

North Cadbury & Yarlington Neighbourhood Plan

Working Group Minutes

Thursday 14th October 2021

Present

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

1. Apologies

Tamsin Bruce-Gardyne (TBG) Group coordinator
Richard Scott (RS)

2. Declarations of Interest

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

3. Chairman's Remarks

MH outlined that the purpose of tonight's meeting was to discuss and agree changes made by JW to the draft plan following the last meeting's review of resident's comments as the NP process enters the submission stage to the Parish Council

4. Finance

JR reported that the plan budget was on track and that the PC had a buffer of £2,400 for unforeseen costs

5. Draft Plan

JW had issued a revised copy of the draft plan incorporating all the points and comments agreed at the last meeting following feedback from the Regulation 14 exercise.

JW had received comments from the NPWG and wished to run through the latest version highlighting key changes

Policy 9 had been amended to include provision for rural exceptions sites in Galhampton and North Cadbury should the affordable housing target not be met. Any site would have to provide 75% affordable housing with only 25% open market housing allowed for viability purposes but only on an open book basis

Policy 16 had been amended to include the introduction of a revised Green Gap area following successful discussions with the two of the landowners associated with the indicative plan. Further discussion with WHL who had expressed concerns was required, not out of necessity but out of courtesy

Action JBG to follow up

Indicative Plan Sub-Group

The Indicative Plan sub-group had met and fed back their comments on revising the indicative layout confirming the need for hedgerow retention, improved access splays both for the proposed development site and at the request of M Raymond where his farm vehicles access his land to the north of the indicative plan

The subgroup still expressed concerns over a pedestrian crossing point just north of Green Hedges, believing that the crossing point at the northern entrance/exit to the development was adequate and safer given that footpaths to NC would be inside the proposed development

JW believes improved road surface and signage could resolve this, but it would not be a policy and should remain under consideration

It was agreed that a better representation of the indicative plan was required to convey better understanding of the various elements (houses, footpaths, and screening of the site)

Habitats Regulation Update

AECOM had identified a potential wetland area for phosphate compensation, but it was obvious to the group that the area selected was inappropriate and that further work was needed by AECOM and a discussion on practical options was needed with landowners

Action JW / RR

6. Further reports required for Submission stage

JW made clear that several reports in addition to the Neighbourhood Plan required drafting and checking ahead of the submission stage:

Basic Condition Statement

JW explained that she would shortly be drafting the Basic Condition Statement - how the Plan meets the statutory requirements set out within the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012

This statement addresses each of the four "basic conditions" required of the Regulations:

- Having regard to national policies and advice it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood development plan.
- The making of the neighbourhood development plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development
- The making of the neighbourhood development plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority
- The making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations

Consultation Statement

How the WG have consulted the local community about the neighbourhood plan proposals and to include:

- Which people and bodies were consulted?
- How many were people consulted including attendee numbers at consultation events?

- How we consulted
- A summary of the main issues raised
- Information about how issues are addressed in the neighbourhood plan

Local Green Spaces and Views

Report needed to be brought up to date

Action AK

7. Timescales and Next Steps

Significant time and effort are required by the WG to review the further reports before the next WG meeting

It was agreed that the target date for NC&Y PC to consider the Neighbourhood Plan was 24th November, with the committee needing access to the various documents by no later than the 17th of November to allow adequate review time.

MH stated that if that timescale could not be met then an EGM of the PC would be called for early December in order that if the NP is approved that it can be submitted to SSDC the LPA before the end of 2021

JBG asked whether individuals get direct feedback or a face-to-face Q&A opportunity on their and other's comments. JW replied that would not be the case but that summarised comments and by whom would be included in the Consultation Table within the report

JBG was concerned that people's voice was not being heard and asked if there was any opportunity for that to happen.

JW reassured JBG that there was adequate time and steps within the plan programme for that to happen starting with the Parish Council meeting either in November or December whilst further opportunities will exist during the LPA's consultation stage, before going to an external examiner and the final referendum

AOB

JW stated she would circulate all the relevant documents for corrections and proofreading ahead of the next meeting and pursue an HRA from AECOM

Action ALL

Subject to the above the Date of Next Meeting was set as

10 November 2021