



Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Report following 6th Meeting at Mill House,
31st July 2017

Present: R. Heath-Coleman – Leader (RHC) Bryan Norman (BN)
John Corbett (JC) Kate Oram (KO)
Steve Millard (SM)
Tim Cook (TC), SSDC, Area East

Apologies: Terri Plummer (TP) Jo Witherden (JW), Consultant
No longer attending: Jamie Paul (JP)

1. Welcome & Apologies noted as above.

2. Conflicts of Interest: NPSG members to note when land or other matters are discussed if there could be a potential personal conflict of interest. There were no conflicts of interest to be recorded.

3. Report following meeting 14th June: arising and not included elsewhere:

1. *Feedback from PC July meeting:* BN advised that the PC had requested that the NPSG budget be amended to include £250 for typing services and be resubmitted to the PC. This was not agreed. There was no other feedback reported.

2. *Timeline for NP:* A copy had been circulated. There were no immediate amendments/additions. The timeline would now be kept updated. It would possibly be a reference paper in the Consultation document. **Action with RHC**

4. Project Plan:

4.1 Outstanding actions and questions

4.1.1 Estate Agents – 5 now returned out of the 12 targeted. No further action.

4.1.2 Service Providers:

- Memorial Hall – amended form presented.
- St. Barnabas through PCC – the Estate Agents' form had been issued instead of the service provider's form. **RHC e-mailing correct form to PCC**
- Countess Gytha School – form still not returned. **RHC speaking to SCC, Carol Bond**
- Playing Field – form still outstanding from Jamie Paul. This form is important as it will identify what additional land was required. **BN to obtain at meeting between PFC and Parish Councillors on Wednesday evening**
- Bowls Club – form awaited from Club Secretary, Geoff Humphrey. **Action RHC**
- Tennis Club – form received from Morwenna Ford

Copies of the forms to be sent to JW for use in the Housing Review Report. JW to be asked to return the previous forms for the NPSG's evidence record. **Action RHC**

4.1.3 TC had located a map showing land grades – to be circulated **Action TC**

4.1.4 Agricultural paper – proposal by BN at Attachment 1 **Action All to review**

4.1.5 Development Boundary – is there a need to re-introduce: TC advised that we would need evidence that we had gone through a process. This item should be reviewed as a final part of the land assessment exercise. **C/f**

4.1.6 Add definition for Village as well as Parish: BN considered there was a need to define Village as well as Parish and his proposed wording was within his typed draft at 1.4.A and 1.4.C (no B). It was noted that this wording was a description not definitions. See Attachment 2 for copy of Parish definition in N, and BN's proposed wording.

- 4.1.7 Do we need further evidence for Vision & Aims, at present based on those in the Community Plan? It was agreed that we should re-visit to see if changes were needed after we have reviewed Section 3. C/f
- 4.1.8 Community Facilities – the need for public venues – not discussed but will be part of the review under Section 3. C/f

4.2 Work Schedule: RHC presented a first draft. There were no amendments and general agreement although BN considered the timescale may prove to be too tight. It was accepted that it was an aim and that if possible we should shorten it (this was the wish of the PC Chairman). The following matters were discussed and ongoing actions noted:

- 4.2.1 *Consultation:* drop-in style favoured for October, similar basis as Planning for Real.
- 4.2.2 *Consultation Statement:* already in draft but cannot be completed until consultations are finished. **RHC to insert Timeline below this line item**
- 4.2.3 *Intro and Sections 1 and 2:* BN's re-draft to be cut and pasted, with highlighting, in time for our next meeting. **Action with RHC & JC**
- 4.2.4 *Sections 3 and 4:* review of these sections to await completion of the evidence gathering work packages. BN's agricultural policy to be reviewed here.
- 4.2.5 *Appendices:* BN's proposed additions at Attachment 3 to Appendix 5, Village Character Statement to be incorporated for review. **Action with RHC & JC**
- 4.2.6 *Mapping:* RHC and TC have an outstanding action to liaise with Ben Turner in respect of corrections to the existing maps in the NP. **RHC to re-circulate e-mail with mapping instructions – all to visit site to gain an understanding.**
- 4.2.7 *Housing:* RHC shared the only three responses to the 'Call for Sites'. The information on each would be entered on the landowners' spreadsheet for further review at the time of the site visits – proposed 8th September – landowners permission to be obtained. **Action with RHC**
 TC noted that it is important that all landowners are treated the same throughout the whole process and that no one submission is seen to be a favourite despite the views held and expressed by members of the group. The next step is to work with JW to assess each submission fairly.
 It was also noted that responses had not been received from land/property owners who had apparently responded to an earlier call from SSDC. **Action with TC to get details from within SSDC**
Post meeting: an e-mailed fourth submission just received with apologies for missing the deadline.
- 4.2.8 *Getting About:* It was noted that **SM/KO/TP/RHC** were doing a series of walks through August to review existing and possible new walking/cycling/horse riding routes.
- 4.2.9 *Community Facilities – Playing Field:* SM/TC and RHC had met with JP on Wednesday, 19th July. There were no material changes to the development plan in the draft NP and JP had not mentioned the need for more land for additional cricket and football pitches. This need should be described on the Service Provider form which BN is pursuing on Wednesday evening. **Action with BN**
- 4.2.10 *Environment:* It was noted that **SM/KO/TP/RHC** were reviewing the evidence for Local Green Spaces and Open Spaces during August.

5. AOB – BN shared his conviction that only a by-pass could solve the traffic issue – speed, size and pollution. PC Minute 04(07/17) Highways recorded a resolution to ask BN to investigate whether Queen Camel might be able to benefit from the government's recently announced 'by-pass fund', i.e. to find out details about the scheme including funding. The group was in general agreement with BN's conviction.

6. Next Meeting – full group **8th September**, to commence with site visits, possibly from 4.00 p.m. with wash-up at Mill House. Time to be confirmed after liaison with JW

Action with RHC

Rosemary Heath-Coleman

Rosemary Heath-Coleman
Leader Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
01935 850254, rheathcoleman@gmail.com

To: NPSG and Ben Turner

Cc: Jo Witherden (JW), Consultant

Cc: District Councillor, Mike Lewis
PC Chairman, John Brendon
Parish Clerk for Parish Council

AGRICULTURAL POLICY – by Bryan Norman – for consideration by NPSG

Approximately 90% of the parish is agricultural land with five separate farms. The Farming Community contributes a great deal to the environment in which we live as custodians of the countryside.

POLICIES:

1. To encourage good Agricultural Use of Land and Buildings
2. Preserve all existing hedgerows and mature trees, copses and encourage margin planting to preserve wildlife. Minimize use of pesticides and fertilizers.
3. Planning Permission – There will be a bias in favour of the reuse of redundant farm buildings for a variety of other uses provided it does not adversely affect other landowners.
4. To encourage Tourism by adapting or building new For Holiday lets in the immediate environment of farm buildings provided. Such buildings will not form part of any housing quotas.
5. Development of Code 1.2.2a land will be discouraged.

Definition for Parish in the NP (Section 5)

PARISH OF QUEEN CAMEL embraces

- The village of Queen Camel
- The hamlet of Wales, which lies about half a mile to the west of the village,
- Lambrook Farm and cottages to the south,
- Windsor Farm to the south-west, beyond the railway line,
- Part of Sparkford Hill, and
- Land to the north of the A303 (approximately 50% of the Parish by land area), which includes the major settlement of Hazlegrove House now housing Hazlegrove School (the preparatory school for Kings School, Bruton), Camel Hill House and Farm, Vale Farm and further north, on the road to Bab Cary, Fortyacres Farm.

BN's proposed wording:

1.4.A. THE PARISH

The Parish of some 2282 Acres (10H) is approximately 5K North to South and 2K East to West. Ninety percent is open agricultural land, mainly grazing with some copses and a general feature of irregular hedgerows with many mature trees. The Parish is situated some 6 miles north of Yeovil.

TOPOGRAPHY divides the Parish into three basic sections. South, Centre and North with the Village of 1000 inhabitants in the middle.

The South section from Hornsey book on the A359 to West Camel Road is almost entirely open gently undulating farmland. There is a solar farm on the East side of the single track Railway. The new Primary School is on the corner where you enter the Village on the A359 from Yeovil and Sherborne.

The Centre section runs from West Camel Road to Camel Hill and the current A303 trunk road with the meandering River Cam running East-West through the middle. The part south of the River contains the village and the hamlet of Wales with open farmland on both sides. The part north, apart from the old council houses is farmland rising some 50 metres from the river to the Camel Ridge with copses and trees near the ridge. The Leyland walking trail follows the river but there are no actual riverside paths.

The Northern section extends from Camel Hill and the A303. There are some residences, a farm hidden away in the mainly woody Camel Hill. It then opens up to the Sparkford Vale open farmland, which is liable to flood. To the east is Hazlewood House, a private school. There are important views to and from the village from here.

1.4.C. THE VILLAGE

Located on the South side of the River Cam, it stretches mainly North to South for about 1 kilometre along the A359 which forms the High Street on gently rising ground. The northern approach from A303 descends to the old narrow bridge over the river and provides a good general view of the St Barnabas Church (grade I). This is approached via an interesting cobbled path. The High Streets and England's Lane form the central core of the Conservation Zone. The buildings are generally 19th century with more recent additions built to blend in with the older structures.

The original draft plan[] established the Central Conservation Zone shown on Fig 3 drawing and the wider Village Development Boundary . This has since been revised to include the development in Roman Way etc . This revised boundary is shown on Fig 3 outline in red.

BN's addition to Appendix 5, Village Character Statement:

1st DRAFT -

3.1.4. DESIGN AND LAYOUT

THE VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT

Intended as a guideline to the Parish Council and Developers

One of the most regular criticisms of new developments is that their designs are mundane and have little to do with, even damage, the character of the Village where they are being built.

There can be no excuse for such crass ugliness being allowed in the Countryside, beautiful scenery or interesting environments disfigured by repetitive unimaginative designs.

We believe responsible design is a duty to ensure genuine thoughtfulness to reflect local styles and settings. To give a sense of 'in place' so that in 100 years people will still want those homes.

Policy intention -

To preserve and enhance the character of The Parish and The Village using good design criteria paying particular attention to the character of surroundings.

Modern and Creative Designs where appropriate, will be considered.

Add RHC draft and appropriate pictures.