramleyndp.org.uk](mailto:survey@bramleyndp.org.uk) so that they are received by Friday 10 October 2014 at the latest.

Please provide your preferred contact details and post code so we can keep you informed of future progress on the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan and guard against double counting. We will not use this information for any other purpose.


**WE NEED YOUR REPLIES** as they are your views and the basis of the NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN, so please help us by replying and giving us the evidence base to produce a plan in keeping with your views

If you would like more information about the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan please refer to:

<http://bramleyndp.org.uk/1stdraft>

Thank you

[www.bramleyndp.org.uk](http://www.bramleyndp.org.uk)




The map above shows the housing numbers in different parts of Bramley to give you some idea of the area covered at different housing densities.

**[www.bramleyndp.org.uk](http://www.bramleyndp.org.uk)**




## Personal Injury Accidents

Maps cover the C32 from Pamper End to Sherfield on Loddon, 01-10-09 to 30-09-14



An analysis of the injury accident record has been undertaken which shows that there have been sixteen reported injury accidents, four serious, along this route in the current five year period up to the end of September 2014. The yearly analysis shows an improving situation with ten collisions, one serious, in the first thirty months compared to six collisions, three serious, in the second thirty months. From the map can be seen that 5 of 16 accidents are around the Level Crossing area



An accident rate per million vehicle kms has been calculated for the route which takes into account the total number of reported injury accidents, traffic flow, length of road (kms) and the total number of days in the study period. An accident rate for the C32 between A339 Pamper End and Sherfield-on-Loddon is 0.23 accidents per million vehicle kms.

This may be lower than the National average for such road, but with 3000+ cars crossing the railway crossing on a daily basis, with cars queuing for the barrier which is down 30-40 minutes per hour, children crossing the C32 to get to school at no specific controlled point, with shop in the centre and cars parked less than 100 metres away from the rail crossing and patrons parking their cars half off/on the pedestrian walkways whilst shopping then the safety of residents is under constant threat throughout the village area.

## C32 Pamber End to Sherfield on Loddon

### Accident Date between 01-Oct-2009 and 30-Sep-2014 (Current five years)

**Accident Number:** 1 of 16                      **Accident Reference:** 090514481

**Severity:** Slight

**Location:** C32 The Street at level crossing Bramley

**Date:** Saturday 28/11/2009

**Time:** 19:15 hrs

**Accident Description:**

Motorcycle travelling east along The Street approaching level crossing with barriers down overtaking stationary traffic. Barriers move up motorcycle moves off skids and falls to nearside landing on offside of car.

**Accident Number:** 2 of 16                      **Accident Reference:** 100061639

**Severity:** Serious

**Location:** C32 Boar's Bridge 40m west of Martingale's Farm House, Bramley Corner

**Date:** Saturday 13/02/2010

**Time:** 20:37 hrs

**Accident Description:**

Car travelling northeast Boar's Bridge negotiating slight right hand bend. Driver sees deer in road swerves leaves carriageway to offside and collides with tree. Car following behind collides with first car.

**Accident Number:** 3 of 16                      **Accident Reference:** 100098622

**Severity:** Slight

**Location:** C32 The Street outside the Bramley Inn, Bramley

**Date:** Wednesday 10/03/2010

**Time:** 21:00 hrs

**Accident Description:**

Van travelling east along The Street overtakes pedal cyclist travelling the same direction. Pedal cyclist turns right into path of van and collides.

**Accident Number:** 4 of 16                      **Accident Reference:** 100199536

**Severity:** Slight

**Location:** C32 Boar's Bridge 75m southwest of Park Gate Farm Basingstoke

**Date:** Sunday 16/05/2010

**Time:** 21:40 hrs

**Accident Description:**

Car travelling southeast Boar's Bridge failed to negotiate sharp left hand bend causing rear of vehicle to slide out colliding with car travelling southwest.

**Accident Number:** 5 of 16                      **Accident Reference:** 100332568

**Severity:** Slight

**Location:** C32 Sherfield Road 560m northwest of Mill Lane Basingstoke

**Date:** Friday 06/08/2010

**Time:** 19:14 hrs

**Accident Description:**

Car travelling southeast Sherfield Road swerved to avoid an animal in carriageway the nearside wheels entered a ditch causing vehicle to roll

**Accident Number:** 6 of 16                      **Accident Reference:** 100415813

**Severity:** Slight

**Location:** C32 Sherfield Road outside Green Farm Basingstoke

**Date:** Wednesday 29/09/2010

**Time:** 15:20 hrs

**Accident Description**

Bus travelling west Sherfield Road strikes overhanging branch of tree shattering front windscreen.

## **Section K1**

**Page 62**

**Accident Number:** 7 of 16

**Accident Reference:** 110168996

**Severity:** Slight

**Location:** C32 The Street junction with Coopers Lane Bramley

**Date:** Saturday 23/04/2011

**Time:** 14:00 hrs

**Accident Description:**

Car travelling east The Street stopped in traffic queuing for level crossing ahead turns right into Coopers Lane colliding with motorcycle travelling east overtaking queue.

**Accident Number:** 8 of 16

**Accident Reference:** 110252912

**Severity:** Slight

**Location:** C32 Bramley Road junction with Silchester Road Bramley

**Date:** Friday 17/06/2011

**Time:** 19:10 hrs

**Accident Description:**

Car travelling southwest Bramley Road braked but skidded into rear of car in front waiting to turn right into Silchester Road

**Accident Number:** 9 of 16

**Accident Reference:** 110443374

**Severity:** Slight

**Location:** C32 Bramley Road outside Pamber Farm Tadley

**Date:** Tuesday 18/10/2011

**Time:** 16:35 hrs

**Accident Description:**

Car travelling southwest Bramley Road fails to see lorry stopped in driveway of Pamber Farm with its rear obstructing into road and collides leaves carriageway to nearside entering ditch

**Accident Number:** 10 of 16 **Accident Reference:** 120024859

**Severity:** Slight

**Location:** Bramley Road junction with A340 Aldermaston Road Pamber End

**Date:** Wednesday 18/01/2012

**Time:** 05:40 hrs

**Accident Description:**

Car travelling southwest from Bramley. Driver overshoot junction causing vehicle to cross Aldermaston Road, mount footway then enter garden

**Accident Number:** 11 of 16

**Accident Reference:** 120236803

**Severity:** Slight

**Location:** C32 Sherfield Road junction with Longbridge Road Bramley

**Date:** Wednesday 20/06/2012

**Time:** 14:00 hrs

**Accident Description:**

Van travelling southeast Sherfield Road attempted passing pedal cyclist on nearside which had moved to centre of road to turn right into Longbridge Road. Van collided with nearside of pedal cyclist causing rider to fall

**Accident Number:** 12 of 16

**Accident Reference:** 120301516

**Severity:** Serious

**Location:** C32 Bramley Road junction with Northfield Road Sherfield on Loddon

**Date:** Friday 03/08/2012

**Time:** 21:50 hrs

**Accident Description:**

Motor cycle travelling northwest Bramley Road. Rider intoxicated mounts offside pavement and collides with parked car causing rider to fall off

**Accident Number:** 13 of 16

**Accident Reference:** 120413333

**Severity:** Slight

**Location:** C32 Bramley Road junction with Silchester Road Little Loddon

**Date:** Monday 22/10/2012

**Time:** 15:37 hrs

**Accident Description:** Car travelling southwest Bramley Road turned right into Silchester Road and collided with car travelling northeast turning left into Silchester Road

## Section K1

Page 63

**Accident Number:** 14 of 16

**Accident Reference:** 130343687

**Severity:** Serious

**Location:** C32 Sherfield Road outside One Stop shop Bramley

**Date:** Monday 09/09/2013

**Time:** 15:00 hrs

**Accident Description:**

Mobility scooter travelling southeast on north pavement attempts to negotiate poorly parked vehicle. Mobility scooter comes off pavement and driver falls out.

**Accident Number:** 15 of 16

**Accident Reference:** 140037838

**Severity:** Serious

**Location:** C32 Boars Bridge Road outside Keepers Lodge Bramley

**Date:** Saturday 01/02/2014

**Time:** 12:30 hrs

**Accident Description:**

Motorcycle travelling southeast Boars Bridge Road fails to negotiate lefthand bend and loses control. Motorcycle and rider slides across road separating motorcyclist slides into car travelling southwest.

**Accident Number:** 16 of 16

**Accident Reference:** 140253839

**Severity:** Slight

**Location:** A340 Aldermaston Road junction with Bramley Road Pamber End

**Date:** Wednesday 16/07/2014

**Time:** 18:24 hrs

**Accident Description:**


Van travelling southwest Bramley Road fails to stop and collides with rear of car stationary waiting to enter A340 Aldermaston Road



## Section K1

### TRAFFIC COUNT

7/21/2014 Bramley Plan.bmp.



**Traffic Count at the various points throughout Bramley. Taken over a 16hr period, 0600-2200 hrs.**

- Ash Lane, Reference 63593106, February 2013,

Direction	5 Day Average	7 Day Average	Peak am / hr.	Peak pm / hr.
Southbound	331	270	38	46
Northbound	329	272	61	39

- Silchester Road, West of Ash Lane, Bramley Corner. Reference 63599425, June 2010

Direction	5 Day Average	7 Day Average	Peak am / hr.	Peak pm / hr.
Southbound/ West	1370	1249	156	142
Northbound/ East	1343	1229	133	140

# Neighbourhood Planning

- Bramley Lane, Bramley, Reference 65590457, November 2010

Direction	5 Day Average	7 Day Average	Peak am / hr.	Peak pm / hr.
Southbound	758	644	115	108
Northbound	809	690	152	83

- Bramley Lane, Bramley, Reference 65591328, July 2011

Direction	5 Day Average	7 Day Average	Peak am / hr.	Peak pm / hr.
Southbound	473	423	51	45
Northbound	645	563	111	55

- Sherfield Road, Bramley, Reference 65594084, February 2014

Direction	5 Day Average	7 Day Average	Peak am / hr.	Peak pm / hr.
Eastbound	2078	2023	154	227
Westbound	1660	1592	184	138

- Sherfield Road, Bramley, Reference 66581239, May 2011

Direction	5 Day Average	7 Day Average	Peak am / hr.	Peak pm / hr.
Eastbound	3032	2860	362	273
Westbound	3032	2850	256	333

- Sherfield Road, Bramley, Reference 67660382, October 2010

Direction	5 Day Average	7 Day Average	Peak am / hr.	Peak pm / hr.
Eastbound	2899	2758	322	247
Westbound	2885	2721	230	333

- Sherfield Road, Bramley, Reference 67660383, October 2010

Direction	5 Day Average	7 Day Average	Peak am / hr.	Peak pm / hr.
Eastbound	2898	2756	321	247
Westbound	2889	2727	229	310

The surveys taken by Hampshire County Council were over different years, but just taking the figures as they stand:-

**3000+ cars** are leaving Bramley to the East, and **3000+** cars are coming into Bramley from the East on a daily basis

**1660** cars are going west across the railway and **2078** coming east across the railway

That is **3738** in the Centre of the village on a daily basis

Looking at the Figures for Bramley Lane, then cars going North past the school are **645** per day, either the rat run avoiding the rail crossing or going to Stratfield Saye. If take the number coming into Bramley Lane of 473, and assume they are from Stratfield Saye area, that is **172** cars per day using the rat run, Olivers Lane, Minchens Lane

Whatever analysis you take, the figures indicate that Bramley is choking under the weight of traffic, causing queuing traffic, pedestrian safety along the C32. Figures are in the main from 2010, with only recent figures in 2014.

**CONCLUSION:** - Bramley is choking under the amount of traffic generated by residents and the outside community using the C32 through Bramley. The Railway crossing with its barrier down time causes queues of traffic both on the east and west sides, with frustrated drivers using the rat run via Olivers Lane and Minchens Lane to avoid the wait at the railway crossing.

More development brings in more cars which only add to the problems.  
October 2015.

Ref : Data analysis from Hampshire County Council.

### Correspondence concerning the requirement for SEA Report (Strategic Environmental Assessment)

1. Letter concerning the Requirement for SEA report from Basingstoke Deane Borough Council



**Basingstoke  
and Deane**



Bramley Parish Council  
Bramley Village Hall  
Bramley  
Hampshire  
16 October 2014

Dear Sir or Madam

#### **Bramley Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Opinion**

This letter sets out the borough council's screening opinion concerning the need for SEA and HRA in relation to the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan. This screening opinion has been underpinned by a detailed report and the opinions of the three consultation bodies (Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage).

The screening process undertaken concludes that in order to meet the 'basic conditions<sup>1</sup>' for neighbourhood planning **an Environmental Assessment is considered to be required to accompany the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan but it would not need to be subject to HRA**. The consultation bodies have all agreed with the conclusion reached. The reasons for the decision are set out below:

<sup>1</sup> Requirement (f), that the making of the order or neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with EU Obligations. The basic conditions are set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

<sup>2</sup> Please see examiners report, page 8.

[http://www.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/your\\_council/policies\\_and\\_performance/council\\_plans\\_and\\_strategies/planning\\_policy/neighbourhood\\_planning/tattenhall\\_and\\_district\\_neighb.aspx](http://www.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/your_council/policies_and_performance/council_plans_and_strategies/planning_policy/neighbourhood_planning/tattenhall_and_district_neighb.aspx)

#### **Strategic Environmental Assessment**

Whilst the neighbourhood plan does include a policy which would restrict the size of housing sites which may come forward, there is no cap on the total number of houses which could be provided using this policy. Therefore, the cumulative environmental impact of such development could be significant.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that the approach to providing new housing is similar to that adopted in relation to the Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan, where an SEA was required in relation to that plan<sup>2</sup>. This is especially pertinent given that Tattenhall is a smaller settlement and had a lower limit on the size of sites (which was set at 30 units, compared with the 50 proposed in this instance).

Therefore, in light of the assessment set out in the screening report it is considered that an SEA is required in relation to the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan.

#### **Habitats Regulations Assessment**

There is one European site within a 10 km buffer zone of the neighbourhood area, namely the Thames Basin Heath SPA. However, the SPA is still over 5 km away from the neighbourhood area. Given the nature of the development which is likely to be facilitated by the neighbourhood plan, which is predominantly housing sites, the size of which is capped at 50 units, it is considered that the impacts of the plan are likely to be fairly localised, and would not impact on the Thames Basin Heath SPA, or any other European site.

The Environment Assessment will need to meet the relevant legal requirements set out in the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. Further guidance on the requirements for carrying out the Environment Assessment is set out in the National Planning Practice Guide and the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive: guidance. In addition, please feel free to contact the borough council (planning policy team) if you require any additional advice regarding how to complete the Environmental Assessment.

Yours Sincerely  
Andrew Rushmer

Senior Planning Policy Officer



# Neighbourhood Planning

---

## **Section L1**

- |    |  |           |
|----|--|-----------|
| 2. | Bramley Neighbourhood Plan Scoping Report.           | Available |
| 3. | Bramley Neighbourhood Screening Report               | Available |
| 4. | Bramley Neighbourhood Plan SEA Report                | Available |
| 5. | Bramley Neighbourhood Plan SEA Report, Non-Technical | Available |

### BRAMLEY HISTORIC BUILDINGS

The Historic Village of Bramley developed around the 12<sup>th</sup> century Church of St James located at the western end of the the present day parish. A number of notable historic building survive in this area.

To the eastern end of the village is Bramley Green, which developed along the edge of the common and now has been joined to the historic village of Bramley by residential development.

Within the Parish of Bramley there are some 52 listed buildings, Grade I and Grade II listed. These are tabulated below and as can be seen from the attached map, not only in the Village boundary but spread across the parish.

### NATIONAL HERITAGE LISTED BUILDINGS BRAMLEY PARISH

<b>BARN, 20 YARDS NORTH-EAST OF HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: CUFAUDE LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane, Hampshire	<b>UPPER CUFAUDE FARM HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: , CUFAUDE LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane, Hampshire
<b>Former cartshed south of Small Barn, 10m west of Upper Cufaude Farmhouse</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: Cufaude Lane, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane, Hampshire, RG26 5DN	<b>CUFAUDE FARMHOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: CUFAUDE LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane
<b>GRANARY, 20 YARDS EAST OF THE HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: CUFAUDE LANE, Bramley	<b>CHURCH OF ST JAMES</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: I Location: , Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane
<b>GRAY'S HOUSE (INCLUDING FORECOURT WALLS AND RAILINGS)</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: , Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane, Hampshire	<b>BARN AT CHURCH FARM (35 YARDS EAST OF RECTORY)</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane, Hampshire
<b>ADAMS COTTAGE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: , BRAMLEY GREEN, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>GRANARY AT BULL DOWN FARM</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location BRAMLEY GREEN, BRAMLEY GREEN, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane,
<b>GRANARY SOUTH OF HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location LATCHMERE GREEN, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>MINCHINS FARMHOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: MINCHINS LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane
<b>GRANARY AT STOCKS FARM</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: MINCHINS LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>LIME TREE COTTAGE, AND BARN ATTACHED</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: THE STREET, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane,
<b>THE OLD COTTAGE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: THE STREET, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane,	<b>BAREFOOTS FARMHOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane,


# Neighbourhood Planning

<b>PARKGATE FARMHOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane,	<b>BULL DOWN FARMHOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II* Location: BRAMLEY GREEN, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane
<b>BEECH FARM COTTAGES</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: , BRAMLEY GREEN, BRAMLEY GREEN, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>LATCHMERE FARMHOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: LATCHMERE GREEN, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane
<b>CARTSHED NORTH-WEST OF HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: , LATCHMERE GREEN, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>STOCKS FARMHOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: , MINCHINS LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane
<b>THE MANOR HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: THE STREET, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>HONEY FARMHOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: THE STREET, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane
<b>OLD BELLS HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: , THE STREET, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>MIDDLE FARMHOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: THE STREET, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane
<b>HOLLYCROSS FARMHOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: , Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>BARN AT PARKGATE FARM</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: , Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane
<b>RAZORS FARMHOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: , CUFAUDE LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>GRANARY, NEXT TO THE HOUSE, ON THE NORTH SIDE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: CUFAUDE LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane
<b>GRANARY, 20 YARDS SOUTH-WEST OF THE HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: CUFAUDE LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>BARN, AND CARTSHED 30 YARDS EAST OF THE HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: CUFAUDE LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane
<b>BRAMLEY CORNER LODGE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: BRAMLEY CORNER, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>STOCKS FARM COTTAGES</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: 1, 2 AND 3, THE STREET, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane
<b>BRAMLEY CORNER HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: BRAMLEY CORNER, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>THE GABLES</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: BRAMLEY CORNER, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane
<b>BARN AND OUTBUILDING, 30 YARDS WEST OF THE HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: CUFAUDE LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>OUTBUILDING, 15 YARDS SOUTH-WEST OF THE HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: CUFAUDE LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane

# Neighbourhood Planning

<b>BAKERS FARMHOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: , CUFAUDE LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>STABLE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: LATCHMERE GREEN, Bramley, Basingstoke
<b>CHURCH FARMHOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: BRAMLEY, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane,	<b>GRANARY AT GREEN FARM</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: BRAMLEY GREEN, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane,
<b>ABBOTS DWELL</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: LATCHMERE GREEN, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane,	<b>BARN NORTH OF HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: LATCHMERE GREEN, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane,
<b>TUDOR COTTAGE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: STRATFIELD SAYE ROAD, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>EXON COTTAGE THE COTTAGE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: THE STREET, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane,
<b>BARN AND OUTBUILDINGS AT HOLLYCROSS FARM</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>BARN, 30 YARDS NORTH OF HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: CUFAUDE LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane
<b>BARN, 20 YARDS NORTH-WEST OF THE HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: CUFAUDE LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane	<b>CARTSHED, 35 YARDS SOUTH-WEST OF THE HOUSE</b> Heritage Category: Listing Grade: II Location: , CUFAUDE LANE, Bramley, Basingstoke and Deane

This is the List of Grade Listed Buildings in the Parish of Bramley that have to be protected for future generations. The proximity of the buildings is shown in the accompanying map.



The Red areas are Ancient Monuments; The triangles are the Listed buildings across the Parish of Bramley



Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council  
Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic  
Interest Bramley

First adopted: 27 March 2007

Last updated: 25 September 2007

This Article published in 2007 also gives the List of Building considered to be of Architectural Interest in Bramley

These are

Pear Tree Cottage, Silchester Road, Bramley; House, Built 1833 to 1899

Yew Tree Cottage, Silchester Road, Bramley; House, Built 1833-1899

Barton House, Silchester Road, Bramley; House, Built 1833-1899

Keepers Lodge, Silchester Road, Bramley; House, Built 1700 to 1833

The Laurels, The Street, Bramley; House, Built 1833-1899.

The houses above were all part of Beaurepaire Estate, cottages typical of Bramley. They all have a distinctive design, built of brick with a tiled roof and ornamented with decorative bargeboards and lozenge/diamond lattice design cast iron casements.

The Bramley, The Street, Bramley; Public House, Built 1833-1899. Inn in the centre of Bramley built in the typical Beaurepaire estate style, built by Welch- Thornton, when the railway opened. It has large tudor style chimney stacks, a tiled roof, brick walls with decorative tile hanging to the upper storey.

Olivers Cottage, Bramley Green, Bramley; House, Built 1700 to 1799. Cottage with some timber framing

The Barracks, Bramley Green, Bramley; House, Built 1832-1866. Terrace of four cottages, former hop pickers dwellings

Lillymill, Mill Lane, Bramley; Farmhouse, Built 1832-1866

Lilac Cottage and Oak Harts, Lane End, Bramley; House, Built 1600-1699. Pair Thatched cottages

Rose Cottage, Bramley Green; House, Built 1600- 1699

The Pigeons, Bramley Green, Bramley; House, Built 1700-1799. Former pub from mid 19<sup>th</sup> century to 1957

Sandwich House, Cufaude Lane, Bramley; House, Built 1700-1840.

These along with those listed in National Heritage article have to be preserved for future generations, and any development has to respect the buildings, the views into and out of the buildings.