

## **2<sup>nd</sup> Brookhampton Development Workshop**

A workshop on Brookhampton Development was held on **Monday, 23rd June 2025** at 5:00pm in the Reading Room at North Cadbury Village Hall.

The session brought together the developer team, parish council, Somerset councillors, and residents to discuss and address important issues related to the proposed development.

### **Attendees**

#### **Developers:**

- **David Harragin** (Ibex Land LLP) – Land Promoter / Developer
- **Rob Illingworth** (Ben Pentreath) – Architect
- **Ed Leeson** (Origin3) – Planning Consultant
- **Ceri Middleton** (AWP) – Highways Consultant

#### **Village Representatives:**

- Ann Cook
- Claire Harding
- Graham Jennings
- Tara Mundy
- Craig Wooldridge

#### **Parish Council:**

- John Rundle
- Richard Rundle
- John Whitehead
- Andy Keyes-Toyer

#### **Somerset Councillors:**

- Henry Hobhouse
- Kevin Messenger

## Topics Covered

- **Flood Risk**

Concerns were raised about whether current flood risk mitigation was sufficient, especially given recent flooding and climate changes. The adequacy of a “1 in 100 years” risk assessment was questioned.
- **Parking and Road Width**

Residents highlighted insufficient visitor parking and asked whether estate roads would be widened to improve access and facilitate refuse collection. The widening of the main road was discussed, along with the challenges posed by narrow estate roads.
- **Cary Road Traffic**

Discussions focused on peak traffic volumes, speed management, traffic calming measures, visibility, and specifically the safety of the Brookhampton Junction.
- **Housing Density and Gardens**

The proposed increase in housing density from 28 to 36 units prompted questions about whether gardens would meet the Neighbourhood Plan’s recommended sizes, and whether there would be sufficient space for refuse bin storage.
- **Refuse Collection**

Residents questioned if there would be adequate space for multiple bins per household, including refuse, garden, recycling, food waste, and blue bag bins.
- **Property Boundaries and Hedgerows**

Clarification was sought on the types of boundaries (fences or walls) within the estate and whether existing ancient hedgerows, especially along road frontages, would be preserved or relocated.
- **Affordable Housing**

There was a request for clarification on definitions—whether shared ownership, reduced prices, or rentable units—and how eligibility for such housing would be determined.
- **Community Facilities**

Concerns were expressed about the timing and guarantee of playground and facility delivery, with questions about who would be responsible for their ongoing maintenance.
- **Energy Efficiency**

Residents asked if all homes, including affordable units, would be built to high energy efficiency standards and whether solar panels would be installed on all properties.
- **Broadband Connectivity**

The need for full fibre connections to all properties was emphasised to ensure modern digital access.

A full record of the meeting is now included below

# Approved Minuted Meeting Notes

## Overview

The structure and focus of the workshop were largely guided by a helpful list of pre-submitted questions and comments from a local resident, which covered a wide range of topics. These prompted further discussion and additional questions from attendees during the session.

**Note:** For ease of reference, the following summary is not presented in chronological order but has been organised into three thematic areas:

- **Traffic & Highway Concerns**
- **Layout & Design**
- **Environment, Landscaping & Ecology**

## 1. Traffic & Highway Concerns

### Parking Provision

- Concerns were raised that the proposed level of on-site parking, especially for visitors, may be insufficient.
- The proposed scheme includes **109 resident spaces and 7 dedicated visitor spaces**, with all resident spaces to be allocated.
- While garages are included within the design, it was noted these are often not used for vehicle parking and are therefore not counted towards the total provision.
- ONS data indicates average car ownership in the area is 1.8 cars per property. The scheme proposes close to 3 spaces per property, and any underutilised allocated spaces may be available for visitor use, not just the visitor spaces.
- Parking spaces are sized at **2.5m x 5m** – slightly above the minimum – to ensure practicality.
- It is not proposed that vehicles park along Cary Road, with all parking accommodated within the site. However, concerns were raised that some cars may still park on Cary Road, particularly near front doors of the proposed properties that front the road.
- Verges along Cary Road are designed to be elevated, making verge parking less feasible. Additional measures such as low-level planting or fencing were suggested to deter this.
- A suggestion to include formal parking bays along Cary Road was raised but was not widely supported due to potential impacts on visibility near the crossing.
- A question was raised about whether some visitor spaces could accommodate larger delivery vans. This will be considered. A designated delivery bay in a convenient location was also suggested.

## Pedestrian Crossing

- A pedestrian crossing is proposed at the **Cary Road / Mitchells Row crossroads**, southeast of the site.
- Safety and visibility are key priorities for its design.
- Attendees noted that vehicles often drift towards the centre of the road, which can reduce visibility.
- A footpath is proposed along Cary Road as part of the development (within the development site) to ensure safe pedestrian access to the crossing.

## Traffic Volumes

- Survey data shows **100 vehicle movements per hour during the 8–9am peak**, and **64 per hour during the 5–6pm peak**.
- Average speeds recorded (survey located approximately 65m north of the existing speed limit change) are just under 30mph.
- Questions were raised about whether school pick-up times (typically 3–4pm) may represent a higher peak.
- The traffic flows for the peak hours presented (i.e. 8-9am and 5-6pm) are the peak hours typically considered as part of a planning application for a residential development, and represent the worst-case scenario for the wider road network (i.e. not just along Cary Road). In addition, these peak hours are when the development is expected to generate the highest levels of traffic movements.
- In terms of the peak hours recorded along Cary Road for the existing traffic, the morning peak hour is 8-9am, the same AM peak hour previously considered. In the afternoon, the peak traffic of existing vehicles is between 3-4pm, where there were **90 vehicular movements recorded**, compared to 64 during the 5-6pm peak hour. However, this is fewer than the morning peak hour for existing traffic, and the 5-6pm peak hour still represents the peak PM hour when the development itself is likely to generate the most traffic.

## Speed and Safety Measures

- A **30mph speed limit change** is proposed further north along Cary Road, at the site boundary. This would include new signage and painted 'roundels' (i.e. speed limit painted on the road).
- The idea of rumble strips divided opinion: some were in favour, while others raised concerns over noise impacts. Suggestion to provide sound data for different rumble strip heights to help inform the next steps. To be discussed further with the Highway Authority.
- A **Speed Indicator Device (SID)** was suggested and generally supported by residents, although it was noted, based on research by the transport consultant, that their long-

term effectiveness is not supported by data, and their positive impact diminishes within a few weeks of implementation.

- Suggestions for measures elsewhere in the village (e.g. gateways, chicanes, speed bumps) were made. It was explained that mitigation funded by **Section 106 obligations** must directly relate to the development's impacts. Broader measures need to be led by the local highway authority and/or the Parish Council, but concerns can be passed on.
- The developer will ask the Highway Authority for input on what traffic calming measures have proven most effective in similar contexts.

→ **ACTION:**

- Ibex Land were asked to engage the Highways Authority about the introduction of a 20mph speed limit
- The Parish Council requested indicative costings for SIDs (Speed Indicators devices) and for reducing the speed limit to 20mph through the whole village, so that they can assess feasibility if these fall outside the development scope.
- Request made for **data supporting the idea** that a widened road with active frontages and a residential character can naturally slow traffic.

### **Construction Traffic**

- Questions were raised about the forthcoming **Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)**.
- The CTMP has not yet been prepared but will include routes for HGVs, delivery times, and other logistics, as well as dust and noise suppression measures, all to be complied with throughout the construction period.
- Attendees expressed concern about construction traffic accessing the site either through the village or from the north.
- A suggestion was made for a **temporary construction access track through adjacent farmland**, but this is unlikely to be feasible.

### **Refuse and Recycling**

- Internal road widths will be **5m**, which is sufficient for refuse vehicle access.
- Questions were raised about whether **high verge levels along Cary Road** could interfere with bin collection. This will be considered further.

## **2. Layout, Design & Community Issues**

### **Site Area and Layout**

- The proposed site area has slightly increased compared to the Neighbourhood Plan (NP), but no specific red line was set by the NP, and boundaries differ across various NP plans.

- Importantly, the **net developable area** (housing, roads etc.) remains within the parameters set by the NP.
- The larger site area is required to accommodate **public open space, attenuation features, planting**, and existing constraints (e.g. water/utilities).
- The allocated land in the NP is also hindered by utility constraints, i.e. a large water main and drainage pipes which have rendered part of the land undevelopable.
- **Figures:** 1.93ha total site area, with 1.25ha net developable. The NP indicates 1.4ha of developable land.

### Housing Numbers vs Neighbourhood Plan

A question was raised about why the number of proposed dwellings exceeds the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) allocation. The reasons provided were:

- To achieve **12 affordable units (43%)** as opposed to the mandatory 35%, the project needs more houses to help with the project's viability and pay for the reduced private housing receipts.
- Over and above what is stipulated in the NP and Somerset Council's planning policy, the project is trying to **over-achieve on 3 elements:**
  - High quality of aesthetic housing
  - An '**over and above**' drainage solution including a possible contribution to resolving the legacy drainage issues in Brookhampton
  - An extensive planting / landscaping / amenity programme
- To deliver the high levels of aesthetic, varying build types and materiality, and organic nature of the scheme, the project needs more houses to make it viable and negate the extra costs of delivering this high quality. The alternative is to stick to the 28 houses, 12 affordable, and deliver a lesser development with exclusively larger, identical, bland family houses to be expected from a large UK housebuilder with lower levels of aesthetic and reduced amenity/planting/landscaping.
- The project is proposing to deliver a **wide range of housing types and sizes (1–4 beds)**, and therefore satisfy the needs of the local community with flats/starter homes/family dwellings etc. It is not proposing a more profitable, exclusive, large family unit development. To be able to deliver this varied property mix, the project needs more houses to make it viable.
- **South Somerset housing targets** have increased since the NP was adopted – from 669 to 1093, the **annual housing requirement**. This target uses the government's new **standard method** under the revised **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**, designed to support the government's target of 1.5 million new homes over 5 years.
- Their 5-year housing supply has also decreased to 2.11. The target is 5; anything below 3 is critical and automatically reduces restrictive planning policy making it easier for developers to receive planning on unsuitable sites. So, the Council are desperate to find sites, and it is likely that another Greenfield site in the parish will potentially have to be found for more housing. It therefore makes sense to efficiently use this allocated site and decrease the chance of this

happening. The best defence against another Greenfield development in the Parish is to deliver increased numbers on this allocated site.

- The average housing density of residential schemes in rural locations in South Somerset is **28 dph (dwellings per hectare)** (as detailed in South Somerset's Local Plan). This scheme is **19 dph** (36 / 1.93 hectares). The NP states <20 dph as a requirement.

#### **Other Design Considerations**

- **Full fibre broadband** will be provided to all dwellings. Fibre is due to be installed along Cary Road in the coming months, which will facilitate the ability to provide fibre for the new development.
- **Swift bricks, swallow nests, and bat boxes** will be considered as part of the project's ecological framework.
- A question was raised regarding future extensions. The expectation is that **permitted development rights will be removed** by the Council, enacted by a planning condition on the planning permission, meaning any extensions (which may have otherwise been built without the need for a planning application) would require one. This allows the Local Planning Authority to retain control over future changes. These applications would be publicised and consulted on in the normal way so that neighbours/residents can make their representations.

#### **Section 106 Contributions**

- It was emphasised that the **Section 106 Agreement** should reflect local residents' priorities. Residents were invited to submit their views so these can be considered during negotiations with the Local Planning Authority.
- In terms of affordable housing, it was clarified that **dwellings should prioritise local residents**, and this will be discussed with Somerset Council when negotiating the Section 106 agreement.

### **3. Environment, Landscaping & Ecology**

#### **Hedge Removal and Planting**

- Concerns were raised about **hedge loss**. This is required to ensure adequate visibility at site accesses. The proposed hedgerow removal has been kept to an absolute minimum.
- Where possible, **removed hedging will be reinstated** elsewhere on-site. The proposed level of hedgerow removal will be **compensated two-fold** across the site (i.e. double the level of hedgerow removed will be planted).
- Residents were concerned about the introduction of street lighting. Ibox Land reported that the matter had not been raised by them or the authorities

## Wildlife Corridor

- **Ecological surveys** are ongoing.
- Attendees noted a known **deer/wildlife corridor to the north of the site**. This point was raised specifically by **Ann Cook and Tara Mundy**, who also offered to assist in providing local ecological and biodiversity knowledge to support the project. They have **agreed to work with the developer** on this matter. This information will be passed on to the project ecologist.

## Other Points Raised / Discussed

### Recap of Drainage / Flooding Points

- The developers are **treating the area as though it is a Critical Drainage Area**, even though it technically isn't. This means that the drainage system and attenuation (basin and tanks) can cope with **1 in 100-year storm events**, whilst discharging at a slower rate equivalent to the 1 in 10-year storm event.
- This results in more rainfall being stored within the development and represents a **significant betterment** to the existing scenario.
- **Climate change allowances** for peak rainfall are published by DEFRA. They state that a new residential development in the location of North Cadbury must be designed to allow for an **additional 45% increase** in peak rainfall when designing the drainage strategy. This standard will be met by the proposed development.

### Management Company

- A **Management Company (Ltd)** will be set up by the Developer, and **all future flat/house owners will be directors** of it.
- Flat/house owners will **pay an annual service charge** to the Management Company.
- When units are sold, becoming a director of the Management Company, agreeing to its articles, and paying the annual service charge will be **included in the sales contract** with the buyer.
- The Management Company will appoint a **Managing Agent** who will be responsible for:
  - Collecting service charges
  - Actioning maintenance and remedial works
  - Ensuring yearly accounts are produced and filed with HMRC, etc.
- The Management Company will be responsible for maintaining:
  - The **estate's drainage and sewer system** (including attenuation pond)
  - **Amenities**
  - **Landscaping and planting**

- The **roads will most likely be adopted** and therefore maintained by **Somerset Council**. This will be confirmed during the planning process.