STRATFIELD SAYE PARISH COUNCIL

Notes from Meeting with Lord Mornington and James Fowler

At 4pm on 6th October 2025 at the Iron Duke

Present at the Meeting were: -

Lord Mornington

Helen William of the Wellington Estate

George Peck of the Wellington Estate

James Fowler of 3West

David Matthews of 3West

Freddie Palmer of Meeting Place intro

Stratfield Saye PC - Cllr Mike Toms, Mike Shearn and Louise Webb

Sherfield on Loddon PC - 3 councillors

Bramley PC - 3 councillors

Freddie Palmer: -

Lord Mornington and the Estate are behind this development and the architects of the idea.

Lord Mornington: -

The family has been here for 200 years and care very much about what happens in this area. Historically, we didn’t want development here. Smaller developments have been done, but never one of this size before. We wanted less houses and less people. The reality is that more houses and more people will be imposed on this area and in every area. The Estate asked itself “do we become a bystander or do we lead this process in the right way?” Can the Estate create a better outcome than what will happen if they don’t get involved? The Estate wants to create “…something to be proud of, to endure and to be a legacy. To be a positive contribution to the local community with positive long term objections”. Many developments are just about maximising profit and then the developers just leave. The Estate wants to retain ownership of some of the houses and the parkland.

Doing this right means having a input from the PCs. We really mean it – we want the development to be supported, constructive and adding to the local area. The Estate feels that the “alternatives will be a lot worse”, but no-one is forcing the Estate to build on this land.

Freddie Palmer: -

Helpful conversations and challenging points from Bramley meetings.

1 utilities. Massive issues re water and seweage.

2 roads and highways

3 healtth and schools

4 local facilities – sports and community

5 green space

Updates now on website. More details to follow in November.

80 % people who completed the online survey did not support the development.

The Estate was advised that if they meet with parishoners, it might help them believe that the Estate is genuine with its intentions to solve residents’ concerns.

The Estate tried to get planning on this land 10 years ago but failed.

The Estate has a history of selling land with planning permission on to other developers such as Beaulieu and Carla.

At odds with saying “…something I can be proud of, compared to something I can live with”.

Many residents cannot speak openly as the Estate is their landlord and/or their employer. A further issue is that many of our residents are not online.

With regard to the Bramley meetings, 3 people walked out of the workshops. Many said the

meetings too busy, the facilitators were not interested in listening and some couldn’t hear well.

The Estate was encouraged to build carbon ready low energy homes – thinking ahead - not just doing the bare minimum. Not having to pay utility bills is a huge bonus. This is an aim.

Chris Tomblin of Bramley PC: -

The Local Plan has to be updated every 5 years. There was a call for sites, the plan was put together and it was put out for consultation. Initially 850 homes per annum needed to be built, with a staged approach to get infrastructure built ahead of housing. Labour won the election and exploded the plan. BDBC now needs to build 1130 homes per annum pa for the life of the plan. A new local plan is needed – coming out in Dec for consultation. Planning inspector will approve by 2027.

BDBC planning powers account for less – Basingstoke has a lot of land available for development. Sites are assessed for suitability on a “harm v benefit” basis. Benefit is given greater value.

This is a speculative site and therefore not included in the Local Plan.

There is another windfall site for 100 houses in Minchens Lane.

Spatial strategy – build the biggest villages bigger. Number of houses required v size of village

How is the infrastructure going to accommodate 650 houses in Bramley?

It is already inundated with traffic. No school places and no GP spaces.

James Fowler: -

We have a big enough pot to fix some of the local issues.

What are priorities of locals? We can knock off 2 or 3 of the top problems.

There is no benefit to 650 houses, unless residents get something for them. How have your plans evolved following the consultation?

The Estate has spoken to the departments of transport, education and health.

Lord Mornington confirmed that infrastructure will be delivered before the houses are built. This has been promised so many times and yet houses are built and nothing is done to the sewage system etc.

43 times over the last year, the river Loddon has flooded, and tankers move in and out. Thames Water have said they need 3 years to fix the problems. Occupation cannot occur until the infrastructure improved. This is a risk to the Estate.

Existing houses are already flooding with sewage. Thames Water is a private entity and it will charge the Estate to connect to the system. The failings of Redrow are well known.

The footpath between Sherfield on Loddon to Bramley could be reinstated by the Estate. Potentially a positive outcome for the residents.

Traffic – there are massive issues around the school as well as a parking issue. Potentially a relief road will push cars into Minchens and Olivers lane.

Education authority want to expand the existing school not build a new one. Estate can gift land to the school to build a car park and expand the school size.

There are currently 2000 car movements from Bramley to Sherfield on Loddon each day.

The only legacy for the Estate will be traffic – nothing positive or more.

**Traffic modelling**

* 2.4 cars per dwelling
* from Bramley to A33 - 109 trips per hr in the morning and 102 trips per hr in the afternoon = 2 additional moving cars per minute. It will double the amount of traffic
* 22-24 extra cars per hour through Stratfield Saye.
* 12-13 extra cars per hour along Minchens Lane.

Count done in June, in 8 different locations throughout the area.

Estate needs to go above and beyond to address peoples concerns.

We know there is a a problem. We understand we are adding to it. We will look to see how parts of the problem can be alleviated. Footpath and cycle bridge.

Minchens Lane is already deadly and the bridge is listed. They can’t make changes to it,

10 % of the local population use the train station – this new development will just create more traffic. The school car park will get filled up with commuters. Without altering the structure of the road you cant resolve this. A33 is oversubscribed already.

SLR are advising the Estate on the transport side of things.

New access to the school from the development. Developers will pay CIL money and gift land, but the local authority will be responsible for spending it. NO guarantee school can be built or extended.

They have to build the houses before the school expansion, otherwise out of catchment area children will fill the places up.

New shop with parking also added to the development – with a post office.

Doctors surgery at capacity. Would like to expand Clift surgery – using CIL monies and land can be provided by the Estate. The Estate has not spoken to the Doctors surgery yet – meeting is being planned.

The Estate was advised it does not understand the scale of the problem. The location of the site is wrong.

Common practice for developers to put new facilities in place at the end of the project. These facilities will attract people into buying the houses.

S106 will hold developers to the deal – these things must be developed early in the project.

Objection to the location of the shop and the playing fields. Requires people to drive there. Allotments can be incorporated into POS spaces. Concerns about lack of burial spaces.

Open space management. Makes sense for the Estate to take it on. Double taxation if you pay council tax and then a management fee. But gives residents direct control as part of the management company.

Plans to downgrade Folly Lane to a pedestrian and cycle lane. But building a new road that leads straight onto Bramley Lane.

Would the Estate consider building fewer houses and/or widen the A33? Might help local residents accept this development a little better.

Loss of economies of scale if they build fewer houses.

Bramley doesn’t need social housing but Basingstoke does. Less social housing and more infrastructure expenditure might be a possibility but an argument would need to be put forward to BDBC for this.

-END-