



## BRATTON PARISH COUNCIL

### NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

Clerk Nicola Duke, April Rise, 81 Studland Park, Westbury, Wiltshire, BA13 3HN 01373 864127

Email: [nicola.duke@bratton-parish.co.uk](mailto:nicola.duke@bratton-parish.co.uk)

---

Notes of a Public Meeting held to discuss the Neighbourhood Plan for Bratton held on  
**Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> September 2021** at 7.00 pm.

Present: Cllr J Ligo, Cllr N Kew, Cllr E Cole, Cllr K Rayward, Cllr Jolly and Cllr Lloyd,

In attendance: N Duke (Parish Clerk) and 34 members of the public.

	<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>
01	<b>Apologies for Absence</b> Mrs R Ridley. Cllr S Ridley due to another engagement.
02	<b>Neighbourhood Planning overview</b> The Clerk provided a brief background presentation on Neighbourhood Planning. A copy of the presentation is available on request.
03	<b>Neighbourhood Plan for Bratton</b> Cllr Eddie Cole reported on the results of the Village Survey carried out in 2019 and the NP for Bratton. A copy of his presentation is available on request.
04	<b>General Discussion</b> A general discussion was held and the following points made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A group of young people requested the Council consider the installation of a skatepark. The Chair reported that the Council was aware of this request and was working with a consultant to develop some plans. It was confirmed that this project would be taken forward independently of the Neighbourhood Plan.</li><li>• In response to a question it was confirmed that residents under the age of 18 would not be able to vote in any referendum on the Neighbourhood Plan, but could encourage their parents/carers to vote.</li><li>• There was a discussion as to the power which any NP would give to the community, given that previous comments from residents on planning matters had not always been acted upon by the Local Planning Authority.</li></ul>

- How much power does it actually give the community? WC previously ignored – a lot of effort to be ignored at the end. EC – read draft Local Plan keeps calling on NP as the method for communities to see that housing goes in the right place. Share concern. WHSAP WC seemed to take little notice of the core strategy. JL – Difficult one, share the cynicism. PC has decided wants to pursue if we can demonstrate a sufficient level of community support. Wont be able to pursue this otherwise. Confusing activity with progress, why this meeting is an important preliminary step to recruit SG members who are enthusiastic. EC – looking at getting a consultation to provide assistance, done many NP's locally and can guide us to what needs to be done.
- Persuade me good idea to take this on in a few sentences – EC – NP mechanism to say where want and don't want housing. Didn't have NP hence have had housing dumped on us and that housing was not in the core strategy. Reality is that 40 houses needed and ended up here as couldn't find anywhere else to put them. Main reason to do that, to stop that.
- Want to use it to stop housing then? Straight jacket? Lack of young people, so need affordable housing or else village becomes unsustainable and own straightjacket need to allow people to grow into the village community. EC-need downsize properties as well as affordable. Requirements for the older population as well – both things need to be addressed and used as polices in the plan.
- JL – purpose not to prevent development but to identify what the village would like to see and where they would like to see it happening. Some good arguments for allowing the village to grow – reference the facilities available to the 1200 residents. Root of the plan ensure plan secures their future and other things like lost the youth club not a lot for young people to do should be done of the key issues addressed in the Plan. Better to do a NP or implement policies separately.
- NK – Plan not set in stone review every 2 years so assess and adjust, with a full review every 5 years and housing being reviewed every 2 years. EC – i.e had the pandemic and this has changed a lot of things.
- Costs – what does the village not get by spending money on the NP? Plan for village green will be grant funded with some match funding. JL – can get the 9k fairly easily. ND – Can be totally funded by Locality. JL – would be resource heavy. Risk of Locality funding not being available in the longer term. Meeting with consultant to get a quote for the early stages.
- SG – age of people attending don't have the 25-45 age group who have more investment in the future of the village than the elderly. Need to engage that age range.
- Opportunity to get over the risks and take control of the community and where you love element of self protection and some councils open to offers and get foisted on if no plan in place. Will clearly define what the community really wants. Plan of action to fit in with how lives change and provide for the needs of young people. Not about us in the here and now about protecting our landscape, facilities and protecting our young people. Work hard for a few years.

- Concerned at time will take – skate park have to be funded through that route. JL – reassure don't have to wait for the NP to address that issues, which is in hand. Initial issue is whether the village green can be adapted – needs to be transformed in a strategic way. Will ask for a skatepark to be incorporated in the plans being drafted and will need to take into account the alternative view. This is being done now. Agree a plan and then raise the funding. Is there anything the young people can do? JL will engage them with the consultant.
- Did use to be a skatepark here – huge amount of money raised and put in the Rec Ground not a success. Will create noise, needs a community support. Would need a high level of consultation.

**JL called for a vote – in favour of driving forward – overwhelming majority in favour.**

**JL called for volunteers for the SG:** noted that the workload and roles for members would be tailored to them. SG meet alterantive months for a couple of hours initially. Not just attending at the meetings. Agreed to arrange an exploratory meeting of those interested in the SG to explore.

List of interested parties:

Name	Email address
Neil Brawn	<a href="mailto:neilbrawn@icloud.com">neilbrawn@icloud.com</a>
Mark Fanning	<a href="mailto:Markfanning128@gmail.com">Markfanning128@gmail.com</a>
James Linehan	<a href="mailto:Jameslinehan10@gmail.com">Jameslinehan10@gmail.com</a>
Amanda Sharpe	<a href="mailto:amandasharpepr@gmail.com">amandasharpepr@gmail.com</a>
Bob Pearce	<a href="mailto:Bobpearce2021@hotmail.com">Bobpearce2021@hotmail.com</a>
Ben Smart	Emails and phones on list
Freddie Pickford	
March Brown	
Thomas Smart	
Roger and Jackie Hames	<a href="mailto:hamesroger@gmail.com">hamesroger@gmail.com</a>
David Green	<a href="mailto:d.green751@btinternet.com">d.green751@btinternet.com</a>
Steve Crosby	<a href="mailto:stcrosby@btinternet.com">stcrosby@btinternet.com</a>
Ollie Rayner	<a href="mailto:Ollier1@icould.com">Ollier1@icould.com</a>
Kobie Bailey	<a href="mailto:Baileykobie7@gmail.com">Baileykobie7@gmail.com</a>
Jack Martin	<a href="mailto:Jacksprat30@hotmail.co.uk">Jacksprat30@hotmail.co.uk</a>

Jackie Hames allotments as at Rogers address

	It was noted that the outcome of the meeting would be considered by the PC at its next meeting on 14 <sup>th</sup> September 2021 – i.e that those present at the Public Meeting voted with a clear majority in favour of progressing a Neighbourhood Plan for Bratton.
--	---

There being no further business the meeting was closed at 8.20 pm.