

Terms of Reference for Bramhill Supplementary Consultancy
Letter authorised by Steering Group in November 2016

Dear Ellen & Paul,

Thanks again for clearing time next week to deal with this for us. I have booked Tuesday from 1pm to 3pm to spend time reviewing your conclusions with you, and hope that by the end of that session we'll be in a position where I can report back conclusions on each of the reviewed sites to the Site Selection Management Group on Wednesday evening.

Inside the Dropbox folder shared with you should be a sub-folder with relevant new documents for each of the sites on which we would like your further thoughts. Those are GNP 1, 7, and 8 in Gatehampton; GNP 5 and 6 on Wallingford Road/Springhill Road; and GNP 3 and 13 in Manor Road.

As I said when we spoke, some of the developers have made revised proposals which they believe should provide sufficient mitigation and some have also retained their own landscape consultants whose expert opinion differs to some extent from yours. We recognise that the nature of expert opinion is often to produce a range of possible conclusions, but we would like to know whether you still consider yours to be the most appropriate where differences have been expressed and, if so, why. Of course, if you think the other consultants' view is to be preferred we want to know that too with your reasons for changing position.

As for the revised proposals on the individual sites, GNP 3 and 13 on Manor Road believe that their truncated developments and commitment to preservation of trees and hedgerows should be sufficient to meet your mitigation requirements for their respective sites. Would you please consider them and let us know whether you are satisfied? If not, please specify what else they would need to include or amend.

GNP 5 and 6 were presented to us as a pair, although we continue to assess their suitability separately. Because of the method of presentation many of the new documents deal with both sites. However, I have placed a copy of anything which contains material relevant to GNP5 in that folder and likewise for GNP6. You will therefore find that you have duplicate documents in those two folders and that there is information in GNP5 which relates to GNP6, and vice versa. I'm sure you'll identify all that without too much difficulty, but thought a few words of warning and explanation might help you notice and exclude the irrelevant more easily !

There are a few specific questions we would like you to answer for us on GNP 5 as well as providing responses to the proposed amendments and their consultant's report:

- 1) Are there any reasons why it would be unacceptable to have a small development in the lowest (SW) corner of this site hidden by landscape mitigation to the North and East and the railway embankment to the West? The developer's current drawings go further than this, but they

have indicated a willingness to reduce the area further in discussion with us.

- 2) If an area could be developed, what mitigation would you want to see?
and
- 3) What is the maximum size of the acceptable developable area in hectares?

As for GNP6, as well as responses to amendments and their expert, would you please specifically address these questions:

- 1) Are there any major landscape or visual impact issues with access from GNP6 to Wallingford Road across the triangle in the NW corner of the site? It seems that no other road access is possible.
- 2) What mitigation, if any, would you want to see for road access there?
- 3) If road access at that point is mitigated with, for example, hedges or trees, would it also become acceptable to build houses in the triangle along Wallingford Road as shown in the concept drawings?
- 4) Is there any further mitigation which you consider would make limited development of that triangle acceptable in addition to use for the road?
- 5) Is there anything you can help us with in relation to the orchard which would counter the developer's statements about it and justify its retention?

GNP 1 and 8 have produced revised proposals alone and together. GNP 1 would also be prepared to limit development to the approximate third of the sites which is outlined in yellow on their concept drawings. I appreciate that you have already effectively answered this at an earlier stage when we pressed you about limited development of these, but would you please give their proposals and expert evidence proper reconsideration and let us know if you see any reason to amend your conclusions?

The owner of GNP7 does not have the benefit of expert assistance, so the amended proposal from him is only arising from discussions in a meeting with us. You have the attendance note. In effect, he would be prepared to limit the built line of about 4 new dwellings to match the edge of the house opposite on Gatehampton Road. That would mean them running in a line perpendicular to Gatehampton Road facing towards the village with rear gardens taking up the rest of that narrow site.

Hope that's all clear, but do come back to me at any time with questions.

Thanks again

Sara