

**Westbury sub Mendip Neighbourhood Plan Working Group**  
**Minutes 19<sup>th</sup> March 2025 at Old Ditch Farm**

**Present** - Mick Fletcher [MF], (chair), Chris Langdon [CL] , Ros Wyke [RW], Sue Isherwood (SI), Alistair Hood (AH), Tony Westcott (TW) Penny Colwill (PCo), Dave Maguire (DMg), Raith Ward (RW)

**1. Apologies :** Guy Timson **Absent** : Adamos Euripidou,

**2. Minutes.** The minutes of the meeting held on 18 Feb were agreed.

**Action:** MF to post copy of minutes on the PC website.

**3. Matters Arising** RW still chasing Jon Fellingham to discuss the potential isolated public space shown in the application. **Action: RW to arrange discussion with John Fellingham**

**4. Items for Report**

**Brownfield Site** – Still awaiting response from CCs re purchase. RW thought we should ask church for a formal request to use some of the brownfield site as an extension to the graveyard.

RW said she would check with Somerset Council to see if they intend to sell Mortar Pits lay-by to developers as they had refused to sell it to the PC. **Action: RW to liaise with SC re intentions re Mortar Pits ownership**

**Roughmoor Lane Application** – The NPWG advice has been provided to the PC and forwarded by the PC to Somerset Planners. It has been circulated to villagers.

There are 52 responses to the application on the planning website. 49 are objections, 3 are neutral.

Some villagers reported that they were unable to comment using the website. RW will take this up with SC. **Action: RW to raise question of being unable to respond to RL planning application with Somerset Council.**

**Pre App re proposed Community Land** – The pre app requested has been filed. Costs have been agreed by PC. There will be conservation input. Awaiting details of timing of pre app meeting.

**Pedestrian Safety** – A meeting was held in Feb between NPWG members and Somerset Highways. CL gave feedback on the meeting. Highways indicated the proposed 20mph TRO had been approved by police which was a major hurdle. Highways will only respond to information that is in the application. Planners can respond to other suggestions and ask applicants to consider further ideas. The NPWG is coming up with a proposal for a pedestrian crossing of A371 which hopefully planners will consider and discuss with the applicant.

CL has produced a draft letter for PC to send to planners. Includes:

- a. request for time delay in a decision on the application for NPWG to work up a crossing proposal
- b. it asks various technical questions as provided by D Mason to encourage a Highways refusal reason to the planning application.
- c. suggestions as to how crossing sight lines can be improved to meet standards

It was agreed by the meeting that the letter should be sent by the PC. **Action: SI to share draft letter with other PC members for agreement and for the letter to be sent by Monday 24 March if agreed**

#### **5. Full draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) doc – “sign off” for issue to planners**

We need to get first draft of NP to planners by end of March. They have agreed to look at it in early April.

It was agreed the suggested contents gave a shape to the document. It was agreed the audience for the document was both the villagers and the planners/inspector who would all need to agree the final plan.

Various aspects of the draft plan were discussed. It was agreed the meeting would stick to principles and individuals should suggest and send in proposed changes and additions to the detail of the plan in the following week for CL to coordinate. The draft plan will go to Stuart Todd at the end of the week for comment.

The structure of the plan was discussed and a reordering of the sections agreed to better match the Local Plan order.

CL agreed to write justification for Employment section. **Action: CL to write Employment justification.**

CL noted any suggested changes on a draft copy of the document to amend later so these have not necessarily been captured in the minutes.

RW suggested the plan should recognise the increase in the number of work related vehicles that people are required to keep at home by their employment contracts. Has an impact on parking requirements.

It was agreed we would keep all the proposed sections including sustainability.

Under Housing it was agreed to keep reference to scale and pace of development as this was a village priority. We need to ensure that data quoted is referenced to source documents.

Under Settlement Character it was noted there were 2 green space areas on Stoneleigh and one on the way up towards Old Ditch.

It was suggested plan should include a map showing the extent of the conservation area and AONB.

There was a discussion about development outside the village development boundary and whether a policy was needed to stop erosion of the development boundaries. **Action: SI to consider the need for a policy on development boundaries and draft a policy if required.**

Under Landscape and Environment there was a suggestion that it would be good to emphasise the stewardship role the village plays and that the policies are supporting.

There was a discussion about how to ensure that views out of and into the village are included. **Action: TW to think about the wording used at LE3(i) when describing views.**

It was agreed that the plan needed to include justification for the Dark Skies policy.

**Action: TW and RW to write Dark Skies justification**

Suggested there is no need to mention Bucklegrave Holiday Park as falls outside Parish boundary.

It was noted the Village Character Assessment did not include Hollybrook which is an oversight. Need to recognise Hollybrook is a part of the parish and the gap between Hollybrook and the village is an important feature along with its active farms and green space. Hollybrook should feature in all the maps to be included in the NP. Also Hollybrook has a water course which needs to be included. **Action: MF to produce a map to show the Parish water courses.**

Allotments should be included in Community Facilities section. The historic use of the playing field was noted as relevant to the need for a safe crossing.

It was suggested that Ordnance Survey maps be used in the NP. SC has a licence which should allow us to use these. Irrelevant features on the maps can be faded out. Flood pathways should be included on a map. Action :CL to obtain floodpaths from Environment Agency to include on a map.

**Way forward – Action: Individual members of NPWG to track changes of text on latest version of NP and forward to CL by Monday 24 March**

**Action:CL to coordinate proposed changes to NP and submit draft NP document to ST and Planners.**

**Action: CL will feedback ST's thoughts on plan to NPWG in due course.**

**6. Date of next meeting - Monday 7<sup>th</sup> April (Venue?)**

**5. AOB – None**