

The following questions have been raised:

responses by Cllr. Alan Atkinson.

1. When does the lease on the Recreation Ground expire?

There are two leases involving the recreation ground. The first lease dates from 26 Jul 1973 and runs for fifty years from that date. The second lease covers the area which was added to the original recreation ground in 1982. It runs from 18 June 1982 to 26 July 2023.

2. What does the lease say about what should happen to the recreation ground were it to expire?

Clause 14 states "The council shall remove all or any buildings or structures erected on the demised premises [i.e. the recreation ground] and pull down and remove the same in a workmanlike manner..and ...restore the site so far as is possible to its present condition", i.e. as it was in July 1973. This therefore applies in some degree to the Pavilion, the Play area and the tennis courts.)

3. Do we need a new village hall?

Many residents use facilities provided by village halls elsewhere because of the constraints imposed by our current hall. Although the question "Do you want a new village hall" was not asked directly in the 2014 questionnaire, a new village hall was one of the things which was mentioned frequently when residents were asked about improvements for the Village.

4. The village should proceed with the Neighbourhood Development Plan despite the stalling of Canterbury's District Plan.

The advice given, as understood by the Neighbourhood Plan sub-committee, was that we had to await the District's plan. This is now understood to be incorrect. Our plan still has to accord with the District's plan, and if it does not, then there would need to be another revision of our plan and another referendum. It was partially to avoid this, at the time considered to be unnecessary, expense that has stalled the neighbourhood plan's completion.

5. Why were the Cantley proposals not included in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan?

The formal written proposals from Cantley were received by the Parish Council in September 2015. The drafting of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan began at least 2 years before this. The most recent draft of the Neighbourhood Plan, which went out to public consultation, is dated October 2014.

6. Why is the draft Neighbourhood plan not yet adopted?

The draft Neighbourhood Plan was consulted upon in 2014. Soon afterwards, Canterbury City Council published its own District Development Plan (June 2015). Given that the neighbourhood Plan must not contradict the Local Development Plan, the neighbourhood plan group decided to await the outcome of the inspectorial inquisition of the Canterbury District Plan. That is now the subject of an ongoing planning enquiry. Final adoption of a Neighbourhood Plan is normally achieved after a local referendum has been held.

7. When will the Canterbury District Local Plan be decided upon?

The Leader of the City Council, who happens to be our local District Councillor, Simon Cook, has stated that he believes this will not be until late 2016 or possibly 2017.

8. Concerns regarding access to a new village hall, if it is to be sited on an extended recreation ground.
Access routes for vehicles to that area has not yet been determined but any future development would require planning authority approval.
9. What was meant by the minutes of the meeting held on September 8?
It was proposed by Bridge Parish Council to consult as widely as possible within the Village. That set of proposals was given Council's support. That was what was meant by the minutes. That plan of action has, unfortunately, become confused with what has since become known as The Cantley Proposals. So Bridge Parish Council supported the plan of information and consultation which was a proposal put to Council in September, and has not decided upon its view as to the Cantley Proposals.
10. Will the Parish Council be representing the views of the whole village? How will this be done?
Councillors will try to reflect the opinions that they receive from residents of the Village. Already, the information and an invitation to inform the Clerk and/or Councillors, has been included in the Village newsletter, and on the Village's website, and there is a series of consultation surgeries already arranged.
11. When will Cantley Ltd. be bringing forward fuller proposals and consulting with the village?
Bridge Parish Council does not know.
12. Questions were asked about the transparency of the current process.
Bridge Parish Council is being as open and transparent as possible.
13. A comment was made about the location of councillors' own properties and their distance from the proposed site north of Conyngham Lane.
Noted. Comments such as this were expected.
14. Are Cantley seeking to rebuild the Bifrons house on the back of the proposed development?
There has been no mention at all by their agent of any such idea.
15. Could there be more houses on the proposed site at a later date?
Yes. This would be subject to a planning application being brought forward. This applies to any land where development might be applied for to the District or some higher planning power.
16. Have Cantley looked at other sites in the village for potential development?
The proposals have come from Cantley. There is nothing preventing the Village, as a whole, from proposing an alternative site to them, though of course the final decision as to which site an application is made for lies with the landowner, Cantley Estates.
17. The school admissions process, and the capacity of the school to increase its provision.
This is a matter that is decided by KCC and the school. It may well be, however, that as Bridge expands, there will be more people from Bridge wanting to attend the school, which might reduce the numbers travelling in from Canterbury each day. Bridge Parish Council could ask the authorities to make proximity to the school a higher admissions priority.

18. Concerns about the ability of the drains to cope with surface water and the sewer to deal with foul drainage.
Southern Water would require the developer to contribute towards an upgraded sewer for any new development. Similarly, KCC for any drainage gullies improvement deemed necessary. While such objections might increase the costs for a developer, it would not prevent development. Such objections were raised, and were ineffectual, at Littlebourne this week. There may be an opportunity to require of a developer that the gullies are upgraded all the way down the High Street and into the Nailbourne, but engineering solutions for the water problems do exist.
19. Has the Parish Council considered applying for Village Green status for the recreation ground? Could the parish Church be used as a new village hall?
This has been considered, in the past and more recently. It is not possible because the Recreation Ground is not used "as of right", but under the terms of a lease. A Church perhaps serves a slightly different purpose to that of a Village Hall.
20. What was the timing of the process?
The Parish Council asked Cantley's agent about the possibility of a renewal of the Recreation Ground lease (it is already not possible to obtain some grants because such a relatively short span remains unexpired) and after some very brief discussion, their response were the Cantley Proposals, which were mailed through on September 8th. Cantley's own timetable, going forward, is unknown.
21. Discuss with Cantley as to what they will do in the event of planning permission being refused.
Yes, that will be raised with Cantley's agents.
22. What will Cantley do if we do not work with them on the proposals as discussed?
Bridge Parish Council does not know. As has happened recently at Littlebourne, it is suspected that a planning application will be put into the District anyway, and we at Bridge will then have very little effective say in anything to do with the matter.
23. How does the new Mill Centre lease affect these proposals?
The Mill Centre will cater for a slightly different set of users, as acknowledged by the Mill Centre Management Group at their meeting recently.
24. Status of the Green Gap between Canterbury and Bridge.
The Green Gap –as described in the Canterbury Local Plan–has yet to be considered by the Planning Inspector Mr Moore. The Green Gap discussion is due to be heard when the examination of the plan reconvenes in 2016 although a specific timetable has yet to be set by the Inspector. Technically, therefore, the Green Gap will only be approved as part of the Canterbury Plan, perhaps sometime in 2017.
25. Isn't the proposed site already protected from any housing development as lying within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?
The proposed site does lie within the AONB. AONBs are largely managed by local authority advisory committees, whereas National Parks require a special authority of their own. The statutory planning process is the responsibility of the individual local planning authorities. AONB status can be over-ruled. See the article http://www.planningresource.co.uk/article/1293071/pickles-approves-mid-sussex-aonb-appeals_

26. What about the proposed green gap between Canterbury and Bridge? Isn't this protected from development?

The Green Gap, as described in the Canterbury Local Plan, has yet to be considered by the Planning Inspector Mr. Moore. The Green Gap discussion is due to be heard when the examination of the plan reconvenes in 2016 although a specific timetable has yet to be set by the Inspector. Therefore, any Green Gap will only be approved when the Canterbury Plan is finally approved.

27. What is section 106 who adjudicates on it? Extent to which section 106 commitments are met in reality.

S.106 is a Developers Levy, an obligation imposed by the planning Authority (Canterbury District Council) upon the developer. It usually takes the form of money paid to the District, or a legal obligation to build some local infrastructure or amenity, and is part of the arrangement when consent is given by the planning authority. It is difficult to be certain how often legal agreements, freely entered into, are disregarded by the District Council.

28. Does the Parish Council no longer support the statements made in the Neighbourhood plan?

The draft Neighbourhood Plan was published in 2014 based upon work begun several years earlier. It has not yet been formally adopted by Bridge Parish Council, and as circumstances change, not all statements will always be fully supported over the entire duration of time-span covered by the plan.

29. SHLAA sites?

Stands for Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Shorthand for land that the owner or a developer wants the District to consider as a potential housing development site. The District's Planning Inspector, Mr Moore will begin considering some of these sites in 2016.

30. Nature of surveys being conducted by Cantley-some animals in hibernation?

Any surveys done will presumably have to meet the requirements set out by the District's Planning Department if they are to be considered as adequate.

31. Could B.P.C. purchase the recreation ground?

Bridge Parish Council successfully registered the Recreation Ground as a Community Asset. This means that should the land ever be offered up for sale, the Parish Council would have the right of first refusal. However, the land is not up for sale, Cantley's agents have not suggested that it will be, but as a result of this consultation process so far, Bridge Parish Council has asked if there is any possibility of the land being purchased, or being leased 'in perpetuity' from the owners.

32. What is the latest about the developments on the Brickfields Site?

The Brickfields site is owned by Canterbury District Council, who have recently proposed a new development for up to a further 40 homes there.

33. Why has Bridge Parish Council become involved in this exercise?

Bridge Parish Council are seeking the views of the Village as to what to ask Cantley to provide here, if/when a planning application is finally made by Cantley Estates. By holding these information/consultation events, B.P.C. hopes to be able to better shape

the package that Cantley will be asked to contribute towards, for the benefit, overall, of the Village as a whole.

34. How do I make my views known?

Bridge Parish Council does want to know what improvements you want within your Village. The Cantley Proposals are ideas that have been mentioned before, or are what Cantley Estates have suggested.

Please let BPC know your views by contacting the Clerk:

Email clerk@bridgevillage.co.uk

Telephone 01227 831085