

**Minutes of Meeting of
Braishfield Parish Council Planning Committee held in The Village Hall
at 7pm on Monday 22nd June 2026**

Present:

Members of Braishfield Parish Council:

Cllr Jane Bennett, Chairman of the Parish Council

Cllr Richard Brazier, Chairman of the Planning Committee

Cllr Julie Benson

Cllr Ian Knights

Cllr Michael Stubbs

Cllr Sally Yalden

Clerk/RFO: Jane Ray

Ward Member: Cllr Sally Yalden

Members of the public: 14

153. Apologies

None

154. Members interests in the business for the meeting

None

155. Public Participation

None

156. To Approve:

a) 25/03028/OUTS New Comments **APPROVED**

Thank you for your letter of the 4th June 2026 notifying the parish council of the amended documents submitted by Bargate Homes and requesting our comments.

You have received a revised Design and Access Statement (DAS) and two additional plans. In their covering letter (also of the 4th June 2026) Bargate explain that these have been provided following:

further reconsideration of the Design Review Panel (DRP) comments

referencing the written summary of the DRP meeting on the 14th April 2026 which you attended but to which the parish council was not invited.

The new plans and the amendments to the DAS show no understanding of the significance of the DRP's comments. Nor do they provide any meaningful response to the concerns expressed by the parish council, its professional advisors, or the many members of the local community who have written to you about the likely impact of Bargate's proposals on our village. In fact, we are now even more concerned about Bargate's understanding of what might constitute an acceptable scheme on this site, and urge you once again to REFUSE the application.

Based on the considerable detail Bargate provided in support of the application both FERIA Urbanism (our design advisors) and the DRP made similar criticisms of the way in which they propose to layout 60 homes on this site. FERIA pointed out that the use of an estate style road layout and perimeter blocks was typical of suburban development in larger towns or villages. It has no precedent in Braishfield and runs contrary to the principles of the Village Design Statement.

The DRP echoed those concerns saying in its minutes:

Despite the presentation promoting otherwise, it was felt that the current proposals were not site specific enough, and could be situated on the outskirts of any other Hampshire village.

The DRP concluded that the scheme required:

- A more defined relationship with the adjacent village,
- A more considered and subservient vehicle route through the site, defined by focal points, access points, community zones and pedestrian areas. The site layout should not be designed around vehicles.
- The final design option should complement the Braishfield village typology,
- Greater variation in density and dwelling type is required across the site.

Rather than reflect carefully on the proposed scale, design and layout, taking account of the feedback on their underlying approach, Bargate have chosen to respond to the DRP and other representations by asking you to accept less detailed information than originally submitted, and promising to do what they have to do anyway – to submit a detailed scheme for approval at reserved matters stage.

They now suggest that the layout which accompanied the application, despite very clearly representing their preferred form of development, was, in fact, just one possible approach. To support the claim that they are open minded about making changes they provide two plans (Option 1 and 2) which show less detail than previously submitted. Bargate invite you to consider these as the framework for the likely design and layout rather than the more detailed plans already prepared.

But neither 'option' plan addresses any of the issues raised by the DRP or those made in our previous representations. There is no attempt to respond to the professional critique with a detailed analysis and explanation of how they are willing to reconsider their approach. Both 'options' are essentially the same scheme but, in less detail, with one or two perfunctory and unexplained areas of open space added. The revised DAS cross references in more detail to the Village Design Statement, but the extent to which this has been done with serious intent is summarised when the DAS says (our emphasis added):

Our approach to development is to take into account the existing character and make the most potential of the land, enabling a density of 30 d/ha within the developable area. We

have used perimeter blocks to reflect the nationally accepted approach to development that is positively outward looking.

These new submissions simply demonstrate Bargate's complete failure to understand or respond to the problems inherent in their proposals. They continue to impose a 'nationally accepted approach to development' when the DRP, national design guidance, TVBC's own design policies and local people have all called on them to demonstrate an empathy with and understanding of local character, style and village evolution. Submitting less information now, and claiming that this represents flexibility and an open mind might have more credibility were any of the new submissions to show any real understanding of the DRP's detailed comments or the underlying concerns, which they do not.

The DRP asked to see the next stage of design evolution in response to its comments, and we would be interested to know whether you intend to convene the DRP again to review these new documents.

We understand that this is an outline application and that, in principle, the layout and design would not be fixed at this point. But Bargate have already shown their hand. The reserved matters proposal that would follow after outline consent would inevitably be an unsuitable and harmful form of urbanisation. These latest submissions simply confirm Bargate's lack of understanding and their intent to force upon the village a scheme that would be both alien and unwelcome.

If Test Valley Borough Council approves this outline application, then what happens next is inevitable and unavoidable, despite the obvious harm it would do to Braishfield. Bargate have already shown you what they propose to bring forward, and have no intention of doing anything other than building 60 dwellings in the 'nationally accepted' form they can roll out anywhere.

The only way to prevent this is for you to refuse the application at outline stage on the basis of the information provided about the likely final form of development. You are legally entitled to do so. If any development at all is to take place on this site it should be at an appropriate scale and in a manner that respects the character and qualities of the village. Bargate have shown no interest in proper consultation or engagement thus far and have shown scant regard for the comments of the DRP, but it is not too late for Test Valley to take control of this process and require them to reevaluate their approach. That starts by making clear that the application will be refused.

b) Housing Needs Survey 2026 **APPROVED** It is anticipated that the NDP will be complete Q2/3 next year. Cllr Brazier thanked Mark Sennitt and the group for all their work

c) Railton TPC Ltd for a transport report at Pucknall - £650.00 **APPROVED**

d) Buxton Solicitors fee to raise issues regarding Bargate application – **REFUSED** lack of funds at this time. Possibly will advise if a judicial review required

157. Update on:

a) Freedom of Information request for Bargate pre-app - request was refused the first time but has been resubmitted.

ACTION: Cllr Brazier to chase TVBC

b) Northwood House – full planning application due to be submitted soon

c) Test Valley Association of Parish and Town Councils – attended by Cllr Brazier and Cllr Benson who reported on Local Government Reorganisation and possible formation of Parish Council clusters

158. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be a full Council meeting on Tuesday 7th July 2026

Signed Chairman: _____

Date: _____