

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Council Office, Maudsley House, 47 High Street, Bridge CT4 5JZ

Tel; 01227 831085

Date 15 January 2017

To members of the Neighbourhood Planning Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Bridge Neighbourhood Planning Committee in the Hunter Room, Bridge on Friday, 20 January 2017 at 5.30 pm

Philip Wicker
Parish Clerk

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 6 January 2017.
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes
4. To report back on the meeting held with Karen Britton of Canterbury City Council on 17 January 2017
5. To finalise plans for the information event to be held on Saturday 21st January at the village hall
6. Any other business

The next meeting of Bridge Parish Council's Neighbourhood Planning Committee will be decided at the meeting.

Minutes of a meeting of Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Committee

Thursday 6 January 2017 in Bridge Village Hall Hunter Room at 5.30 p.m.

Attending: Christobel Seath, Kathy Walder, Philip Wicker, Esther Hall, Jim Boot, Mervyn Gulvin, John Hill, Terry Wilmshurst, Alan Atkinson, Joe Connor, Rosy Atkinson

Apologies: Sue Hodges, Claire Tester

Joe (JC) began by wishing everyone a Happy New Year and expressed hopes that the Neighbourhood Plan will come to fruition well before the end of 2017.

Minutes from the previous meeting were agreed.

Joe gave a summary of the membership and running of the Neighbourhood Plan. He stated that Philip (PW), the Parish Clerk, is on the committee in an advisory capacity only, to support with any legalities that may arise. It was stated that he is not a voting member of the committee. Joe stated that membership of the group was confirmed by accident and Joe was invited to be chairman in November 2012. Joe (JC) stated that any Parish Council Members were included as members as is their right due to being council members. It was also stated that non-Parish members are to be confirmed at the next Parish Council meeting. It was also stated that the status of the Neighbourhood Plan is that of an advisory group for the Parish Council. It was advised that the agenda for the meeting needs to be published 3 full days before the meeting and it was admitted that this has not always happened but that the aim will be to do this in future.. It was also advised that members of the committee need to be summoned to attend the meeting by the clerk. It was also stated that Esther's (EH) position as note taker needs to be regularised. Members of the public are also allowed to attend and are welcome but if they wish to speak it can be only for 3 minutes or less and notice of their desire to speak needs to be given. Joe stated that he needed to leave at 6.30 and John (JH) nominated Alan (AA) as chair in Joe's (JC) absence which was seconded by Terry (TW).

Joe (JC) spoke about the letter addressed to Karen Britton from the Inspector dated 15/12/2016. Joe (JC) said that the key point was the removal of Brickfields as a site to be built upon. Joe (JC) said that this was reassuring. The Inspector stated that the ANOB had not been preserved and also gave the Neighbourhood Plan the authority to make a decision about where building could go as long as it fitted with the caveats that need to be covered when making this decision. Philip (PW) said that this report from the Inspector was an interim report but also stated that decisions made in this report were seldom altered for the final report. Mervyn (MG) spoke of worries that the green gap would still not be persevered. Philip (PW) clarified with the planning officer at CCC (Canterbury City Council) that the green gap would stand between Bridge and Canterbury even though the Inspector did want the green gap between Canterbury and University of Kent changed. Joe (JC) agreed to clarify this again with Karen Britton at the meeting with her later in January.

Alan (AA) reported his delight at the recognition of the work that was put into saving Brickfields has been registered and taken forward. Christobel (CS) stated how praise needed to be given to the people who had completed this piece of work as the Inspector is not known for making positive 'green' decisions.

Philip (PW) said that the traffic count is to be conducted next week, w/c 09/01/2017.

Joe (JC) spoke of the health check completed by Claire Tester. Jim (JB) gave Claire's (CT) apologies for not attending the meeting. Alan (AA) stated that he had made some alterations to the Neighbourhood Plan in light of the health check and Mervyn (MG) agreed version 4b of the Plan was the up-to-date one. Jim (JB) ran through the main points of the health check. He stated that Claire (CT) did say that the arguments and scope of the Plan were strong and well done with the Village Design Statement. On page 2 of the report Claire (CT) suggested leaving the allocation of housing to CCC and suggested to focus on policies. Jim (JB) said that the policies themselves would be the support and used to make the decision on any housing proposals. Christobel (CS) stated that she felt that the Plan should still include housing allocation as that was why the Plan was started in the first place. Christobel (CS) stated that she has circulated an email asking the Group to support this. John (JH) stated that he agreed totally with this and said that if the Plan doesn't allocate then the Council will. John (JH) also agreed that that was what started the Neighbourhood Plan Committee, that the idea was for the Plan to be a village voice for any housing. Jim (JB) stated that if the group decides to choose to go ahead with the allocation within the Plan, Claire (CT) gives direction on how to do that and that a strategic environmental assessment (SEA) would be needed. Jim (JB) reported that he has asked CCC if they have produced one but they have replied that they have been too busy. It was agreed that this needs to be on the agenda for the meeting with them on 17/01/2017. Alan (AA) asked if the Plan allocates an area for housing, would that mean that if other areas were proposed by the City Council they could be rejected as not agreed in the Plan? Alan (AA) stated that historically experience of CCC Planning Department had not been good. Terry (TW) said that in previous training they were told to include sites for allocation or else the Plan would be left wide open to decisions from the City Council who, in Canterbury's case, are not known for looking at evidence and have in the past allocated indiscriminately.

Claire (CT) also stated that the Plan needed to join the dots between baseline data and its relevance to the issues within the Plan and that the Strategic Environmental Assessment would help to do that. Christobel (CS) said that a lot of the appendices might also help to answer some of those questions but that they were still in progress. Claire (CT) also stated that the group needed to think who they were writing the Plan for – the villagers, the developers or the Council. She has also given guidance on how not to mix up projects with policies. She also said that it was important to get villagers' responses but need to also link with SHLAA and sustainability appraisal. Jim (JB) said that the Parish Council had the final say of what was included in the Plan. Mervyn (MG) disagreed with this as he stated that that was not how the group was initially set up. Philip (PW) said that the group was only a committee of the Parish Council and that legally it was the Parish Council who would produce the Plan. There was fear expressed within the group that the Parish Council would just overturn the work done but Alan (AA) believed the Parish Council would accept the Plan.

Mervyn (MG) suggested that the Plan was becoming bland and non-personal to Bridge. Alan (AA) agreed and suggested that Claire (CT) hadn't thought about Bridge and its requirements and how to point the village in the direction that it needs to go in. Mervyn (MG) said that policy C'' had been scrapped totally and he found that objectionable. Christobel (CS) totally agreed that Claire (CT) had gone down a line that hadn't been requested and stated that the decision did not lie with CCC but with Bridge to protect itself against CCC and developers. Jim (JB) said that Claire (CT) had advised the committee to develop the description of the ANOB more fully and Christobel (CS) said that it was the intention to include the Village Design Statement in the Plan. Alan (AA) asked if anyone else wanted to say anything else about allocation. Kathy (KW) questioned if by allocating a site for housing it

would then be planting a seed for the Council to run with but Alan (AA) said that if no allocation, it left Bridge to be seen as an open book. Alan (AA) said that 2 areas were in the Plan, Brickfields for affordable and north west of Conyngham Lane, and asked if people agreed with that. The group agreed that they wanted to retain the sites and there was a full vote for it. It was agreed that a SHLAA site assessment would be completed and that this issue would be revisited after that assessment.

Mervyn (MG) said that the alterations still needed to be completed within the Plan. Alan (AA) said that the current up-to-date Plan was 4B. Mervyn (MG) suggested a workshop to look at the alterations. None was agreed

Jim (JB) suggested gathering together a list of questions which needed to be sent to Claire (CT) for clarification.

Philip (PW) said that the village know that the exhibition is happening on 21/01/2017 but that no time or what is going to be in the exhibition has been stated yet. It was agreed that it will be the photos. Jim (JB) suggested the green spaces work and in the light of transparency the exhibition should also include showing Claire's (CT) report. Philip (PW) said that the traffic report might also be available. Mervyn (MG) suggested using it as an information day and including the up to date draft Neighbourhood Plan, Village Design Statement and that members of the Neighbourhood Plan Group would be there to discuss the information displayed with the villagers. The time of the exhibition was agreed for 10 -1. Philip (PW) suggested getting down to technicalities at the next meeting. He also asked how to capture responses and conversations with the public. Christobel (CS) also asked how to capture people's responses to the photo survey. Jim (JB) said that he could prepare 3 questions for people to answer or have post it notes for them to write on. Jim (JB) also said that he would produce a time line of the Plan's development. MG offered to produce a display of the Village Design Statement. It was also agreed though that the Group had consulted with the Village throughout the process so far.

The Neighbourhood Plan Group will also be reporting to the Parish Council on 12/01/2017 and this will be reported in their minutes. Jim (JB) also stated that he had homework for the Group on green spaces. John (JH) gave out his new email address.

There was no other business.

The next meeting was agreed for Friday 20th January 2017 at 5.30pm in the Hunter Room.

Minutes of a meeting of Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Committee Friday 20th January 2017 in Bridge Village Hall Hunter Room at 5.30 p.m:

Attending: Christobel Seath, Kathy Walder, Philip Wicker, Esther Hall, Jim Boot, Mervyn Gulvin, John Hill, Terry Wilmshurst, Alan Atkinson, Joe Connor, Rosy Atkinson, Sue Hodges.

No apologies.

The group confirmed the minutes from the previous meeting.

Philip (PW) said that the traffic count is completed but the data would not be available for the exhibition.

Joe (JC) reported that Karen Britton (KB) was given a copy of the Neighbourhood Plan draft copy 5 and was happy with it. It was agreed that various statements need to be added and that there are still a lot of things that need to be done to complete the Neighbourhood Plan such as the sustainability appraisal. Jim (JB) reported that he would provide minutes from this meeting.

It was agreed that Lisa Gadd (LG) will be asked about an assessment for green spaces and that there are examples from Canterbury City Council's (CCC) own green spaces report to help with this.

CCC are committed to screening for the Strategic Environmental Assessment although Jim (JB) felt that the screening to clarify the position of various organisations such as Natural England could be completed by the Neighbourhood Plan Group and then presented to CCC. Alan (AA) was in agreement.

Christobel (CS) said that a housing needs assessment needs to be completed again and the Parish Council will ask CCC to arrange for one to be carried out.

Philip (PW) said that he was reviewing advice on the membership of the committee but would keep the Group informed.

Philip (PW) reported that he had already put up a rudimentary display for the exhibition for the next day and would finalise it in the morning. Mervyn (MG) had completed the Village Design Statement for the exhibition. There would be hard copies of the Neighbourhood Plan Draft 5 and Claire Tester's (CT) report available to peruse and people would be able to request copies if needed. Philip (PW) agreed to send this out if requested or to provide the website address if people were happy to read them on line. Philip (PW) had also displayed panoramic views of the village with a map of where the views had been taken from and also displayed the 15 photos of the green spaces with a map. Jim (JB) has a slide show that will be shown on a loop. The Group thanked Philip (PW) for his work in organising the exhibition and photos. Alan (AA) stated that the exhibition would be a space for people to share their views, show the progression of the Plan and to invite comments. Various coloured post it notes would be provided for people to note their views about the different areas of the exhibition. It was agreed that when people arrived they would be registered using the electoral roll to ensure the views received were those of villagers. In terms of manning the exhibition Terry (TW), Sue (SH) and Christobel agreed to help Philip to set up from 9.30, John (JH) would be there from 10 – 11, Kathy (KW) 10.30 – 1.99, Mervyn (MG), Rosie (RA) and Joe (JC) would be there from 11.30 – 1.00. It was agreed that tea and coffee would be available from the Parish Council.

Joe (JC) mentioned the meeting with Cantleys. Joe (JC) felt that the biggest impact from the meeting was their expressed interest in Great Pett Farm. Cantley's stated that they had already renovated the house and that once the farmer retires, possibly due 2020, they would execute their plans. They did not comment upon these but reported that that they were linked to employment opportunity. It was implied that the village would not agree with it but it was their land. They therefore wanted to clarify the green spaces noted on their land and confirmed that they were not going to issue a lease on the recreation ground as yet. They didn't release any future plans. It was an amicable meeting. With this meeting in mind, the Group agreed that the employment section of the Neighbourhood Plan would need to be revised.

Rosie (RA) asked about a workshop to work on green spaces and the Plan. A selection of dates would be sent round and people could sign up to which dates and which sections they would like to be involved in. Alan (AA), Jim (JB), Joe (JC) and Philip (PW) would make a list of what needs to be revised.

There was no other business.

The next meeting was agreed for Friday 24th February 2017 at 5.30pm in the Hunter Room. Apologies from Sue (SH) and John (JH) who will not be able to attend. Christobel (CS) also said that she might be absent.

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Council Office, Maudsley House, 47 High Street, Bridge CT4 5JZ

Tel; 01227 831085

Date 20 February 2017

To members of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee at the Hunter Room, Bridge on Friday, 24 February 2017 at 5.30 pm

Philip Wicker

Parish Clerk

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2017.
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the agenda
4. Declaration of Pecuniary Interests Returns (Clerk)
5. Identification of potential housing land (including consideration of the feedback from the information event on 21 January 2017) (KW)
6. Important Local Green Space
7. Baseline information and evidence report (JB)
8. Consultation statement (JB)
9. Highland Court
10. Housing White Paper (MG)
11. Points of information

The next meeting of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee will be on Friday 24 March 2017 at 5.30 pm in the Hunter Room.

KW=Kathy Walder

JB=Jim Boot

MG=Mervyn Gulvin

Minutes of a meeting of Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Committee Friday 24th February 2017 in Bridge Village Hall Hunter Room at 5.30 p.m:

Attending: Christobel Seath, Kathy Walder, Philip Wicker, Esther Hall, Jim Boot, Mervyn Gulvin, Terry Wilmshurst, Alan Atkinson, Joe Connor, Rosy Atkinson

Apologies: Sue Hodges, John Hill.

The minutes from the previous meeting were checked and Jim (JB) asked that as the sentence re: sustainability was incorrect it should be removed. It was also noted that Sue (SH) was present and not absent as the minutes stated. Philip (PW) also stated that the minutes need to be signed once agreed.

Jim (JB) stated that he had received the minutes from a meeting with Canterbury City Council (CCC). He had agreed them and he will send them around to the group.

Regarding the Strategic Environmental Assessment report Jim (JB) said that some of the pieces of work involved can be completed by the group instead of asking for a cash grant. Philip (PW) has been in touch and it has been agreed that we would be eligible for a company, Aecom, to do some of the work for the Plan. Philip (PW) has completed the paperwork necessary to unlock the extra cash needed for this. Jim (JB) values Aecom as a good company. Jim (JB) said that it is still in discussion with the council (CCC) as to who is responsible for the screening part of this report and he is still of the opinion that it should be the council (CCC) who does this. The group was shown an example of a SEA completed by Aecom. Jim (JB) said he would send the link for it around.

Christobel (CS) asked about the Housing Needs Assessment as it was last completed in 2005, and asked where the money would come from to complete it as it would cost £1000. Jim (JB) suggested asking Rural Kent to do it as they could obtain the cash from the grant or asking CCC if they would complete it, but Christobel (CS) and Alan (AA) asked that the Neighbourhood Plan Group do the assessment as results would be obtained more quickly than if CCC do it. It was agreed the group would do the necessary work.

Philip (PW) asked if the people who had not completed the pecuniary interests form could do so and send it to him.

Kathy spoke of her unhappiness with the decision on potential housing land and questioned the appropriateness of Conyngham Lane, especially in light of Mr Quinn's proposed development. It was stated that if building is completed in Cunningham Lane and if Highland Court gets building permission it will extend the village and enlarge it to a degree not wanted by the village. Christobel (CS) said that now the green gap has been fixed it changes the plan for housing in the village. She feels that the village need to be asked again where if necessary they want building to be placed. They need to be asked which site would be least harmful and to have the chance to say no to building but be informed that this could lead to losing the recreation ground. Christobel (CS) stated her worries that the Plan could lose the referendum if the housing choice isn't looked at again. Alan (AA) replied that the previous questionnaire did ask the village and they had received strong feedback and views that linked with other important objectives within the village which could lead to losing the village hall. He stated that if Conyngham Lane was the site it would mean it would be moving in the same direction as Canterbury and would be contained by the green gap boundary.

Christobel (CS) said that she felt the village hall isn't a decider for people. Alan (AA) said that there will need to be building and the decision is actually about which villagers would be upset by the housing because whatever the decision it will upset someone. Mervyn (MG) said that no housing is not an option, especially in light of the Housing White Paper. Mervyn (MG) also stated his support of Kathy (KW) and Christobel's (CS) argument against Conyngham Lane and is supportive of site 3, behind the surgery as it would be contained within the village and would encompass the village green. All sites are ANOB so there's no argument in that direction. Mervyn (MG) argued that the bypass has already blighted the land by the surgery so in those terms it is a better site to consider. It was stated that someone will decide about the housing as the village need to take its 10% share – will that decision be taken by the Neighbourhood Plan? Christobel (CS) said that she doesn't feel the council (CCC) will mind if the Plan changes its view of which site is to be used as long as there are the same number of houses being proposed. Rosie (RA) suggested that site 3 could be extended for housing and not limited to the set amount. Mervyn (MG) said that if the villagers were asked again, they would need to be given 2 choices - Conyngham Lane or site 3. Jim (JB) felt that we need to find another way of assessing views rather than a questionnaire but Mervyn (MG) said there wouldn't be a difference between the two sites using Strategic Environmental Assessment evidence. Jim (JB) said Aecom could be asked if they have a way of being able to decide or could get planning advice from a planner. Philip (PW) said that this whole issue is fundamental to the Plan and he advised that maybe a vote within the group is needed and that then a motion would need to be submitted for this to occur. It would also mean that absent members could be involved. Christobel (CS) agreed but said that it needs to be clear that it is the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan and so needs to deliver what the village wants and not what planners want. Rosie (RA) said that it also needs to be clear that no housing is not an option and one site needs to be chosen. It was agreed that motions need to be put forward before the next meeting and Philip (PW) asked that they be sent to him by 9.00 am on the 17th March.

Alan (AA) asked what evidence there is for doing this and Rosie (RA) stated that Mountfields has scared the village. Christobel (CS) said that Cantleys are not known for their kindness and thought towards the village. Mervyn (MG) said that he would put forward a motion about Great Pett Farm.

Kathy (KW) reported that 4 members had met to discuss important local green spaces and were asking if the group agreed with what had been decided. Kathy (KW) stated that there were missing elements such as information about hectares and aerial views but that map references had been included. Jim (JB) agreed that these would be useful and Mervyn (MG) said that the map references will show up on the proposals map anyway. Kathy (KW) also said that the Water Meadow was not shown correctly. Rosie (RA) and Joe (JC) both thanked the group for their work. Christobel (CS) said that verges were important and should be kept and are covered in a paragraph. Philip (PW) said that a drone view of the village could be considered. He said that there was an old one on You-tube. Jim (JB) wondered if CCC have the views and that also CCC have suggested another meeting soon so could ask them then.

Jim (JB) said that he had reviewed the health check with a few members and had produced a document answering some of the questions which would then be used to feed into the Strategic Environmental Assessment. It would also feed into the consultation statement. Alan (AA), Mervyn (MG) and Joe (JC) did work on measuring the different sites against elements such as transport, water and flood and showed that the differences between the sites are marginal except for Church

Meadow which is totally unsuitable. Philip (PW) stated that site 3 changes and has different results depending on where looking to access the site from.

It was stated that although Highland Court is not part of Bridge there is a presentation to be held about it on 02/03/2017 but it was not sure if this was a public meeting or not and it was stated that no planning has been formally agreed yet. Mervyn (MG) stated that Highland Court highlighted an example of what could happen if no Neighbourhood Plan or decision had been made about housing.

Mervyn (MG) spoke about the Housing White paper. He said that the government are trying to encourage other forms of investment in property such as pension funds, institutions etc to increase the scope of rental housing. He said it was about getting houses built and that it still states engagement with local communities so Mervyn (MG) felt that the Neighbourhood Plan would still hold strong. Mervyn (MG) said that the paper is still pushing for building as targets have not yet been reached by the government and local authorities, therefore no new housing in Bridge is not an option. Jim (JB) said that the paper also encourages more design to be included in Neighbourhood Plans.

Jim (JB) suggested dates for the meeting with CCC with Lisa Gadd – 09/03/2017 2pm or 14/03/2017 10.00 pm. Jim (JB) said that CCC has more feedback to give on the Neighbourhood Plan. Jim (JB) asked that people let him know which is the best date.

Philip (PW) stated that the legal challenge for Mountfields has been put forward. Philip (PW) asked that if he receives a no in relationship to the grant for housing needs, should he ask the Parish Council for the money? The group agreed that he should. Philip also said that a leaflet drop in the village would also be an opportunity to communicate with the village.

The next meeting was agreed for Friday 24th March 2017 at 5.30pm in the Hunter Room.

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Council Office, Maudsley House, 47 High Street, Bridge CT4 5JZ

Tel; 01227 831085

Date 19 March 2017

To members of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee at the Hunter Room, Bridge on Friday, 24 March 2017 at 5.30 pm

Philip Wicker

Parish Clerk

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 24 February 2017.
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the Agenda
4. To consider resolutions forwarded for this meeting (See below) (Chair)
5. Update on meeting with Canterbury City Council on 14 March 2017 (Chair)
6. Update on the evidence base for the Plan; the strategic environmental assessment and the consultation statement. (Jim Boot)
7. The Housing Needs Assessment-documents for completion(attached)
8. Confirmation of the composition of the Neighbourhood Planning Committee from May 2017 (Clerk)
9. Points of information.

Date of next meeting: 28 April 2017 5.30 p.m. Hunter Room

Proposed motions to Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Committee.

Motion 1. Proposed by Kathy Walder, seconded by Mervyn Gulvin

Following the publication of the final draft of Canterbury Local Plan and the designation of the "Green Gap" between Canterbury and Bridge the matter of a site for housing should be re-considered:-

The village should be consulted and asked at a public exhibition to vote between

- a) Land north west of Conyngham Lane.
- b) Land to the east of the recreation ground between the A2 and Bridge School to the north of the public right of way.

Motion 2. Proposed by Mervyn Gulvin, seconded by Christobel Seath

To add to Section a new policy C3:-

To support the proposed conversion of redundant farm buildings at Great Pett Farm to units within class B1 appropriate to the rural setting and within the current footprint, to provide local work opportunities and provided that the development does not significantly increase traffic within the village centre.

Motion 3. Proposed by Christobel Seath, seconded by Kathy Walder

To add to Section F a new policy to prevent further light pollution within the village.

Motions to be placed on the agenda for the committee meeting of Friday 24th March 2017

Draft Minutes of a meeting of Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Committee Friday 24th March 2017 in Bridge Village Hall Hunter Room at 5.30 p.m:

Attending: Christobel Seath, Kathy Walder, Philip Wicker, Esther Hall, Jim Boot, Mervyn Gulvin, Terry Wilmshurst, Alan Atkinson, Joe Connor, Rosy Atkinson, John Hill.

Apologies: Sue Hodges.

The minutes from the previous meeting were checked and agreed.

Matters arising from minutes not on the agenda: The sudden appearance of the development of Great Pett Farm by Cantleys was discussed. The plans that have been published are for 10 units and 30 units. It was wondered if it might bring a change to the Neighbourhood Plan. It was stated that previously the plan for Great Pett Farm was for light industry and now it is housing and it was mentioned that these plans had only come out the day of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan meeting for the village to see so members have been unable to view and think about them.

Philip (PW) reported that he had spoken to Mr Gooch (of Cantley Estates) and asked him if the plans meant that Cantley has no other industrial plans for Bridge and he didn't receive an answer. Philip (PW) said that his sense was that there wouldn't be any light industry in Bridge and that Mr Gooch had said that they were re-evaluating their entire estate in Kent and are possibly considering light industry elsewhere. It was stated that what is in writing is a draft lease for allotments which is still a work in progress. Philip (PW) also asked Mr Gooch about the two possible plans for housing but again no clear answer given. An architect was asked to draw up plans and they are not the final plans. There is affordable housing in the 30 unit plan. It was felt that Cantley are keen for the Neighbourhood Plan Group to know that they are serious about development and so were keen to release a possible plan. And to get some information out to the village. Philip (PW) said that he didn't ask about Conyngham Lane.

Kathy (KW) felt that Cantley's housing plans would be detrimental to the village, pushing out the boundaries and destroying part of the green site. Christobel (CS) said that she didn't understand why the Group were even discussing these plans as the Neighbourhood Plan had already decided to allocate light industry to Great Pett Farm and now Cantley were allocating housing. Christobel (CS) also said that she felt that there was no benefit to the village and that if the site was in the village could ask for parking for example which would benefit the village. She also felt that the village would be upset by the new site as it would for example mean losing the sleighing field which has been there for generations. Christobel stated that she felt the Group should look at the proposals in line with the Neighbourhood Plan. Philip (PW) agreed with Christobel (CS) but also said that these plans are only for information at the moment and that no one has had time to look at them and to form decisions. Alan (AA) also agreed that the papers were not released in time for discussion at the meeting. Joe (JC) said that the plans will need to be discussed and how it could change the Neighbourhood Plan. Alan (AA) said that there will always be an outcry whichever site is chosen for housing and that the Neighbourhood Plan has two proposed sites and evidence to support both those sites gained from the village voting twice. Alan (AA) said that there was no evidence that this needs to change and maybe need to accept that housing will happen and to go with the first and then repeated decision. Christobel (CS) also felt that there had been no time to consider the new plans and that they would need to be discussed at a future date. Philip (PW) said that the village

would need to see the plans and see what comments received. Jim (JB) suggested leaving it for the Environmental Strategic Assessment to consider and villagers to then comment. Christobel also said that if the committee do to agree with the plans then can discuss after the Assessment done. It was agreed that this is what would happen.

Two resolutions were received for the meeting. Kathy suggested that given the information now known about the green gap, the sites for housing need to be reviewed and the village consulted again about the 2 potential sites, behind the recreation ground and Conyngham Lane. Alan (AA) checked how people would be asked to vote and it was agreed it would be one vote per person, using the electoral roll. Christobel (CS) agreed that it needs to be a vigorous process. It was also agreed that the green gap needs to be protected and Alan (AA) said that Conyngham Lane would be contained and the green gap would be protected for the whole village. Rosie (RA) stated that she was worried about access to all sites. Christobel (CS) said it would be up to the developer to demonstrate where access was to be.

Mervyn (MG) asked if it would be better to have Aecom's views before the exhibition and their views could then be included. It will take about 10 weeks for them to action their assessment. Philip (PW) said that it will be funded and Jim (JB) is writing the statement to start the process. . It was agreed that the new plans to be included and Alan (AA) will action this. Rosie (RA) it a; needs to researched fully and Mervyn (MG) agreed that the assessment would give additional evidence. Mervyn (MG) stated that he would prefer to see housing elsewhere and industry at Great Pett Farm as it would give opportunities to the village. Joe (JC) agreed that Aecom would be asked for their opinion. Mervyn (MG) suggested planning the exhibition for straight after the assessment. Kathy (KW) withdrew her motion until after the assessment feedback. Christobel (CS) said that there needs to be a record that 3 sites are now being considered. Philip (PW) agreed to ask Aecom to consider 3 sites.

Mervyn (MG) proposed a second motion regarding consideration of the need to have work within the village to support the village structure. He would like to see light industry and feels that Great Pett Farm would be the best place and still be within the boundary of the village. Mervyn (MG) asked if Aecom could be asked to look at Great Pett Farm for suitability for light industry use and Mervyn (MG) agreed to park the motion for now. Christobel (CS) said that the 2 different proposals for the site need to looked at and the benefits and consequences to the village.

Philip (PW) asked if the committee would like him to write to Cantleys. . Mervyn (MG) asked if Cantleys could be asked for a plan for the third site behind the school and compare and contrast. He also asked if Cantleys could also be asked about any plans for light industry in the village and comment on accessibility.

Christobel (CS) proposed another motion. She stated that light pollution was not included into the Plan. She feels that there needs to be some guidance on what light is allowed and the standards that should be followed especially for any new development. She stated that the stars can't be seen lie they used to be. Alan (AA) asked if it might be better to do that via the village design statement. Jim (JB) said that it had already been noted that it has not been included and that it is mentioned in other policies so would need to reference these in the Plan. This was agreed.

Joe (JC) gave an update of the meeting with Canterbury City Council (CCC) which he said had been quite informative. He attended with Philip (PW) and Alan (AA). Lisa Gadd (LG) had sent minutes to Philip (PW) which he will circulate. Lisa (LG) said that the chief way that the Plan did not conform to CCC's Plan was with the green gap. She said that could still go ahead but suggested writing to the inspector to ask for their advice. Jim (JB) also said that he had received communication from Lisa (LG) asking for a plan of the next steps to be taken for the Neighbourhood Plan and Jim (JB) reinforced CCC's duty to help us. Jim (JB) suggested arranging a meeting to discuss this and to consult with neighbouring Parish Councils. Philip (PW) also said that CCC has a fund that can be accessed for money. Philip (PW) said that can claim up to £9000 a year and that the Group had already had £6900 so could still apply for £2100. CCC also has further funds that could be explored. Philip (PW) will write to them.

Jim (JB) gave an update on the consultation statement. Jim (JB) said that he has a few gaps that he needs help filling. He said that he needs a copy of the survey of vehicle parking and Mervyn (MG) agreed to find and to send to him. He also said that he needs notes for the editorial meetings that were had and it was agreed that Mark might have the notes. It was also noted that there might be minutes as it was a working group. Jim (JB) said that he just needs to explain the process that was gone through. Joe (JC) and Philip (PW) agreed to try and quantify what occurred. Jim (JB) also said that need to go through the evidence document. Alan (AA) was asked to go through that and fill in the gaps. Jim (JB) agreed to let Alan (AA) know what he needs.

Philip (PW) said that ARCK will carry out the housing needs assessment and asked if the group agreed with the letter that will be sent out. Philip (PW) said that need to be clear who is sending the letter out and reference as to why people are being asked to complete it again. Philip (PW) to edit the letter and send round for comments before sending out.

Philip (PW) said that the committee needs to be reaffirmed in May by the Parish Council. He asked that if there is anyone who does not wish to continue could they write to him. He stated that it is for the Parish Council to decide who will replace any member leaving. Philip (PW) also asked for members to let him know if they have anyone who might be interested in being part of the group.

Joe(JC) thanked Esther(EH) for the assistance she had given to the committee over several years.

The next meeting was agreed for Friday 28th April 2017 at 5.30pm in the Hunter Room. Philip (PW) to take the notes next time.

Minutes of BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL'S NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Held at 5.30 p.m. on Friday 26 May 2017 in the Hunter Room

Present: Cllr A Atkinson, Cllr R Atkinson and Christobel Seath. Also in attendance, Philip Wicker (Clerk and note taker) and Jim Boot (Consultant to BNPC)

Apologies: Cllr Hodges and John Hill

Christobel Seath was proposed as **Chair** for the meeting by Cllr A Atkinson and seconded by Cllr R Atkinson. She agreed to undertake the role.

The **Minutes of meeting** held on 24 March 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chair. There were no matters arising to consider.

SEA scoping report. Jim Boot rehearsed the reasons for the scoping report and how it is funded. It will be sent to KCC Highways and to the AONB planning adviser as well as to statutory consultees. JB explained that responses will be noted and considered. Section 10 of the report sets out next steps. The current consultation ends on 15 June 2017.

Site allocations. Given that a further set of plans for proposed housing on the Patrixbourne Rd end of the recreation ground had been printed by the Clerk a few minutes before the meeting it was decided to defer this item until the next meeting. It was also agreed that the forthcoming housing needs survey would provide important evidence for putative housing developments within the Neighbourhood Plan and that this process needed to start as soon as possible (see below). The basis of the forthcoming regulation 15 consultation with the parish will be on how to improve policies and site allocations within the Plan. This consultation-to be led by Canterbury City Council- must go beyond a box tacking exercise. Consultation by Cantley themselves on all of their housing proposals is also a possibility.

Timeline for completing the plan.

Discussion took place on how the village can be involved in consultation on proposed housing site allocations. This should commence by early September 2017. **Bridge Parish neighbourhood Planning Committee will take a decision on how to allocate sites within the plan taking SEA and the housing needs survey into account, to then be accepted or not by the full Parish Council**

The housing needs assessment.

It was agreed to put the survey out as it currently stands without adding additional questions which might blur its focus and confuse respondents. The Chair stated that affordable housing might be sold off under housing plans of the last government, though Jim Boot pointed out that there might be ways round this through the use of "Community Land Trusts"

Points of information. The Parish Council will take a close look at the latest draft of the Neighbourhood Plan at its meeting in September 2017

The meeting closed at 6.30 p.m.

The next meeting of Bridge Parish Council's Neighbourhood Planning Committee will be

on Wednesday 28 June at 5.30 p.m. in the Hunter Room

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Council Office, Maudsley House, 47 High Street, Bridge CT4 5JZ

Tel; 01227 831085

Date 22 May 2017

To members of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee at the Hunter Room, Bridge on Friday, 26 May 2017 at 5.30 pm

Philip Wicker

Parish Clerk

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 24 February 2017.
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the agenda
4. SEA Scoping Report - consultation period/responses
5. Site allocations
6. Update from meeting with CCC on 23rd May
7. Timeline for completing the plan
8. The Housing Needs assessment-questions to be asked and timing
9. Points of information

Date of next meeting

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Council Office, Maudsley House, 47 High Street, Bridge CT4 5JZ

Tel; 01227 831085

Date 22 June 2017

To members of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee at the Hunter Room, Bridge on Wednesday, 28 June 2017 at 5.30 pm

Philip Wicker

Parish Clerk

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2017
([http://www.bridgevillage.org.uk/jcwebfiles/parishcouncil/pages/NHP/Draft%20\(revisions\)%20Minutes%20of%20BPC%20planning%20committee-26%20May%202017-1.pdf](http://www.bridgevillage.org.uk/jcwebfiles/parishcouncil/pages/NHP/Draft%20(revisions)%20Minutes%20of%20BPC%20planning%20committee-26%20May%202017-1.pdf))
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the agenda
4. To receive updates from Cantley Ltd
5. To receive updates on the Strategic Environmentla assessment process
6. To receive an update from Jim Boot on latest developments (Jim Boot)
7. Points of information

The next meeting of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee will be set at the meeting.

Draft Minutes of BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL'S NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Held at 5.30 p.m. on **Wednesday 28 June 2017** in the Hunter Room

Present: Cllr A Atkinson (Chair) Cllr R Atkinson (arrived at 17.48), John Hill and Christobel Seath. Also in attendance, Philip Wicker (Clerk and note taker) and Jim Boot (Consultant to BNPC)

Apologies: Cllr Hodges.

The **Minutes of meeting** held on 26 May 2017 were amended and signed by the Chair. There were no matters arising to consider.

Updates from Cantley.

Now the Canterbury Local Development Plan has effectively been signed off by the government inspector, a written communication is expected from Cantley Ltd within 2 weeks outlining their intentions in so far as potential development sites within Bridge are concerned.

Update on the Strategic Environmental assessment process

Formal responses have been received from the AONB, CPRE, Historic England and three villagers. The Environment Agency will probably respond during the regulation 14 consultation. There has not been a response from Natural England which according to Jim Boot suggests they appear to be content. In all probability, a table showing the major points raised during the consultation will be created by AECOM inviting comments from the Committee.

Latest developments and Next steps (Jim Boot)

The Committee will need to decide on site allocations (or none) before a redraft and update of the plan can be properly discussed by the Parish Council in September 2017.

Jim explained the next steps in the SEA process, using a document already received from AECOM as a template and attached to these minutes.

He also pointed out the May/June 2017 edition of a publication called "Upfront" which shows how villages can be protected from development of unallocated sites once a Neighbourhood Plan is in place.

The Housing needs assessment results should be available by late July. The next redraft of the Plan-to be prepared in time for the Parish Council meeting on 14 September-should include this information as well as any amendments brought about by the SEA process.

Points of information

Members discussed their availability during the summer months.

Thanks were extended to members of the committee and other volunteers for distributing the housing needs survey in late June 2017.

The meeting closed at 6.13p.m.

The next meeting of Bridge Parish Council's Neighbourhood Planning Committee will be on Thursday 17 August at 4.00 p.m. in the Hunter Room

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Council Office, Maudsley House, 47 High Street, Bridge CT4 5JZ

Tel; 01227 831085

Date 17 August 2017

To members of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee at the Hunter Room, Bridge on Thursday, 17 August 2017 at 4.00 pm

Philip Wicker

Parish Clerk

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence (Jim Boot, Philip Wicker)
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 28 June 2017
<http://www.bridgevillage.org.uk/jcwebfiles/parishcouncil/pages/NHP/Final%20Draft%20Minutes%20of%20BPC%20planning%20committee-28%20June%202017%20-1.pdf>
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the agenda
4. Update on the latest version of the draft plan
5. Updates from Cantley
6. Update on AECOM and SEA
7. Update from Jim Boot on latest developments (Jim Boot)
8. Points of information

The next meeting of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee will be on tba at 5.30 pm in the Hunter Room.

Draft Minutes of the NPC 17 August 2017

Present AA, (Chair), RA, JH, SH, CS.

1 Apologies for absence

Received and accepted from PW and Jim Boot

2 Minutes of previous meeting were accepted.

3 No matters arising not covered elsewhere

4 Latest version of the Plan

AA thanked CS and SH for the work they had done in the latest update of the Plan. There remains some cross checking references to do.

5. Updates from Cantley

Cantley's agents have indicated that they will withdraw the site North of Conyngham Lane, and they are in discussion about other sites around the Village. They are keen still to have sites included within the Plan. It was agreed that there might still be need to discuss this matter with them, and that a meeting with them would be required. AA to arrange with PW.

It was suggested that it would be possible to consider Cantley's suggestion for housing separately first, before their inclusion within the Plan, by employing external assistance to consult within the Village.

It was agreed that AA should contact Democratic Services about this.

6. Updates from external bodies.

It seems that there has been nothing new received to report back on.

7. Report from Jim Boot

JB being absent, this was deferred.

8 Points of Information

AA is to report back to BPC at the September meeting.

Date of next meeting TBC.

(AA)

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Council Office, Maudsley House, 47 High Street, Bridge CT4 5JZ

Tel; 01227 831085

Date 30 October 2017

To members of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee at the Hunter Room, Bridge on Friday, 3 November 2017 at 5.00 pm

Philip Wicker
Parish Clerk

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 17 August 2017
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the agenda
4. Report back from meeting on 4th Oct at Canterbury City Council (Chair)
5. To review the final offer and pamphlet from Cantley
6. Voting arrangements-to approve the booking and use of the village hall on 25 November 2017 and the voting arrangements to be employed on that date
7. AECOM feedback (Jim Boot)
8. Agreement re any amendments to Plan subsequent to voting outcome.
9. Points of information

The next meeting of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee will be on tba at tba in the Hunter Room.

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Council Office, Maudsley House, 47 High Street, Bridge CT4 5JZ

Tel; 01227 831085

Date 24 November 2017

To members of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee at the Hunter Room, Bridge on Wednesday, 29 November 2017 at 3.00 pm

Philip Wicker
Parish Clerk

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2017
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the agenda
4. To receive feedback on the parish vote on 25 November (all)
5. To decide whether to write the vote result of 25 November into the Neighbourhood Plan (Chair)
6. Points of information

The next meeting of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee will be on tba at tba in the Hunter Room.

Draft Minutes of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee at the Hunter Room, Bridge on Wednesday, 29 November 2017 at 3.00 pm

1. Present: AA (Chair), SH, RA, JH, (plus advisor JB) [Apologies for absence – PW (CS sent apologies that afternoon)]
2. Minutes of the meeting of 3 November 2017 confirmed as a true record
Matters Arising from the Minutes : JB explained that the AECOM report had been received and repeated their conclusion that over 75 housing units began to significantly negatively impact upon the area.
3. The parish vote on 25 November returned 215 yes votes, 113 no votes, and one unmarked paper. This is therefore in excess of a 65% 'yes' vote on a turnout of approximately 26% turnout,
4. It was agreed to include the Cantley proposals into the draft Plan. Further, it was agreed to remove the additional social housing units at Brickfields, given the provision for this housing within the Cantley package. This would maintain the overall total of new housing units within the Plan at 40 units. AA noted the current rules which limit Brickfields to those who already have some Bridge Village connection, and was concerned to maintain such a link with any new social housing. There was then some discussion as to whether it was possible to stipulate that the new social units could be restricted to persons with a prior connection with the Village. JB suggested this was possible, and had been done at Wye.
5. JH to produce a list of NP contributors: SH and CS to continue work on open spaces: AA would ask if District's planning maps might be used within our plan.
6. Next meeting: Wednesday 13th December at 3pm, venue probably Hunter Room.

Minutes taken by Cllr A Atkinson

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Council Office, Maudsley House, 47 High Street, Bridge CT4 5JZ

Tel; 01227 831085

Date 8 December 2017

To members of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee at the Hunter Room, Bridge on Wednesday, 13 December 2017 at 3.00 pm

Philip Wicker
Parish Clerk

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 29 November 2017
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the agenda
4. Date of next meeting with Canterbury City Council
5. Employment of planning consultant(s) for the housing element of the plan?
(JB)
6. Current status of latest version of the plan and next steps
7. Any other business

The next meeting of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee will be on tba at tba in the Hunter Room.

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Council Office, Maudsley House, 47 High Street, Bridge CT4 5JZ

Tel; 01227 831085

Date 2 January 2018

To members of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee at the Hunter Room, Bridge on Monday, 8 January 2018 at 3.00 pm

Philip Wicker

Parish Clerk

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 29 November 2017
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the agenda
4. Meeting with Canterbury City Council (15 Jan)
5. Current status of latest version of the plan and next steps
6. Any other business

The next meeting of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee will be on tba at tba in the Hunter Room.

Draft Minutes of a Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee at the Hunter Room, Bridge on Monday, 8 January 2018 at 3.00 pm

1. Present: AA (Chair), SH, RA, CS, JH, (plus advisor JB and notetaker PSW)
2. Minutes of the meeting of 29 November 2017 were confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes:
 - It was agreed to include Brickfields as one of the proposed green spaces within the plan-using one or more of the 4 criteria set out by Jim Boot namely, Recreational use/Heritage/Wildlife preservation/Tranquillity.
 - Views were shared about matters to be raised with Canterbury City Council planners on 15 January 2018. It was agreed to ask about the use of maps/to talk through the current state of the plan (with as many appendices as possible;) and the potential use of the Sticky World software mentioned previously by CCC as a consultation tool.
4. **The current status of the plan.**

It was agreed to:

- add more photos to the views of the village section;
- add photographs of the proposed Green Spaces and to add relevant text to both sections.
- send the latest version of the plan to AECOMM for them to start their environmental report in a timely fashion
- encourage the Parish Council to consider the Neighbourhood Plan for adoption at its 8 February meeting in order to kickstart the regulation 14 process
- approach former Councillor Corfield to see whether photos on the website could be used

Consultation responses have been received and considered. The next version of the plan will include those responses which have been accepted for inclusion in the plan. Once completed, the plan will need to be sent to CCC as well to other statutory consultees.

JB reminded the meeting of the requirements of regulation 14 and 15 consultations. Regulation 14 will include local parishes and statutory consultees and will last for 6 weeks. Regulation 15 will be for CCC to express their views. Once done, the plan is submitted to an independent examiner for inspection and thereafter goes to referendum if deemed acceptable.

5. Further consultation with the community.

The meeting also considered the means of consulting with the local community. JB undertook to circulate a copy of the Wye consultation form. It was agreed to produce a non technical summary document to all households (with a list of the policies and a means of finding out more) and to have printed copies available in public places. The clerk agreed to sound out the following places as potential repositories of the consultation draft: St Peter's Church; the Parish Office; The Sports Pavilion; the 3 pubs, the village hall, the Londis shop, both hairdressers, and surgeries, Mr Gulvin's office and the pharmacy.

6. Next meeting if needed: Monday 22 January 2018 at 3pm, venue probably Hunter Room. The meeting closed at 15.55.

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Council Office, Maudsley House, 47 High Street, Bridge CT4 5JZ

Tel; 01227 831085

Date 2 May 2018

To members of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee at the Hunter Room, Bridge on Tuesday, 8 May 2018 at 6.00 pm

Philip Wicker

Parish Clerk

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2018
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the agenda
4. To agree revisions to the plan as a result of the Regulation 14 consultation
5. To review next steps in the formal adoption of the plan
6. Any other business.

The next meeting of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee will be on tba in the Hunter Room.

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Council Office, Maudsley House, 47 High Street, Bridge CT4 5JZ

Tel; 01227 831085

Date 11 May 2018

To members of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee at the Hunter Room, Bridge on Wednesday, 16 May 2018 at 6.00 pm

Philip Wicker

Parish Clerk

Draft AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 8 May 2018
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the agenda
4. To review the draft Basic Conditions Statement and to agree on how responses to the regulation 14 consultation would be shown in the regulation 15 consultation document.
5. To review next steps in the formal adoption of the plan
6. Any other business.

The next meeting of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee will be on tba in the Hunter Room.

Draft Minutes of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee at the Hunter Room, Bridge on Tuesday, 8 May 2018 at 6.00 pm

1. Present: AA (Chair), SH, RA, CS and Clerk PW
2. Apologies for absence – JH sent apologies with a note indicating he was happy for the meeting to adopt the latest draft for the regulation 15 consultation.
3. The minutes of the meeting of 8 January 2018 were confirmed as a true record, signed and dated by the Chair. Having gained the approval of all members of the committee, he also signed and dated as a true record the previously circulated notes of a meeting held on 20 March 2018 between AA JH PW and Charlie Gooch of Cantley Ltd.
4. Matters Arising from the Minutes: There were none which did not appear on the agenda for this meeting.
5. The committee agreed revisions to the plan as a result of the Regulation 14 consultation. All members of the committee confirmed they had received a copy of all of the responses to the consultation. CS and AA took the committee through all changes to the plan line by line. The agreed version of the plan would now be placed before Bridge Parish Council on 10 May, and if accepted by the Council, would then form the basis of the regulation 15 consultation with Canterbury City Council. The committee agreed to publish all of the responses received, whether from members of the public, public authorities or from private companies. Thanks were offered to all those members of the committee who had spent so many hours revising the plan prior to its adoption at this meeting.
6. In reviewing next steps in the formal adoption of the plan, members agreed they needed to pay particular attention to the tabulation of responses and the basic conditions statement before regulation 15 consultation can commence. Members also noted that 2 planners from Canterbury City Council had walked the village with members of the committee to review the proposed green spaces.
7. There being no other business the meeting closed at 7.12 p.m.
8. Next meeting: Wednesday 16 May at 6pm, in the Hunter Room.

Minutes taken by Philip Wicker, Clerk to Bridge Parish Council

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Council Office, Maudsley House, 47 High Street, Bridge CT4 5JZ

Tel; 01227 831085

Date 12 June 2018

To members of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee in the Hunter Room, Bridge on Monday, 18 June 2018 at 4.00 pm.

Philip Wicker

Parish Clerk

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 16 May 2018 (circulated)
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the agenda
4. To review the regulation 15 consultation document in light of a meeting with Canterbury City Council planners on 12 June 2018
5. To review next steps in the formal adoption of the plan
6. Any other business.

The next meeting of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee will be on tba in the Hunter Room.

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Council Office, Maudsley House, 47 High Street, Bridge CT4 5JZ

Tel; 01227 831085

Date 10 October 2018

To members of the Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee in the Parish Office, 47 High St , Bridge on Tuesday, 16 October 2018 at

[3.30 pm](#)

Philip Wicker

Parish Clerk

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2018. (circulated)
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the agenda
4. To review the Plan in light of comments received through the Regulation 16 consultation document
5. To decide upon responses to be made to the Inspector dated 9 October
6. Any other business.

Minutes of NP meeting March 4th, 2019

Present : AA, RA, PDa, PDh, SF, SH.

Apologies : RM, PW.

Absent : NK, SS.

- 1) Membership of Committee : the membership was agreed changed to reflect the suggestion from BPC. Former Clerk Mrs Seath indicated that she did not wish to remain as a member of the group, but that she was willing to assist as required, particularly should there be matters relating to the earlier years' work. Membership is as set out above, although the members marked absent will be asked to confirm their willingness to assist and to remain as members.
- 2) It was agreed to meet with the CCC Planners. This has now been arranged for Tuesday 12th March at 10 am, with Lisa Gadd and Karen Britten at Military Road.
- 3) As agreed by BPC, it was agreed that NP will be rewritten, with former Plan withdrawn. New plan to incorporate much of the comment from the Examiner's draft report, but to include the housing elements from the Cantley Proposal. Once this can be done, it will be re-presented to the Village for comment, before proceeding onto formal consultation process.

Meeting closed at 7.50.

AGENDA

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

11 JUNE AT 6.30 IN THE HUNTER ROOM

1. Review Progress of Plan
2. Suggest Amendment
3. To agree on a Consultation for the Village.
4. Agree Meetings going forward.

AGENDA

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN MEETING

22nd JULY AT 6.30 IN THE HUNTER ROOM

1. Apologies
2. Call for Sites - Responses
3. To agree on a Consultation for the Village and Dates
4. Update re website format to agree a format going forward.

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN COMMITTEE

22nd JULY AT 6.30 p.m. IN HUNTER ROOM

Those Present: Cllr Atkinson, Fawke, Davies, Kirk, Shirley, Cook, Cllr R Atkinson and the Clerk.

Apologies: Sue Hodges, Phillip Wicker, Cllr Dhillon and Cllr Moon.

Cllr Atkinson confirmed the minutes were a true reflection of the last meeting and all Cllrs agreed.

With regard to the Call for Sites this has been sent to Cantely, Vanessa McDonald and Canterbury City Council. Cllr Atkinson read out a letter from Peter Reilly with regard to the Brickfields site and to confirm that this is currently on a short-term tenancy and this is not available. Cllr Atkinson confirmed that Cantely have again proposed the site by the Recreation Ground and the letter has been circulated by the Clerk to the Committee.

Cllr Cook asked whether Canterbury City Council are actively developing Brickfields. Cllr Atkinson confirmed that Brickfields is not available as a potential site. Cllr Cook also mentioned that the City would be looking at their Local Plan during the summer.

This meeting is to agree on consultation dates for the village, previous meetings were carried out in the Church or the Hall – Cllr Atkinson suggested that a weekend presentation to the Village and possibly a Tuesday evening.

Cllr Atkinson confirmed that the Plan would be open to the Village for Consultation. Cllr Atkinson explained the Cllr Kirk has some ideas. Cllr Kirk outlined his proposal that the first meeting will be introductory before the official consultation. A resident asked about a referendum and did we not have a referendum before Cllr Atkinson explained that this would happen after the Consultation period.

Cllr Cook said we need time to inform the Village and invite comments beforehand. It was suggested that suitable times were the end of August, however Cllr Cook felt that Villagers were still on annual leave, so the dates were suggested as Saturday 7th and Sunday 8th September. Confirmed as Saturday 7th and Tuesday evening the 10th September (between 7 p.m. – 9 p.m.). Copies of Plans will be distributed at this time.

There will be time for the Village to chat about the Plan Cllr Cook asked is this an event to inform people or for people to ask questions. Cllr Kirk asked can we take comments. Cllr Cook felt that comments via letter and email should be relevant. Cllr Atkinson confirmed we need all AEOM Assessments to be carried out before this goes to consultation. Cllr Cook asked Cllr Atkinson was the only call from Sites received from Cantley? Cllr Atkinson confirmed this.

Cllr Atkinson asked the Committee shall we work towards the suggested dates? This was agreed by the Committee..

Cllr Kirk is looking to do a dedicated website for the NP – Home page should then navigate everyone to the correct place and explains the process. NK is open to comments from the Committee before

this goes live and would welcome these. Cllr Atkinson asked that the entire Committee to look at this before it goes live. Cllr Kirk will email this through to the Committee.

Cllr Kirk feels we should do a maildrop and is in the process of preparing a leaflet. Cllr Kirk asked when would this go live? In addition, should there be a link from the current website to this dedicated website and can there be links from Facebook page to this.

Cllr Cook asked the cost and Cllr Kirk explained a domain is £10.00 per year.

Clerk to check times/dates with Mark Esdale for the Consultation to the Village.

The meeting ended at 7.10 p.m.

Next Meeting Monday 2nd September at 7.00 PM in the Hunter Room.

AGENDA

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN MEETING

2 SEPTEMBER 2019 - HUNTER ROOM AT 7.00

1. Apologies
2. Confirm Minutes of last meeting
3. Update on progress since last meeting
4. NP website
5. Presentations to village: material required
6. Printing of material : distribution of same
7. Date of Next Meeting

AGENDA

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN MEETING

30 SEPTEMBER 2019 - HUNTER ROOM AT 6.30

1. Apologies
2. Confirm Minutes of last meeting
3. A Review of what has happened since last time: two consultations and discussion with AECOM.
4. Consider the comments received at/since last consultations/ decide what to amend within the Plan.
5. To agree to obtain info and to progress to next steps.
6. Discuss whether comments should be anonymised and made public via the website
7. How to increase village participation in the NP process.
8. Date of Next Meeting.

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN COMMITTEE

2nd SEPTEMBER AT 7.00 PM. IN HUNTER ROOM

Those Present: Cllr Atkinson, Fawke, Davies, Kirk, Shirley, Cook , Moon and the Clerk.

Apologies: Sue Hodges, Phillip Wicker, Cllr Paldeep, Cllr R Atkinson.

Cllr Atkinson confirmed the minutes were a true reflection of the last meeting and all Cllrs agreed.

Update on progress since last meeting – As per last minutes only one Site received, The Cantley Site Cllr Atkinson wrote to CCC about Brickfields Site Cllr Atkinson has spoken to a Planning Consultant who has agreed to look at the Plan. Grant money has been received from Groundwork sum of £4,000 paid on 04/08/19.

Cllr Kirk confirmed we have a Domain separate from the Village. Cllr Kirk will take off the passwords and Cllr Atkinson has asked that all Councillors look at this. Cllr Moon suggested by 5.00 pm tomorrow. Cllr Kirk will ask Mark Esdale to put a link from main village website. Cllr Fawke.

Presentations to Village will need to be put back by a week end of Saturday 14th September (2.00 – 4.00) and Tuesday 17th September (6.00 – 8.00). Clerk to confirm with Village Hall/Pavilion is available for these dates.

Cllr Cook asked how are we going to track comments – Cllr Atkinson confirmed this would be done via the Clerk. The Clerk will take minutes name and addresses at the village Consultation and if someone would like to not give their address at the meeting they can do so afterwards to the Clerk. Cllr Cook suggested a box in the School and a box in the Shop. Cllr Kirk will put on website. Deadline for written notes needs to be 5.00 pm on 27th September.

Cllr Fawke will speak to Ranjit at Londis about putting a box in the Shop and Cllr Cook suggested asking Rev Estella re a place at the church.

Cllr Kirk has had quotes from two printing place, 800 pamphlets and will contact CCC who are normally competitive. It was decided to print 20 copies of the draft plan.

Date of Next Meeting Monday 30th September 6.30.

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN COMMITTEE

30th SEPTEMBER AT 6.30 PM. IN HUNTER ROOM

Those Present: Cllr Atkinson, Cllr Kirk, Shirley, Cook, Cllr R Atkinson and the Clerk.

1. Apologies; Sue Hodges, Phillip Wicker, Cllr Paldeep, Cllr Moon, Cllr Fawke, Cllr Davies.
2. Cllr Atkinson confirmed the minutes of the 2nd September were a true reflection of the last meeting and all Cllrs agreed.
3. The draft Consultations have taken place and people left their comments these were held on Saturday 14th September and Tuesday 17th September approximately 65 people attended both events.
4. Review of what has happened since last time: two consultations and discussion with AECOM and they asked for paperwork on Sites etc. Cantley would like to speak with the Village/Parish Council. Cllr Cook said that parking in the High Street should not increase due to the proposal of the houses via Cantley and Cantley need to encompass their Property with adequate parking.
5. Consider the comments received at/since last consultations/ decide what to amend within the Plan. 38 Comments in total, these have been categorized into Parking. The Plan will not bring additional parking issues to the High Street. Possibly some parking around the Village Hall. Page 13 paragraph houses on the 40 (DG) asking for clarity update. Amend the Plan wording to show this. Action reply to DG. Mutiny houses or not Cllr Atkinson/Cllr Cook we don't do this then we wont get anything back. Write back to the persons with the various comments. Sustainable Transport – Cycle path – South Canterbury Development has plans for cycle path. Support the plan. Due to the builds taking place in south Canterbury feels there is no need for houses to be built. Village Hall needs to be where tennis courts – the reason for the Village Hall being there is Primary School and Flood areas. Cllr Cook suggested that if Cantley give the land then its down to BPC where Village Hall go. Cllr Atkinson suggested if things need to be moved they should be done so now. However due to Flood zone area it needs to be left where it is. Comments why is Bridge offering houses, last consultation the majority of the people voted against the Plan. Cllr Cook we need to be very clear that the Plan is not just about gaining the Recreation Ground but about the organic growth of houses. Cllr Cook do we have formal writing that houses will be developed? Cllr Atkinson asked about putting Recreation Ground on Brickfields Cllr Atkinson – to ask CCC Planning – about local houses coming through. Location of houses etc people to offer up more land. This is a plan for next xxx years. The movement up the field because of flood plain. The village hall will cost a lot of money there are schemes that exist to raise the money.

Policy A2 – potential wording change in development of Pett Farm There is a specific policy about this Page 8 wording needs To change.

Policy C3 – needs a new map Page 14.

Appendix F needs to be published.

Community Assets – The Clerk is currently dealing with raising these.

Should be possible for the Lease be to be buy-out - major development. We are not tenant so we cannot argue this.

Policy E2 – Cllr Cook feels people talk about the Bridge envelope rather than what encompasses Bridge Parish. Cllr Kirk do we include a map to include this, Cllr Cook the NP does not envisage any more than 40 houses. The BPC will strongly impose development outside the Green Plan

10.3 The NP is a sub-committee and why has village people been invited. The NP was set out and we had to co-opt members.

Notification - no notification received for consultation

There is no need for BPC to offer up houses, map needs clarifying.

Green – a lot I agree with how are you prioritizing the green BPC will firmly support South Canterbury Cycle Path.

Village Hall concept – mechanism in place to borrow money frequently asked questions.

In favour of this development – timescales set out and Village Hall mechanisms in place.

Consultation regarding building of Village Hall.

What measures are in place with regard to Flooding – Little Stour and Nailbourne River Group. Currently BPC is a founder member of this Group.

20 mph seems like a sensible limit and have put this in the plan.

Buses from Folkestone to Canterbury and only 1 to Folkestone. BPC regularly lobby stagecoach.

Consideration should be given to Islands for slowing of traffic, speed bumps, ramps etc. Traffic calming methods increase air pollution.

Buses are operated by Stagecoach we can lobby but have no.

Stronger policies on transporting children to school – it sits outside our authority cannot be issued.

Cycle path Policy B1 project B4 talks about working with Council. If cycle route is essential. Segways. Check inconsistencies.

People drive to drs surgery and londis, BPC we regularly lobby the CCC for enforcement. We cannot make people walk.

Mention of Farmers Market – not within the plan. This is for Farmers market organisation

Could we have wind turbine to reduce the carbon footprint – no authority for.

Policy A2 – this clear for conversion only – groups chosen were light industrial Cllr Cook to check B1 anything industrial that doesn't interfere with anyone.

Policy C3 – Cantely supportive of affordable houses – handled by CCC as was before.

The reference of transferring the lease – was to make it closely linked as possible.

Clarification is required regarding Flood Zone 1, this will not run through the flood zone.

Policy C 3 should include the village design statement.

Speeding in Bridge High Street – Air Quality Monitoring we are already looking at High Street. Speed watch are out.

Very sensible people air quality.

Pleased with plan – similar houses to Mansfield Court for the elderly people.

See no objection – Village Hall and Parking – restrictions 20 mph = air quality monitoring.

I agree with the proposals cycle route. Fully support the plan hope this goes to referendum – could do with photos being reinstalled.

Strongly support

Bridge to stay as clean as possible.

Happy with plan – car park could have grass parking rather than tarmac Parking included for school.

No more houses – affordable house need to be built but not in Bridge.

No objections to houses being built – Access is a problem – new roads – we have written about footpaths

and it will be very difficult to reinforce people parking outside the village.

Paul referenced some communications marking out the issues, Good advice on Mark Esdale Paul has a strong presumption that because of the sub-tenancy to tennis court and work with the pavilion – there is scope for an extension to the lease. If this Plan does not come off – back up plan – Get advice on the Recreation Ground. Representation very positive move to be invited tonight. Cllr Atkinson the NP was pre-determined. PF Look at Locality guidance that it doesn't just have to be Councillors.

6. To agree to obtain info and to progress to next steps.

Cllr Atkinson and Cllr Kirk – meet Wednesday to draft points. Formal Consultation period which will be handled by Canterbury City Council

7. Discuss whether comments should be anonymised and made public via the website

Decided these should be anonymised.

8. How to increase village participation in the NP process

9. Date of Next Meeting **Monday 11th November at 6.30**

AGENDA

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN MEETING

Bridge Village Hall on Thursday 12th March at 7.15pm

1. Apologies
2. Confirm Minutes of last meeting
3. A Review of what has happened since last time: two consultations and discussion with AECOM.
4. Consider the comments received at/since last consultations/ decide what to amend within the Plan.
5. To agree to obtain info and to progress to next steps.
6. Discuss whether comments should be anonymised and made public via the website
7. How to increase village participation in the NP process.
8. Date of Next Meeting.