

North Cadbury & Yarlington Neighbourhood Plan

Working Group Minutes

Tuesday 26 January 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 Humbertson (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 ref the Grange
JBG ref the Grange
RR ref Clare Field
AS/RS ref Sandbrook Lane East

3. Minutes of Last Meeting

These were approved unanimously.

4. Finance

4.1 JW reported that the Second Consultation exercise is an additional cost but as this was pushing the timescales back, the elements that could not be covered this year can come out of the next grant period after 31/3/21. The details for applying for next year's grant are not yet available.

4.2 JR reported that the Parish Online licence has been paid as has Western Web.

4.3 JR also reported that there are two instalments due to be paid to JW. **JR**

4.4 AKT asked about VAT. JR confirmed that PC claims it back.

5. Feedback on SSDC Meeting

5.1 JW gave feedback on the recent positive meeting with SSDC elaborating on her note which had already been circulated to the Group. She confirmed that some key evidence for the Local Plan was likely to be published June/July, SSDC officers would then go back to the councillors towards the end of the year to agree the next draft, before going out to consultation.

5.2 JW reported that the officers were not supportive of greenfield development in North Town, which is seen as a separate settlement to NC, and not suitable for further development from a sustainability point of view.

5.3 JW confirmed that this was contrary to the committee decision regarding the planning approval for Higher North Town Lane and that it may be useful to ask for a formal written view on this.

5.4 The next meeting with SSDC was agreed for **Wednesday 23 February 1.30-3pm**.

5.5 Number of houses and timeframe

5.5.a. JW confirmed that the requirement for 60 houses over 20 years (i.e., 3 pa) was unlikely to change in the short term (until SSDC decide on the next draft of the Local Plan) but that officers had confirmed that the extant consents (approx. 25-27) would count towards this target. Her advice is to identify sufficient sites that would include a slight buffer of perhaps between 5 – 20%.

5.5.b. JW suggested the NP should cover 10-15 years (enabling the requirement for 60 homes over 20 years to be proportioned), given that the NP would be subject to revision and review probably in the next 5 - 10 years. Any review of the plan would provide an opportunity to bring forward other identified potential sites if there was a need, and would help ensure a degree of phasing, which would otherwise be more difficult to achieve.

5.5.d. JW agreed that there would be no credit if the NP offered more homes than needed (unless these were specifically linked to bringing forward infrastructure) but it would mean the plan would be less likely to be challenged in terms of whether it was delivering sufficient housing.

5.6 Affordable homes

5.6.a. JW said that, whilst there was not target per se for affordable homes, the NP should offer some affordable houses if possible, as there was some evidence of need (there are 3 households on the current register), and this was supported by the local community and SSDC. There were certainly options that could deliver some affordable homes.

5.6.c. JW said feedback from the second consultation and AECOM and landowners would be important in deciding the sites and number of affordable houses to be included in the NP.

6. **Additional Sites Consultation**

6.1 Another site has recently been proposed, next to NC17, owned by Anne Pilditch, but too late to readily include in the current consultation. It would be discussed at the upcoming AECOM meeting to see if they could assess it. JW said it was likely more appropriate for consideration in the next review rather than this current NP, given that access to the site would potentially be through NC17.

6.2 RR summarised that the second consultation had been launched on 22 January with a deadline of 6 February. The newsletter had gone to 123 people of which 70-80 had opened it. RR will prompt others to also open it.

6.3 AS said she had put posters up around the Parish.

6.4 MH thanked Richard and Anna Scott for all their work designing the flyer.

6.5 JW said that a reasonable sample size response had been received - 65 to date including 8 from Galhampton, 44 from North Cadbury, 9 from Woolston and 1 from Yarlington. However further responses would increase the accuracy and robustness of the survey.

6.6 RR asked whether RS/AS could edit the flyer to make the deadline visible so it could be sent out with the next newsletter **AS** (Post-meeting note: this has now been done).

7. Neighbourhood Plan

7.1 JW talked through the working draft of NP explaining the structure and topic chapters and where there were gaps. She said that she had moved some topics around and RR noted that the website may need some editing to be in sync with the NP document.

7.2 JW asked for some examples of good Design and Planning Statements. **JR**

7.3 JW agreed to forward the excel sheet with the comments from the first household survey on examples of good design, and that JR should consider researching these by looking at the officers' report, the conservation officer's comments, the landscape reports and the applicants' planning, and design statements associated with the planning applications.

JW

7.4 JR agreed to review comments on garden sizes. **JR**

7.5 JW said more information was needed on important trees within the sites being considered. RR offered to ask Andreas Maistrello for the information as he had provided it for Clare Field. **RR**

7.6 JW said more information was needed on wildlife sites. RR mentioned the badger set on Ridgeway Lane. Andreas Maistrello was suggested as someone who might be able to provide information and evidence. **RR**

Flood Risks

7.7. a It was agreed that anyone with evidence of flood risk should forward it to AKT for the online map.

7.7. b JW said that as drafted the plan would highlight applicants needed to look at the surface flood and river flood risk. However, this could be further supplemented by local information if this were highlighted areas which were not shown on the flood risk maps.

Community Services

7.8. a JW said there were no generic policies yet on Community Services, but these would be covered in the settlement specific chapters.

7.8.b The supply of allotments was discussed as when consulted, the allotments association had indicated that there was a waiting list. MH said the current supply was thought to be sufficient and if more were needed in the future Archie Montgomery had previously indicated that he could make provision. It was agreed that AKT would check demand with the chairman of the NC Allotment Association and MH would liaise with AM and draft a statement for inclusion in the NP re future provision. **AKT, MH**

Galhampton Village Hall

7.9 The shortage of parking at the village hall was raised but it was agreed that it was not a significant problem. AKT mentioned that James Buxton had offered a field for use for large village hall events.

Transport

7.10. a BM and JR gave updates on the idea of a footpath across the field to Galhampton Country Stores. It is not currently an option but, if the land were to become available, the Stores' owner

(Charles Bradley Hudson), could be interested in buying it and would be supportive of the Footpath project. JW agreed to include it as a project, rather than a firm proposal. **JW**

7.10.b. MH reported that he had spoken to SW Buses who said they would be amenable to a bus stop at the Galhampton Stores to improve safety. JW said she would also list this as a related project. **JW**

Area Chapters

7.11 JW confirmed that the maps needed refining when decisions on site allocations had been made.

Important Buildings

7.12. a JW referred everyone to Appendix 3 which included a full list of listed and unlisted building of interest (in relation to North Cadbury) and asked whether others should be included such as the Wesleyan Chapel, the village hall, Dairy House etc. A similar list would be pulled together for the other villages as the plan is drafted.

7.12.b AKT agreed to review JW's changes on heritage and asked the wider group for any more information. JBG offered to help. **AKT, JBG**

7.12.c RR said he would list the buildings mentioned in Sam Miller's book. **RR**

7.12.d AB agreed to circulate a list of buildings that exist and then agree from there which other ones to include. **AB**

Walking Routes

7.13 JW wanted to ensure the view was in the right place for V4 as it was not currently shown from a public right of way. JBG agreed to take a photo of the view and pinpoint it on the map. **JBG**

Local Green Spaces

7.14.a JW suggested the inclusion local green spaces should be reviewed by the group at a future meeting, to ensure that these could be robustly defended if challenged.

7.14.b One example would be whether the School Playing Field should be included as a designated green space or a local community space.

Highways Issues

7.15. JBG raised the issue of the impact of additional congestion and highways traffic but JW said that the NP could not address existing speeding and safety issues unless there were solutions related to proposed development. NH said it was important to ensure that the NP does not make the issues worse. MH said it was more an issue for the Parish Council and asked JBG to raise with JR. **JBG**

8. AOB

8.1 RR said discussion around the website was needed to ensure that it mimicked the NP structure. He undertook to speak to everyone about it. **RR**

8.2 MH again reiterated his thanks to JW for her efforts in drafting the NP.

9. Date of Next Meeting

Thursday 18 February at 7pm