



The Council Office, North Street Workshops, Stoke sub Hamdon, TA14 6QR

**MINUTES OF THE ADDITIONAL MEETING OF STOKE SUB HAMDON PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON
WEDNESDAY 17th SEPTEMBER 2025
THE COUNCIL OFFICE, NORTH STREET WORKSHOPS, STOKE SUB HAMDON, TA14 6QR**

Parish Councillors Present: Cllr. S. Nelms (Chair), Cllr. A. Salter (Vice-Chair), Cllr. M. Hulett, Cllr. D Burton, Cllr. R. Merrick and Cllr. P. Berry

Somerset Councillors Present: Cllr. E. Pearlstone and Cllr. M. Hewitson

Members of public: Approx. 40

Also in attendance: Mrs G. Lowe (Parish Clerk)

-
- 25/190 RECORDING OF MEETING**
Cllr Hullet informed the Chair that she would be voice recording the meeting.
No objections were raised.
- 25/191 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
Apologies were received and accepted from Cllrs Foley, Russell, Dullaghan, Middleton & Lewis.
- 25/192 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN AGENDA ITEMS**
None
- 25/193 PLANNING**
Members are asked to provide comments on the following planning applications:
- i. **25/02132/LBC – 9, East Stoke, Stoke-sub-Hamdon TA14 6RQ**
Proposal: Installation of new sashes with slimline “heritage” double-glazing in existing window frames.
Members had no objections to this application and **AGREED** to support it.

The Chair used Standing Order 4(e) to allow members of the public to make representation on the following agenda item.

- ii. **25/02103/FUL – Land Os 2964 Link Road to A3088 north of Stanchester Academy, Montacute, Yeovil**
Proposal: Development of 61 dwellings with associated access, sustainable drainage provision, open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure.
Cllr Nelms noted that many residents from Montacute were in attendance, as both parishes will be equally affected by the proposed development,

although she questioned why the description of the location is listed as Montacute, when it falls within the Stoke boundary. She introduced the representative from Acorn Property Group, the developer, who offered to answer as many questions as he could.

A lively discussion took place with many members of the public raising concerns which largely featured around the following main issues:

- Road safety / traffic impact – the development has no pavement on that side of the road, so residents will need to cross a fast road. The developer has proposed a pedestrian crossing and a 30mph limit along the road – those assembled felt it would be ignored, as many drivers don't respect the 60mph national speed limit. The transport surveys used had been carried out largely during the recent pandemic and therefore didn't truly reflect the volume of traffic. Locals know how busy and dangerous the existing junction to join the A3088 is, and how many accidents have happened, including one fatality when the survey reports only two 'slight' collisions. When there are accidents on the main roads, there is already a knock on effect through both villages which become a cut through.
- Look and design of the dwellings and materials proposed – no local materials have been proposed in the designs and the density and overall look of the development is not in keeping with the locality. The developer stated that as a modern development there needs to be a good quality of insulation, air-source heat pumps, PV (solar) panels on the roof and EV charging points. They did maintain pitched roofs, not flat, and use of buff coloured bricks with some cladding, not red brick. Stoke-sub-Hamdon Parish Council provided Somerset Council with a Built Environment survey carried out in 2017 detailing the construction of existing houses. They will provide the developer with a copy of that for reference.
- Impact on flooding in the area – it was felt that this is the wrong place for any buildings to be built – after heavy rain, there is substantial flooding and run off from there. The Acorn representative defended the flooding impact explaining rainwater harvesting and the hydro-brake system to slowly release water from an attenuation pond. All modern developments now have to be responsible for their own drainage (which would be run by a management company) and are not allowed to join existing sewerage systems. They also have to allow for a one in 100 year storm event and deal with likely flood water scenarios, and for this they take advice from the Environment Agency and Somerset Council agencies such as the SRA. Those assembled were concerned about the longevity of a Management Company, and who takes responsibility in the event that it ceases to exist (as has happened elsewhere in the locality).
- Environmental / ecological impact – Concerns were raised about the loss of ecological habitat, the wildlife corridor and the environmental impact from lighting, both street lighting and light emitted from windows. The percentage of green space in the whole development is estimated to be only 5-10% of the total area. There are bats and barn

owls at both Stanchester Academy and Montacute House who use the proposed site as a feeding area. The developer confirmed that surveys carried out mention specific species of bats & dormice, and there is a 5m perimeter around the site which is a no-build zone. Street lighting is kept below 0.5lux for countryside development and there will be bird and bat boxes, wild meadows and native trees to encourage wildlife.

- Other Concerns

A representative from Montacute Parish Council raised several issues disputing the developers infrastructure claims, the need for housing and the likely impact on flooding and criticising the building materials proposed, the lack of a local consultation and the impact on the environment. He felt it was an opportunistic development that is not required by either parish.

The Somerset Councillors provided information about S106 funds and how they are calculated. S106 money is requested by the local authority and decisions are made at county level on where it is spent. There is a period of time to negotiate the appropriate portion of 106 money for highways, health and education. Addressing capacity needs is considered by the relevant agencies e.g placements at schools can be moved in order to balance numbers but this is worked out by the local education authority. If schools are at capacity, then S106 monies can be requested, but local schools are forecasting a decline in school roll numbers due to the declining birth rate and aging population. Cllr Nelms asked how the S106 money would be split between the 2 parishes and Cllr Hewitson said that they would have to have sensible conversations about the various needs and facilities in both parishes.

On affordable homes, questions were asked about at what stage in the development they are built, if there is a guarantee that the number promised are delivered, and if local residents get priority? The developer explained that housing associations usually buy the affordable homes, and as a developer, they prefer to get them built first especially when the private market is quite flat, and you have a guaranteed sale of the affordable homes. In this particular case, the affordable homes are peppered throughout the development and the plans are to start the build from the top and move down. Local residents do normally take priority, but the Parish Council would need to discuss those needs with Somerset Council.

Final questions asked if it is true as stated in media reports that there will be a footpath to Stanchester Academy from the development? The answer was no. Also, have National Grid confirmed the capacity of the network for the size of the proposed development? The developer confirmed that the site will have its own substation and National Grid have confirmed capacity for this on the network.

A member of Montacute Parish Council thanked Stoke-sub-Hamdon Parish Council for arranging the meeting and providing a forum for discussion and to allow concerns to be raised. Cllr Salter reminded everyone that the monthly surgery was being held on 18th September (the following day), and those who didn't have online access but wanted to submit their own comments, could ask councillors for help.

Members **AGREED** to **OBJECT** to this application and include the various concerns raised in their submitted comments.

iii. **25/02145/FUL – Recreation Ground, West Street, Stoke-sub-Hamdon TA14 6QE**
Proposal: Erection of an 8m high, tubular section galvanised CCTV column.
Members **AGREED** to fully support this application.

iv. **25/01995/TCA – Summerlands, West Street, Stoke-sub-Hamdon TA14 6PU**
Proposal: Notification of intent to carry out tree surgery works to No.2 Trees within a Conservation Area.
T1 – Lime – Small limbs overhanging the drive and obstructing vehicle must be lifted by 10ft from the ground at least. Small branch to be reduced by approx. 4ft
T2 – Conifer tree to the rear of the house close to the boundary line to have the snapped and unstable limbs removed from the lower portion of the tree.
This is for **notification** only.

v. **25/02199/TCA – Avalon, 13, Windsor Lane, Stoke-sub-Hamdon TA14 6UE**
Proposal: Notification of intent to fell No.1 Tree within a Conservation Area. T1 – Silver Birch, 20ft in height – this tree is in decline.
This is for **notification** only.

Meeting closed at 8.25pm

Approved by.....

Date.....