

North Cadbury & Yarlington Parish Council

Clerk: Mrs Rebecca Carter, Portman House, North Barrow, Somerset, BA22 7LZ

Tel: 01963 240226

e-mail: parishclerk@northcadbury.org.uk

<http://www.northcadbury.org.uk>

“Draft” Minutes of Parish Council (PC) Meeting
held as a consultative virtual meeting via Zoom software on
Wednesday 28th October 2020 at 7.00pm

Councillors Present (remotely):

Malcolm Hunt (Chairman)	Alan Bartlett (Vice Chairman)
Sue Gilbert	Karen Harris
Roger House	Andy Keys-Toyer
Bryan Mead	Archie Montgomery
Alan Rickers	John Rundle
Katherine Vaughan	

In Attendance (remotely): C.Cllr M Lewis, D.Cllr H Hobhouse, D.Cllr Kevin Messenger, the Clerk, Mr A Tregay, Boon Brown and nineteen members of the public.

Public Session

There were no comments from the public.

Clare Field, Ridgeway Lane, North Cadbury – Presentation of Initial Plans for Development

Presentation by Mr A Tregay, Boon Brown to PC of initial conceptual plans on scheme at Ridgeway Lane prior to formal consultation with PC, neighbours/residents. The Chairman informed residents that the presentation by Mr Tregay would not constitute a formal consultation. Mr Tregay had given his assurance to the Chairman that the PC and neighbours/residents would have the opportunity to comment and ask questions during the formal consultation process at pre- application and post-application stages, which would be held at a later date, which was also confirmed by Mr Tregay.

Mr Tregay stated that this was the start of a constructive dialogue with the PC in order to give an indication of the proposed development during the early stages and to hopefully receive feedback. The aim was to keep the PC and neighbours informed as much as possible. He advised that the format for the formal consultation was yet to be determined due to Covid-19. They would normally present at an open evening/afternoon in a village hall, however, it may need to be a digital or written process but he would continue to liaise with the PC to make sure everyone involved is notified.

Mr Tregay outlined the proposals on behalf of his Client, Mr P Longman, for the residential development of Clare Field, Ridgeway Lane, North Cadbury. He advised that the plans were conceptual and, therefore, subject to change, however, they would give a good indication of the direction of the scheme (Attachments 1 and 2). The development would be in the region of 80 new homes, 35% [28] of which would be ‘affordable’. There would be a mix of housing types and sizes, from starter homes for first time buyers up to larger family homes, with scope to include bungalows. The site would be accessed off a new road linking to the A359; Ridgeway Lane would be unaffected and would only be accessed by the development in emergencies. The new road would have the advantage of removing any new traffic from the village, thus allowing the village to grow without adding any significant quantum of traffic to the existing roads.

The scheme would incorporate a new drop off zone for the school and teacher parking, located next to the existing public footpath, removing any school time parking from Cary Road.

Landscaping would include a significant amount of open space and green areas, including a nature reserve and central green. There are several footpaths which cross the site, some of which may need a modest realignment, however, they were looking at extending the number of footpaths

and green corridors across the site. They were also looking into opportunities for a nature trail, which would be open to all and could possibly incorporate a cycleway

The majority of the site is in flood zone 1, however, the western edge along the River Cam is in flood zone 2 and 3; they were not proposing any residential development in this area and any application would need to be supported by a drainage strategy.

The application is likely to be in Outline, therefore, the only detail for consideration would be the access arrangements; design and exact layout would not be considered at this stage, although there would be an indication of what they were considering.

The Applicant would be required to make a number of financial contributions, including the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), of which the PC would receive approx. 15% to spend within the community, on top of any contributions requested by the District and County Councils.

Mr Tregay commented on the Review of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006 – 2028) – ‘Preferred Options Consultation’; one of the options would be to categorise North Cadbury into a newly formed ‘Village’ tier within a new settlement hierarchy; [North Cadbury was currently categorised as a ‘rural settlement’]. It was anticipated that each new ‘Village’ would be expected to accept an additional 95 [60] homes over the planned period; their proposal would meet a considerable element of this number. He believed that one of the major advantages of larger development over smaller schemes, was that the majority of traffic would not be going through the village, it would provide school drop off facilities and green open space that added to further public benefits, which smaller developments could not provide on their own. New people to the village would support existing facilities such as the Catash Inn, Village Stores and new pupils for the primary school, thus supporting its long term viability. Greater critical mass would also be better able to support bus links.

The site would be well contained from a landscape perspective and would be further enhanced by new planting and buffering to give an overall net gain for biodiversity.

They were still working with a number of consultants on technical matters, therefore, there would be no detailed discussion at this point. They would continue to keep the PC updated as the scheme progressed and would hold a more formal consultation once the advanced design and technical reports were complete. He considered the proposal would bring a raft of benefits for the village and hoped that neighbours could work with them to make it the best development it could be. They would also be happy to liaise with the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group (NPWG).

The Chairman thanked Mr Tregay for his presentation and proceeded to put forward a number of questions compiled in advance from councillors based on the conceptual plans received, some of which had already been answered in his presentation.

Q1. Local Government planning and the review of South Somerset’s Local Plan was in a state of flux with a lack of clarity and guidance on housing provision, what evidence can they provide to substantiate the need for such a large development and further explain how it can be of benefit or wanted by the community?

A1. Mr Tregay agreed that there is a state of flux. The current Government White paper will make quite fundamental changes to the planning system, albeit it was still under consultation and had received a high level of objections. The current situation is that South Somerset District Council (SSDC) has a 5 year housing land supply deficit. The numbers quoted of circa. 95 houses were from the Preferred Options draft document for the Local Plan, which was in the early stages and being consulted on and in which SSDC propose to raise the profile of North Cadbury with 12 other villages throughout the District. Given their access to services, they are deemed appropriate places for development. Larger schemes would need to provide affordable housing and a mix of houses [as well as the benefits previously mentioned].

Mr Tregay stated that there is no requirement to ascertain whether the development is wanted by the community, however, he appreciated that there may be concern by neighbours over the scale of the development. He hoped to gain public opinion by engaging early on and working with people.

Q2. 80 dwellings would potentially increase the population of North Cadbury by 50% by adding another 200 people, which is a significant increase. Can the current infrastructure sustain this increase?

A2. Mr Tregay stated that the school has capacity and the pub and shop would welcome additional custom. More people create a critical mass to support local services such as bus links. They were relatively confident the current infrastructure would support a development of

this size. The developer would need to make a number of financial contributions to further enhance any infrastructure that may be needed.

Q3. How would the scheme mitigate the increase in pressure on main drains and sewage?

A3. Mr Tregay advised that Consultants were working with them on an indicative drainage strategy that included flood risk appraisals. No technical details were available at the moment and would not be provided until the final details of the scheme were known, i.e., the number and size of houses. However, any scheme provided could not worsen any existing situation and on the whole would need to provide betterment. If necessary, funds would be required to provide betterment.

Q4. Do you see the traffic movement off the new road from the A359 coming in to the Estate being convoluted, how would it work? The entrance on Ridgeway Lane is marked for emergency vehicles only, how can this be prevented from becoming a 'rat run'?

A4. Exact details were not known yet. Emergency services can have certain keys, gates can be locked or other restrictions put in place. Regarding the access road from the A359, consultants have looked at the number of likely trip generation, the capacity of the road and highway network. They are confident that there is ample capacity and the road can be designed to accommodate the new traffic. The application will most likely be all matters reserved except access, therefore, this will be provided in detail incl. road specification, exact widths, location and landscaping.

Q5. What studies have been undertaken and are you prepared to share them at this stage?

A5. They have had a number of Ecology reports carried out commencing with a Phase 1 report (walkover and desktop survey), followed by the recommended more specific Phase 2 reports including species etc. The results showed that there was nothing of particular interest on the site, which is well managed agricultural land with a general low biodiversity rating. They were currently working with Landscape, Highways, Drainage, and Heritage Consultants, mindful that there is a listed building and conservation area nearby.

Q6. There are three Rights of Way (RoW) on Clare Field, what are your plans?

A6. There are no plans to extinguish ROW but some may need to be modestly realigned. They were also looking at providing additional footpaths, a nature trail and possibly a cycle trail, which would run round the site.

Q7. There are three Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) on Clare Field, what are your plans?

A7. A tree report was also carried out and they were working with an arboriculturalist. The central tree would be a 'feature' tree with a green around it, the other 2 were most likely in the flood zone and therefore, they would not be looking to remove them. They would also be looking at enhancing the planting of trees and hedgerows with a mix of species and were working with an ecologist to maximise the biodiversity gain as well as the landscape gain.

Q8. Given the number and degree of hardstanding which will create water run-off, what will be the flooding risk to areas such as Brookhampton?

A8. There were no technical details yet, however, they are working with flood risk experts. The proposal would not worsen any situation and would need to better it as well. There is always a drainage solution, some more costly than others. They hope to have the details soon once they have carried out a more formal consultation.

Q9. Do you have any idea of when the Outline Application will be submitted, i.e., when should we expect the formal pre-consultation?

A9. They were not where they wanted to be due to Covid-19, however, he hoped to be able to come back to the PC before the end of the year with an update or the formal pre-consultation. Some first draft reports were back already, however, they would need to be analysed to provide the level of detail required for a formal pre-consultation with PC and neighbours. As they progress they would keep the PC informed. They would also discuss with the PC if there was a preference on how the PC would like the consultation carried out; digital may not be best for some parishioners, so perhaps a paper consultation/letter drop? He asked that any questions come via the Parish Council so that he is not asked the same question many times.

The Chairman thanked Mr Tregay for his presentation and would await details of the formal pre-application consultation.

North Cadbury and Yarlington Neighbourhood Plan Working Group (NPWG).

Cllr Keys-Toyer gave the following report on behalf of the NPWG:

Finance: Awaiting Locality's response to our grant application.

AECOM Report on Call for Sites: Completed.

AECOM Housing Needs Assessment: Jo Witherden, Planning Consultant was still negotiating second draft.

Heritage Report: Completed and awaiting invoice.

Public Consultation: This has been the main focus of work, preparing a story board and data into a form where it will work through the website to operate as a Virtual Village Hall venue for the consultation and questionnaire. We are still planning to run actual Village Hall events but the two need to be coordinated. This has pushed our schedule back a bit.

Henry Hobhouse, our District Councillor, kindly agreed to a meeting with us to give us advice and feedback from his point of view.

Reports from County and District Councillors.

District and County Councillors may give short verbal reports on matters affecting the Parish.

D.Cllr Hobhouse reported that the Government had recently written to all District and County Councils, including BANES and North Somerset regarding unitary authorities. However, the numbers would not allow for one unitary authority if BANES and North Somerset were included, which would mean there could be two or three unitary authorities. Cllr. Hobhouse was doubtful that the Government knew the possible results of its proposals.

C.Cllr Lewis reported that he had requested an answer on the subject of Ash Die-back trees that abut the highways, raised by Cllr. Archie Montgomery, but as yet had had no response.

Covid-19 There was still a need for individuals to stay safe. The details about the pandemic from both the District and the County Council are sent on a regular and weekly basis to the Clerk.

The current consultation on the Government White Paper on Planning raised the prospect of the lack of a 5 year land supply might be deleted from the current National Planning Policy Framework.

20/84. Apologies for Absence and to consider the reasons given.

Council to receive apologies for absence and, if appropriate, to resolve to approve the reasons given.

RESOLVED: None received.

20/85. Declarations of Interest.

Members to declare any interests they may have in agenda items that accord with the requirements of the Local Authority (Model Code of Conduct) Order LO9-12 May 2018.

(NB this does not preclude any later declarations).

RESOLVED: None received.

20/86. Minutes.

To approve the Minutes of the Virtual PC Meeting held on 22nd September 2020.

RESOLVED: The minutes were approved as a true record and would be duly signed.

20/87. Vacancy on the Parish Council

To consider applications received and conduct vote to fill casual vacancy on the Parish Council by co-option.

RESOLVED: There were two eligible candidates for the vacancy, Mrs K Harris and Mr N Humberston. Due to 'technical difficulties', Mr Humberston was not 'present', therefore, following a presentation by Mrs Harris, she was co-opted unanimously and would duly sign her Declaration of Acceptance of Office (DAO) remotely.

20/88. Planning.

a. SSDC Decisions.

- i. **PA 20/01762/HOU.** Demolition of existing single storey room and erection of a two storey extension to form reception room with bedroom/en-suite above at Brick House Farm, Corkscrew Lane, North Cadbury – **APPROVED.**

ii. **PA 20/01724/FUL.** Erection of livestock building and associated landscape works at Avalon Farm, Galhampton Hill, Galhampton – **APPROVED.**

iii. **PA 20/01357/FUL.** The erection of new butchery/charcuterie, and food storage/delivery buildings (Use Classes B2/B8), erection of new warehouse/office building (Use Classes B8/B1) and associated access and landscape works on land adjoining Tor View Farm, Galhampton Hill, Galhampton – **APPROVED.**

20/89. Finance.

a. **Balance of the Councils Bank Account & Bank reconciliation.**

To report on Council's Bank Account.

RESOLVED: The Clerk previously circulated the PC Accounts which were received and approved.

b. **Accounts for payment**

To review and approve a schedule of items of expenditure:

Parish Council Expenditure:

Clerk's Expenses £157.94

Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Expenditure:

Aurora leaflet print £70.00

RESOLVED: Items of expenditure **APPROVED** unanimously.

20/90. Highways and Footpaths Report.

PC Representatives to provide progress reports.

RESOLVED: Cllrs Rundle and Vaughan presented their reports, which can be found at Attachments 3 and 4.

To consider provision and installation of 3 Woolston Village name plates at approx. £600 as PC contribution towards speed mitigation scheme, following onsite meeting with Mr G Warren, SCC Highways Engineer.

Cllr Rundle reported that a number of residents in Woolston were willing to contribute towards the scheme.

RESOLVED: Following a brief discussion the PC agreed unanimously to share the cost of the scheme, with both residents and the PC contributing £300 each; the PC would make up any deficit as necessary.

20/91. Parish Woodlands

Mr M Gilbert, North Cadbury 'Environment Champion', to present his proposal for the provision of Parish Woodlands for consideration by the Parish Council.

Mr Gilbert gave a full presentation. He considered that North Cadbury lacked a focal point and proposed that the PC consider applying for funding to provide a Village Woodland at the heart of the village, in the vicinity of the Church, Village Hall and Village Stores. He had researched other Woodland Trust sites such as the Sparkford Hill Copse and Haddon Wood, Alhampton. There were a few constraints to consider, including the cost of purchasing agricultural land, which was currently £12K-£15K per acre. Another option would be to obtain land through a legacy donation or memorial fund. Other issues to consider were the risk vandalism, theft and dumping of waste. Such projects would need expert management through organisations such as the Woodland Trust. The Village Wood could be set up including an existing orchard/trees, which could be planted with additional trees with the involvement of the Village Hall, local community and Primary School who were keen for a Woodland School.

Cllr. Montgomery would prefer not to see the change of use of land in the curtilage of a Grade I listed building. He suggested that it was a short walk to Camelot where there was a huge area of woodland; there were no public rights of access, however, walkers were welcome.

RESOLVED: Following a full discussion the PC voted **AGAINST** the proposal by a majority vote.

Items for Report and Future Business

a. Cllr Rundle reported on the poor state of the slip road off the A303 near Teals Orchard.

ACTION: Cllr Rundle to speak with Mr N Sinfield, Teals Orchard and follow up with Highways England.

b. Cllr Gilbert requested that the PC include as an Agenda item for discussion at the next meeting, how to improve communication with parishioners.

Next meeting: to be held remotely on Wednesday 25th November 2020, 7.00pm via Zoom.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.40pm.

Signed
Chairman

Dated