

North Cadbury & Yarlington Neighbourhood Plan

Working Group Minutes

Thursday 23rd September 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 thanked everybody for their efforts during the Reg 14 period and suggested the WG followed JW's proposed agenda for the meeting which would focus on response to the draft plan

4. Finance

JR had nothing to report

5. Draft Plan – Post Regulation 14 Feedback

Following the conclusion of regulation 14 consultation on 15th September the group discussed at great length the early reaction to the draft plan, particularly the proposed housing development at Brookhampton.

The key points raised were:

JBG raised several concerns that had been mentioned to him regarding sites 18, 17 and 22 (known as 18 and 19 respectively in the draft plan) namely:

The difference in approach taken to the first and second sites consultation exercise and the late addition of site 22.

- In response it was pointed out that the second consultation which coincided with the peak of the second wave of the pandemic was restricted due to covid guidelines but that every means to connect with residents had been made
- As for site 22 the group were duty bound to include it as and when they became aware.

JW commented that the approach was reasonable and proportionate and that the public response on the second consultation had been good with over 100 responses of which 56% supported the proposed plan, a further 19% were neutral whilst 25% appeared against it.

JBG suggested that by reducing the length of the plan and / or the level of buffer housing to enable the removal of either policy 18 (preferably) or 19 would probably appease those objectors

JW made the following points:

- A reasonable buffer (which is a judgement call) is required to safeguard the plan against delivery issues or loss of extants, if not the plan may not be deemed robust by the LPA and/or the Inspector
- Reducing the plan years and /or the buffer to a level that removed 18 or 19 meant that the NP would not be able to deliver on the target level of 11 affordable houses and the balanced gateway design argument made by AECOM would not be satisfied
- JW made the point that due to the linear nature of the village and the lack of side road access the consultation and analysis exercises demonstrated there were no alternative sites that would be easier for NC to accommodate and that if the plan were rejected then the parish became vulnerable to speculative development

After 1 ½ hrs. debate the WG agreed to move on to other items

Indicative Plan

Feedback indicated that the main concerns were to do with the possible loss of hedgerow and traffic issues re the narrowness of Cary Road. JW asked for views on how the indicative plan may be improved pointing out that hedgerows are not a natural characteristic of the village

There was however full agreement that the indicative layout should ensure effective site boundary screening including the retention of the roadside hedgerows whilst at the same time improve the ability of traffic to pass one another along the Cary Road. Suggestions included reducing the bulk of the hedgerow, introducing vehicle passing places, design of safe pedestrian access, and the use of entrance/exit splays.

JW requested that in the light of the discussion a subgroup should go away and come back with full recommendations on preferred changes to the current indicative layout

Action RR to form a subgroup and report back

Green Gap

In the light of resident's concerns regarding potential further development over time up the Cary Road AK suggested the inclusion of a Green Gap (development exclusion zone) as employed in Martock's NP. Much debate was then held on the location, scale, and merits of such a scheme. All agreed that providing we had landowner's support that it would be a good additional element to the NP and allay people's fears, particularly those who live in Brookhampton and North Town

**Action JBG to draft the possible Green Gap area
RR/AB to talk to landowners**

Draft Plan - Comments Received

JW requested that the WG now go through the draft plan on a page-by-page basis reviewing the comments and feed back that had been recorded during Reg 14 with a view to making changes to the plan where appropriate

Several changes were made of a minor nature e.g., regarding naming and location of buildings etc. More significant topics that arose were:

- Subject to the outcome of the Green Gap proposal JW would include a policy statement accordingly

Action JW

- Post the Green Gap determination a Phosphate mitigation strategy is required, JW would instruct AECOM specialists to undertake a Habitats Regulation Assessment and strategy recommendation for consideration at the next meeting

Action JW

- Residents flooding concerns were discussed, and it was agreed that the main culprit regarding surface water flooding (there is no evidence of river flooding outside the published flood map) was due to drains not being cleared frequently by SCC or blocked sewars caused by inappropriate material being flushed into domestic toilets

JW reported that Wessex Water had reported no issues about their ability to cope with surface water runoff and sewage because of the indicative plan as all new development would have to meet stringent drainage design criteria

The group reviewed the complete draft plan, JW agreed to amend it accordingly in advance of the next meeting

Action JW

There being no AOBs the date of the next meeting was set as 14th October 2021