

**Note of Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Group (BNPG) meeting  
with Canterbury City Council (CCC) 26<sup>th</sup> July 2016**

**Present:** Cathy McNab, Senior Planning Policy Officer, Karen Britton, Planning Policy Manager, CCC Mervyn Gulvyn, Vice-Chair, BNPG, Alan Atkinson, Chair, Bridge Parish Council (BPC) and Jim Boot, Consultant, BPC/BNPG.

1. For the 'soft' examination/health check, CM suggested that rather than using an Examiner who might not know Bridge, to use Catherine Hughes a Planning Consultant based in Wye, Ashford. JB supported the suggestion. JB knows Catherine helped Wye with their NP and has worked for CCC including the Canterbury Rural Settlement Hierarchy Study, 2011 (see Dropbox) and so is familiar with Bridge. ***This would be proposed to the NPG and if agreed JB will contact Catherine.***
2. CCC now have to provide 800 dwellings per annum, up from the 580 dwellings per annum. Five years' supply is a key issue and having some degree of certainty about this. CCC have had to find sites that could come through quickly. Their next 'Proposed Amendments' [to the draft Local Plan] consultation will be from November to January. In September the Inspector will spend two weeks looking at infrastructure, employment, green gaps etc.
3. KB offered to go through Bridge's six proposed sites:
  - a. Site 2 was a SHLAA site (see Dropbox: CDLP Rural South – SHLAA Worksheets).
  - b. Site 4&5 were not considered viable because of flooding.
  - c. With Site 3 there was a concern over the view over the recreation ground.
  - d. KB and CM asked about whether the possibility of swapping current recreation ground for Site 4 and developing the recreation ground had been considered. AA confirmed that it hadn't been put forward as part of the March-April 2016 site consultation.
  - e. It was considered that Site 2 has an issue with CCC's Green Gap and has a few vociferous opponents. Positively it would likely cause less traffic to travel through the village and could encourage walking to school. It was also the most favoured site with residents in the March consultation. CM said that she had carried out a housing land assessment on the site and it didn't score well. ***CM to send AA and MG SHLAA report.*** AA explained that determining the extent for development at that site might help fix the Green Gap.
  - f. AA said that Site 1 likely has groundwater springs in it and the lower portion is wet and adjacent houses on the High Street have had water in their cellars. It was not included in the SHLAA. There is potential to extend the allotments along/bordering the road to Canterbury.
4. CM asked about the Great Pett Farm as an employment/business site – although acknowledge it would need some minor road improvements. ***It was suggested adding Great Pett Farm into the plan as employment land.***
5. JB asked whether the decision [on housing sites in Bridge] was really now in the hands of the Inspector and KB and CM acknowledged that it probably was. AA said that as long as [Bridge] brought forward 40 homes, why should it matter where they were. KB said that Sites 1&2 had come in late, once the SHLAA had been done.
6. MG mentioned the traffic plan for South Canterbury and how it might impact on Bridge.
7. CB suggested that the key test of 'major development' in the AONB was 'impact/effect'. It was ***suggested to get a view from the Kent Downs AONB Unit's Katy Miller.***
8. JB asked about affordable housing. CM confirmed that the current proportion on a site was 30% 'affordable' but the government is moving towards including 20% Starter Homes in this definition leaving on 10% for social housing (to rent). KB asked about the demand for housing in the village and MG referred her to the original household survey (see Dropbox) which was relatively favourable to

**Note of Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Group (BNPG) meeting  
with Canterbury City Council (CCC) 26<sup>th</sup> July 2016**

affordable housing (63.2%)<sup>1</sup>. But that there was a concern over diminishing rural services. CM said that in some respect you do want development nearer to the village centre to support the existing services, rather than an outlying development where people would simply disappear up the road into Canterbury.

9. **CM said that the Statement of Community Involvement was a good start but needs the detail of the responses adding in. Include posters and leaflets as well.** AA ran through the consultation process that Joe Connor had mapped out. CM remarked that consultation on sites was quite short and further consultation on this might be appropriate. This could be done at the draft plan stage.

10. **CM said that as you are putting in a site, you will have to do a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Plan but that you can use the CCC SA particularly for the Site and Policies** (see SHLAA for Bridge document). Also that BNPG might consider using the same consultants but they maybe expensive. Also that you should **talk to the statutory consultees sooner rather than later (see list at the end)**.

11. Other recommendations included:

a. **'Local Greenspace' designation for particular sites in the village including the recreation ground and Church Meadow. It was felt that BNPG would need to consult landowners. Also putting together a register of brownfield sites and their possible use. AA confirmed that the only possible site was Great Pett Farm.**

b. **Also to check 'permitted development rights' in the NPPF ie from shop to house.**

c. **To use positive wording [of policies] and avoid the word 'only'!**

d. **She also advised that with development, you may need to look at infrastructure, highways, buffering and landscaping.**

e. **It was confirmed that the CCC energy policy on CHP was only for much larger sites and so not appropriate for Bridge.**

f. **Also suggested taking a look at the KCC website on this (see links at the end).**

g. **Also that you would need to seek a response from Southern Water.**

h. **Although the Code for Sustainable Homes has gone, additional building regulations are included although Bridge could have a more stringent requirement.**

i. **Also, CCC has a 'residential intensification' guide.**

j. **CM confirmed that she would be happy to look at the policies in more detail after September.**

12. CM said that the **Parish Council must request to speak in September at the Public Enquiry on the Green Gap.**

13. CM said in terms of JB's timetable it was unlikely you would have a referendum so close to the examination and **JB acknowledged this and said he would amend the timetable.**

14. Also to have a **look at the CCC Consultation Statement** and put responses into tables.

15. She suggested **asking (contacts at the end) now to have a look at the flood risk and transport policies.** Also asked if Cllr Simon Cook is engaged.

**Date of next meeting with CCC:** Wednesday or Thursday afternoon 28 or 29<sup>th</sup> September (Bridge NDP on 30<sup>th</sup> September) are possible otherwise Tues-Thurs 4,5,6<sup>th</sup> October the following week.

---

1 In the 2012 household survey in response to the question whether households felt more housing was needed in Bridge 50.5% said 'no'. A supplementary question was then asked: 'If you believe that the number of houses in Bridge will be increased, then should these be? [and the responses were]: Starter Homes 50.2% and Affordable Housing 63.2%.