

**Westbury sub Mendip Neighbourhood Plan Working Group**  
**Minutes 7<sup>th</sup> April 2025**  
**Online Teams**

**Present** - Chris Langdon (chair) [CL] Mick Fletcher [MF], Ros Wyke [RW], Sue Isherwood (SI), (TW) Penny Colwill (PCo) Guy Timson (GT), Dave Maguire (DMg)

**1. Apologies** (Tony Westcott TW, Al Hood (AH) **Absent** : Adamos Euripidou,

**2. Minutes.** The minutes of the meeting held on 19 March were agreed.

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

**3. Matters Arising**

To be followed up at next meeting: Brownfield Site, Mortar Pits land ownership, Pre-app community building.

PC letter of follow up questions to Highways has been responded to.

**Action** SI to circulate

**4. Safe Pedestrian Crossing**

This meeting was primarily to agree a safe pedestrian crossing proposal for issue to planners and highways. A draft proposal and sketch of sight lines had been circulated previously.

CL summarised: At the PC meeting with Highways we let them know there might be a way to solve sight line restrictions with a slice of land or oversight of land being made available. The response was that the PC should issue a proposal to planners as they were able to request the applicants consider it – whereas highways were apparently restricted in doing so.

DMg and CL have worked up the draft proposal together with sight lines with the main objective being to demonstrate a potential solution that the planners could then approach the Roughmoor lane development applicant to discuss and work through the detail. CL talked the meeting through the proposal.

GT confirmed that as owners of Court House Farm and the land immediately south of the A371 they were fully supportive of pursuing options that might lead to a solution for a safe crossing including offering a slice of land of their front garden if necessary. They expect that a safe crossing would lead to substantial increase in use of the footpath which runs across their front garden. This would impact on Court House Farm and so as part of any safe crossing solution they would require that this footpath to be diverted.

GT thought it might be possible to lower the wall and hedge below 600mm in height but he felt it would not be possible to lower the gates to this height.

GT confirmed that the footpath had previously been diverted along the A371 and that, when they bought the property, they sought to have the original path across their land reinstated. He confirmed this had been a difficult, slow process. He thought diverting the path again would not be easy. DMg thought the previous diversion demonstrated that in

principle diverting the footpath along the A371 should be acceptable to Somerset Council unless they could point to something significant that had changed since the previous diversion.

DMg confirmed that alternative crossing sites had been considered but the best option was by the Post Office as included in the proposal.

MF identified a great number of “ifs” to this proposal – elements that would need to be considered - footpath diversion, impact on listed buildings, Church Commissioners support, lighting of crossing, highways and planners agreement, loss of part of protected green space. All agreed there are many obstacles to overcome but the general consensus from village meetings and questionnaires was that a safe crossing of the A371 was a top priority for the village and all efforts must be made to achieve this. It was noted that the village was trying to obtain the brownfield site south of the A371 to ultimately develop as part of a community hub. A safe crossing of the A371 was key to the successful development of this site and it's use by all villagers living north and south of the A371.

The meeting agreed that CL and DMg draw up a proposal doc for issue to planners and highways based on the documents discussed. There was agreement we should attempt to get this to planners this week as they are moving towards determination of RL application. Proposal doc and sketches to be issued to Planners / Highways as a joint note from Sue as chair of PC together with Co-chairs of NWPG

**Action** – CL / DMg to draft proposal version for planners and issue to SI

**Action** - SI to issue proposal to planners / highways from PC as above

**5. AOB None**

- 6. Date of next meeting . Action** CL to ask planners and Stuart Todd ref timetable for comment on WIP draft NP doc and agree timely date of next meeting thereafter. Not before end of May with holiday commitments