



## **Minutes of the Queen Camel Village Meeting held on Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> July 2019 at 7pm at the Memorial Hall**

**Present:** Simon Thornewill (Chair), Dan Hewlett, Brian Hewlett, Kathy Grainger, Jude Coggins, Sue Gettings, Bryan Norman and Emma Curtis – Parish Clerk

**There were 35 members of the public in attendance.**

- 1. Confirm circulation of the Neighbourhood Plan Summary and proposal to extend consultation period by two weeks:** Simon Thornewill welcomed everyone to the meeting and confirmed the meeting had been arranged to provide members of the public with further information on the Neighbourhood Plan. Simon commended members of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group for putting the document together but stressed electors recognise its importance to read the document and decide if it suits Queen Camel and to ensure they provide their feedback. He confirmed that every household should have received a summary of the full Neighbourhood Plan document and that the Parish Council would consider an extension to the public consultation period by two weeks at their meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2019.
- 2. Way ahead with the Neighbourhood Plan:** Simon Thornewill provided the benefits of a Neighbourhood Plan being adopted stating that the local planning department would consider the plan giving the village a voice and should development go ahead the village would receive a higher percentage in financial benefits. He stressed the importance of members of the village to complete their feedback forms and confirmed that the Parish Council would analyse answers with the assistance of a planning consultant. Simon explained that depending on the feedback received the Neighbourhood Plan may have to be amended with a new environmental report being conducted. He confirmed that the Neighbourhood Plan process would conclude with a public referendum.
- 3. Question and Answer session on the Neighbourhood Plan:** Members of the public were invited to ask questions regarding the Neighbourhood Plan and the following questions were asked and comments made:
  - **What is truly affordable housing?** ST stated that this is defined in law and would provide a detailed response following the meeting. A member of the public commented that affordable housing was defined as 80% of the market value.
  - **As the previous Council approved and endorsed the Neighbourhood Plan, are the current Council bound by this decision?** ST stated that the Council had to abide by the decision made by the previous Council but that the whole purpose of the consultation period was for members of the public to

make comment on the document and that the village would have the final say during the referendum.

- **Although SSDC Planning Committee are committed to consider the Neighbourhood Plan, they may still go against it:** ST commented that this may be correct but that the village would be stronger with a Neighbourhood Plan and that the village should support the Parish Council when they object to an application.
- **A comment was made that it felt as though the Parish Council were delaying the submission of the Neighbourhood Plan and that this may be counterproductive:** ST responded that it was ridiculous to suggest it was counterproductive and that the meeting had been arranged to share views, answer questions and interpret the Neighbourhood Plan as parishioner's judgement was crucial.
- **Have safe routes for cyclists and walkers been considered:** BN stated that this was very important but that more work needed to be done. BN commented that as a member of the NPSG he urged as many as people as possible to complete the feedback forms.
- **Who is going to process the feedback forms?** ST stated that the Parish Council would resolve a way forward to process the feedback forms.
- **Who is responsible for the maintenance of the footpaths?** KG confirmed that Rights of Way were the responsibility of Somerset County Council.
- **New traffic figures had been collated in May, could these be inserted into the plan?** ST commented to add these statistics to the feedback form for consideration
- **Would speed safety measures for West Camel Road be considered in the plan?** ST stated to ensure this is put on the feedback form but that Somerset County Highways would have the final say on any measures.
- **Would the private lane behind South View remain so?** BN responded that it is a private lane and assumed it would remain private.
- **Why had the medical centre been left blank and not considered in the plan?** ST commented that it was illogical that it hadn't been considered and that out of 28 landowners contacted only 5 had responded.
- **What is the timeline for collating responses from the feedback forms?** ST stated that hopefully this would be conducted by September but that it had to be conducted correctly. BN commented that should a new environmental report need to be produced then the Parish Council would foot 100% of the costs.
- **Would new houses be in keeping with the village as new houses had not blended with red brick houses which stand out?** ST responded this would depend on the developers and their design but to add to the feedback form.
- **Would the gap between the medical centre and new estate be extended? Would there be a new village boundary?** The village boundary was considered.
- **Why is there no representation from the NPSG as it is a shame they are not present to provide a brief?** BN agreed and ST stated that he had attempted to get a member of the steering group to attend but they had refused.
- **Regarding the proposed two week extension, if this is granted, the longer it will take to have the protection of a Neighbourhood Plan in place:** ST responded that it was paramount comments from villagers were

received and some may have been intimidated by the lengthy document,  
hence the circulated summary.

The meeting closed at 7.50pm.

Draft