1.What do you like about the proposal?

Some attempt has been made to create variety in terms of layout and design on paper, and it is all a very pretty little picture ….. But it provokes more questions than answers

### 2. Do you have any general comments about the proposed layout of the development including the location of the community land?

### Community Land: to be meaningful as a community amenity, any new amenity such as a Village Hall, together with much needed associated off-road car parking, should be placed as near the centre of the village as possible. This means the north east corner, closest to the village shop, the village school, the church, none of which have any designated parking area at present.

### The Stoneleigh Estate, to the north and west of the proposed new Roughmoor Lane estate, together with the houses on the north side of Roughmoor Lane cover an area almost equal in dimensions to those on the present development plan. Within the Stoneleigh Estate the roads are narrow and there is a good deal of on street parking which makes for difficult access. Any new plan should make allowance for a) roads sufficiently wide and b) designated off-street and easily accessible parking for each dwelling. For single occupancy dwellings one car should be allowed for, and all larger dwellings should allow space for two cars. Anything less will lead to the kind of street obstruction mentioned above, and a commensurate lack of access ability for emergency vehicles.

### The Stoneleigh Estate and half dozen or so houses between it and the junction with the A371 amount to around 60 dwellings. It is difficult to imagine that 60 dwellings in the Roughmoor Lane proposal, together with the land set aside for community use, and the 0.5 hectare of open space promised, and the footpaths and bat corridors indicated, and the provision of sufficiently wide streets (see above), can produce anything other than an unacceptably crowded layout. In sum, 60 dwellings is too many for this space. The number should be radically reduced.

### At present the population of Westbury-sub-Mendip is around 800 (2020 census). A conservative estimate of additional population per house might be 2.5 people. Taking this estimated figure, 60 new homes would equal 150 new residents. This is not far short of a 20% increase in population. This is an unacceptably large increase all at once, especially for a small rural community.

3. Do you support the proposed network of roads, cycle paths and footpaths?

Roads: A re-designed access road to any new estate would be welcome. The following should however be taken into consideration. 1) Roughmoor Lane and any access to it from the A371 should be sufficient to take large, wide agricultural machinery. 2) Alternative arrangements for the bus stop, small car parking area (and footpath) must be accounted for. Roads within the estate must be of a sufficient width (see above)

Footpaths: The Parish Paths Liaison Officer has submitted a detailed response

4. How can the proposal be enhanced?

Due care and consideration should be given to tree planting and provision of open spaces. - See submission of the Westbury-sub-Mendip Community Tree Group. A central, open space for communal use/children’s play area is far preferable to small pockets of open space scattered around as indicated on the plan.

 5. Do you have any other comments or points you wish to draw to our attention?

* No building should be taller than two storeys.
* There is a real need for supply of small starter homes for local people. The plan should therefore include terraces of small houses and single occupancy dwellings, including flats.
* Not all dwellings need gardens. Some occupants may not have time or energy for their upkeep. Consider small paved areas, or integrated covered balcony areas for first floor flats.
* The parish has a Dark Sky policy. There should be no street lighting.
* Building materials should be in keeping with the traditional local housing, and should be varied. Choice of roof material also important. (See Parish Paths Liaison Officer’s report, Para. 1.)