

# North Cadbury & Yarlington Neighbourhood Plan

## Working Group Minutes

### Thursday 18 February 2021

#### Present

Malcolm Hunt (MH)	Chairman
Andy Keys-Toyer (AKT)	Vice Chairman
Richard Rundle (RR)	Vice Chairman
Tamsin Bruce-Gardyne (TBG)	Group coordinator
Alan Bartlett (AB)	
James Bruce-Gardyne (JBG)	
Nigel Humberston (NH)	
Brian Morris (BM)	
John Rundle (JR)	
Anna Scott (AS)	
Jo Witherden - NP Planning Consultant (JW)	

#### 1. Apologies

Richard Scott (RS)

#### 2. Declarations of Interest

AKT	ref Sandbrook Lane East
TBG/JBG	ref the Grange
RR	ref Clare Field
AS/RS	ref Sandbrook Lane East

#### 3. Actions from last meeting

3.1 JW had received examples of good Design and Planning Statements from JR. (7.2).

3.2 The excel sheet with the officers' report, the conservation officer's comments, the landscape reports and the applicants' summary statements had been circulated by JW. (7.3).

3.3 Information on garden sizes had not been forthcoming (7.4) and JW confirmed there is no definitive guidance in Planning Policy, so developers build the minimum. JR agreed to take this issue up outside the meeting. **JR**

3.4 No response had been received from Andreas Maistrello on important trees (7.5 and 7.6). It was agreed that the next newsletter would request information on trees, wildlife, and habitat in the newsletter **RR.**

3.5 Archie Montgomery had confirmed to MH that he would be willing to increase the number of allotments if there was demand (7.8) and that only 2 out of 19 were currently occupied by non-Parish members.

3.6 *Important Buildings* - JBG and AKT are awaiting a steer from JW re important buildings before they can review the section on heritage. (7.12.b). JW agreed to circulate a note **JW.**

3.7 A useful list of buildings from Sam Miller's Book had been circulated. (7.12.d)

3.8 Photos had been taken of V4 (7.13).

3.9 The highways issue needs to be raised with the Parish Council (7.15).

**JBG**

3.10 Website discussions remain ongoing.

**RR**

#### **4. Minutes of Last Meeting**

These were approved unanimously.

#### **5. Finance**

5.1 JR reported that the two instalments were still due to be paid to JW and that there would be a £1k surplus after that.

**JR**

5.2 JR noted that the end of the grant period was approaching (31 March) when a report justifying expenditure was required. He said he was awaiting feedback on compiling this.

5.3 He also said the Group would need to consider its needs beyond April 2021 and that the application form was long with several challenging questions and a very long instruction section. JR, RR and AKT agreed to discuss the application. NH offered his help too. **JR, AKT, RR, NH**

#### **5. Responses to Second Consultation**

##### **5.1. Sites**

5.1.a. JW talked through the responses, saying an adequate response level had been of 150+ had been reached and that feedback on the sites was more positive than in the first consultation. She surmised that the school parking proposal was generally well supported but there were questions over access and ownership. She also said feedback on green spaces was well-supported except for Ferngrove Farm.

5.1.b. AS's help in collating the comments was acknowledged.

5.1.c. RR commented that the responses suggested more negativity than the scores indicated.

5.1.d. MH said some negative comments had been reflected by AECOM.

5.1. e. JBG questioned whether the two consultations could be adequately compared as the second had been carried out before AECOM had reviewed the sites and it was not therefore very surprising that the responses were largely positive.

5.1.f. JW acknowledged that it would have been useful to have had the AECOM report ahead of the second consultation, but the pressures of time prevented this. She added that people would be given another chance to comment anyway.

##### **5.2. School Parking**

5.2. a. There was a potential issue over the right to access the parking site offered by Archie Montgomery and permission would be needed from the frontagers (the School/SSDC, Mike Gibson and the Bakery) onto the restricted byway JW said it was important to check this was a deliverable.

5.2. b AKT undertook to talk to Mike Gibson regarding access and draft a round robin letter to the frontagers.

**AKT**

5.2.c It was agreed that the proposed new parking site, which was anyway only to be for 12 staff cars, would only ameliorate the current parking problem and this should be made clear to both SSDC and the whole community. Problems at drop-off and pick-up along Cary Road would remain.

## **6. AECOM Report**

6.1. RR talked through the draft comments and findings and said AECOM had raised concerns about the impact on views, the countryside, habitat, and loss of environment.

6.2 JW said it was only a draft and factual errors only should be fed back to AECOM. It was agreed that comments should be sent to RR within 24 hours to forward to AECOM with a request that their revised draft be circulated ASAP. (Post-meeting note: this has been done). **ALL/RR**

6.3 MH asked whose opinion usually carries the day if there was a disconnect between AECOM and SSDC planning officers and whether a case officer's decision is always supported by the Planning Policy team?

## **7. Publication of Second consultation findings**

7.1 JW discussed the draft findings of the second consultation and her thoughts on potential site options which she had circulated ahead of the meeting.

7.2 NH offered to update the consultation summary. JW agreed to send NH key points. **JW/NH**

7.3 It was agreed not to circulate detailed feedback to locals until the final AECOM report was available but AS agreed to see if a succinct communication could be put out pending wider feedback. **AS**

7.4 JW said that the next stage for locals would be the Draft plan with explanation as to why certain sites had been chosen based on both local consultation and AECOM feedback.

7.5 MH commented that soon the NPWG would be able to host outdoor meetings open to the public offering up a wider forum for discussion.

7.6 There was a discussion about Glebe field by the Church which is owned by NC parochial church council and which is supported by locals as a green space.

## **8. Draft Neighbourhood Plan**

8.1 JW reported there was no further update on the Draft Plan.

## **9. SSDC Meeting (23 February)**

9.1 It was agreed that it would be useful to have a more formal note of meetings with SSDC and to request this at the start of the upcoming meeting. **JW**

9.2 It was agreed to share site options with SSDC but to agree the preferred one ahead of the meeting. Everyone was asked to give Jo their comments on the various options by Sunday. **ALL**

9.3 MH said it would be useful to raise affordable housing in the meeting and find out what SSDC's policy was. **MH**

## **10. AOB**

10.1 RR commented that Wessex Internet Fibre to House was being installed in Galhampton and Yarlington, people in North Cadbury should register their interest with Wessex. This was a matter for the Parish Council.

#### **11. Date of Next Meeting**

**Monday 8 March at 7pm by Zoom.**