**Minutes of Roughmoor Community Group Meeting 23 Jan 2022**

The meeting was opened by Rowan Stewart, notes taken by Liz Hughes and Rowan Stewart

**Agenda**

1. Reminders
2. Priorities
3. Actions
4. Church Commissioners
5. Parish Council

**1.Reminders**

1.1. Group Agreement

All were reminded of the group agreement made at the meeting on 16 Jan 2022 regarding how we conduct ourselves in the meeting namely:

* One voice at a time
* Recognising that we will all have different views on the detail so it is fine to disagree and still pull in the same direction

1.2. Original purpose of Roughmoor Community Group

Rowan set out the original purpose of Roughmoor Community Group to reduce the impact of the housing development with the proposal to acquire a belt of land along the hedge to provide a proper bat corridor (minimum 10m required) and a wooded space for the school and other community activities that would be accessible and inclusive.

The group has grown and is aimed at being an independent group for everyone not just Roughmoor Lane. At the meeting on 16 January, various priorities and concerns were raised. This meeting will look at these and determine how we take them forward.

1.3. Parish Council

There may be a point where members wish to discuss items related to the Parish Council in which case Parish Council members were respectfully asked if they could sit out at that point although their contributions prior to that welcomed.

2. Priorities

Several questions were asked about the process for application for planning permission. Sue Isherwood had prepared a very useful document explaining this which was distributed in hard copy but can be available by email also. This sets out the stages of application very clearly. In addition, advice was provided by one of the group members with planning experience, that this stage will be significant in setting the scope of the development e.g. number of houses so important that we all make our feelings clear to the Church Commissioners through the consultation process now. It was also pointed out that we should present our concerns based on design issues rather than just as an objection to the housing.

There was discussion whether our objective should be to stop the build or reduce its impact. Adam has been collecting signatures to stop the build which others also supported. Others felt that it was unlikely that we could stop the build because the land is in the permitted development of the Local Plan Part 2.

***Decision: Following the discussion the group was asked if they would like to proceed with the twin objectives of stopping the build and minimising the impact on all residents. The majority indicated with a nod of heads that this was the preference and was adopted.***

Rowan invited the group to brainstorm the priorities that people have now. The following suggestions were made:

* Look at the conditions in the Local Plan 2 and show where the proposal does not meet them. For example:
* it does not safeguard amenities of nearby properties
* it does not propose a solution to the need for “safe pedestrian links”.
* heritage design houses are required next to listed buildings.
* Conditions can be found on Sue’s helpful handout (copies of these can be forwarded by email or paper copies dropped round as necessary) or on page 155 of Local Plan 2.
* Adam has also collected concerns about the issue of “safe pedestrian links from a number of more vulnerable people. There were a number of comments made about how dangerous the road is and how much worse it would be with upwards of 100 cars for 60 houses. Concerns were also raised about the farm traffic driving through the new estate.
* A number of the people Adam met were concerned about the bus stop and its location also.
* There was concern that the Church Commissioners’ school survey was very out of date. Pressure on schools is a serious issue. The status of the Priddy and WSM schools is fragile and there is no guarantee they will continue to exist. Secondary schools in Wells and Cheddar are full.
* The Church Commissioners survey on health was also out of date.
* The build, especially with the presence of the green line and the attenuation pond outside the boundary of the agreed build, opens the floodgate to considerable future building.
* Support of the Parish Council is a priority as there will be an opportunity for the PC to formally represent the concerns of the village in the application of planning permission process. There was recognition that we all need to work together for the best outcome for the village.

3. Actions

The group was invited to consider actions that we could set against the priorities already listed. It was agreed to do the following

***Road and access***

3.1.A survey of the road at different times to identify current use. Ensure this covers more popular travel times, such as during holidays and events, as well as normal traffic density (Gill and Trevor -camera)

3.2. Contact the police to arrange a clicker style assessment of road use (Alexa)

3.3. Photograph the size and quantity of lorries waiting to go west up the hill out of the village (Alexa with borrowed camera)

3.4. A question was asked if there should there be a campaign to downgrade the A371 as it is not fit for the weight of traffic it currently carries? This was not finalised in the meeting.

3.5. Find out the size and frequency of farm traffic needing to use the main road and Roughmoor Lane, turning circles etc (Linda and Malcolm)

3.6. Arrange a meeting with the highways department, once the data has been gathered. (Open)

3.7. Possibility of also measuring traffic pollution levels on the road (Alexa).

***Services***

3.8. Get an up to date assessment of primary school capacity (Adam)

3.9. Get an up to date assessment of secondary school capacity (Rowan)

3.10. Ascertain current capacity of medical services (Liz)

***Houses, heritage and design***

3.11 It would be valuable for all villagers to photograph examples of housing that are more appealing and those we don’t like. Ellie Mains agreed to collate these. Priddy has guidelines about new building suitable to the village – could we adapt this? (Ellie)

3.12 A list of objections to the build we can most fruitfully target based on the conditions the Church Commissioners are required to consider, would be useful (Mick)

3.13 Enable people who don’t feel able to write letters to express their views (Adam to co-ordinate; a number of people volunteered to help with this).

***Environment***

3.14 Issues around waste water and phosphates - info about this could be very relevant. (Mick to talk to Emma Gifford)

4. Church Commissioners

4.1 **It was agreed that Liz and Rowan would write to the Church Commissioners on behalf of the Roughmoor Community Group, detailing our dissatisfaction with the consultation process.**

5. Parish Council

Members of the Parish Council were asked to step out to give the group an opportunity to discuss any issues related to the PC as comments had been made in relation to the council earlier in the meeting.

**Following some discussion related to representation of community interests, a motion was raised to have a vote of confidence in the PC to represent the community’s views. This was carried by a majority with a show of hands.**

It was agreed that this should be conveyed by the Chair of RCG to the Parish Council

**The meeting was closed at 7.30pm**