



Barton St David

Parish Council

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 26th JANUARY 2026

PRESENT: Cllrs S Jackson (Chair), D Rowley, E Rice, M Love and J Stafford.

IN ATTENDANCE : C Potts (Clerk) 23 members of the public (part bar). SC Cllrs T Kerley and S Page

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME – Numerous comments were raised regarding the planning application, severe concerns over pedestrian safety dominated but also flooding and the already over stretched utilities especially sewage were voiced. The Chair urged members of the public to add their comments to the planning portal.

SOMERSET COUNCIL COUNCILLOR REPORT They are still awaiting details of the 3 year settlement from Central Government without which the SC budget can't be finalised. There remains an urgent need for foster carers – include appeal in the next village newsletter.

A G E N D A

Meeting commenced at 8.29pm

1.26 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies received and accepted from Cllrs A Hicks and S Cranfield.

2.26 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS - none

3.26 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC - none

4.26 ADOPTION OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MINUTES

Confirmed and signed as a correct record, the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 30th November.

5.26 NEW PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED TO or DECIDED BY SOMERSET COUNCIL

a) Applications

Application Number	25/03038/FUL
Location	Land Off Main Street Barton St David Somerton Somerset TA11 6BZ
Proposal	Erection of 24 homes together with new vehicular access, parking and associated landscaping

The council readily accepted that more housing of the right stock was required in the village and in the correct location would be welcomed. Having listened to the numerous comments from members of the public present, they summarised their various thoughts based upon material considerations – see full details in the appendix. The council unanimously recommended refusal of this application.

b) Decisions

Application Number	25/02472/S73A
Location	Hill Farm Jarmany Hill Barton St David Somerton Somerset TA11 6DA
Proposal	S73A application to vary condition 1 (approved plans) to install photovoltaic arrays on the carport roofs for all five plots, in relation to approval 23/03167/S73 (variation to approval 22/00878/FUL for Demolition of agricultural barns (with Class Qb prior approval) and erection of 5 dwellings)
Decision	Approved with Conditions

6.26 WORKPLAN UPDATES AND ACTIONS

A. Infrastructure

1) Traffic calming – Cllr Jackson & Rowley

Speed and volume survey information has been circulated. There was concern over the speed of vehicles passing through the village. A proposal to relook at SIDs was made - **resolution passed**. Clerk/Chair to look at feasibility and costs.

2) Flooding & drainage

Highways are planning to carry out the work on Peacock Hill and Mill Road next spring/summer and are hoping to undertake investigation work at Mill Road prior to that.

B. Asset Management

1) War Memorial name preservation – Cllr Love

Most of the information and photos for the new webpage have been supplied to the Clerk, QR code TBC. Clerk to action.

7.26 ADMINISTRATION MATTERS

To receive updates from the Clerk and to resolve any matters proposed.

- a) A proposal that the Parish Council reserves the right to table any planning applications not listed at the time the agenda is issued but received by the time of the meeting itself. Not approved, concerns over Cllrs not having sufficient time to consider applications.
- b) Approve installation costs for the Second defibrillator at The Barton Inn – **resolution passed**.
- c) Approval of the following training courses
 - Cllr Cranfield Councillor Essentials Part 1 £25 and Data protection for Cllrs £40 – **resolution passed**. Clerk to add to payment list.
- d) Approval of opening a new saving account with Hampshire Trust bank. Easy access account = 3.61%, 95 day access = 3.95%. Current savings account = 2.1% - **resolution passed**. Clerk to open both savings accounts and advise council at the next meeting the suggested amount to place in the 95 day account. The Clerk and Cllrs Jackson, Rice and Love to have account access as currently.

8.26 ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES NOT COVERED OR CARRIED FORWARD OR ANY UPDATES REQUIRING RESOLUTIONS.

Cllr Rice has drawn up a list of S106 requests for the planning application 25/03038/FUL. Proposal that the Clerk to circulate for comment and submit if approved - **resolution passed**.

9.26 ITEMS FOR THE NEXT MEETING ON 23rd FEBRUARY

Update on Broadband, mobile mast, Stock Green, Footpaths, Accessibility to public areas, appoint internal auditor, website accessibility and Neighbourhood Plan.

10.26 PARISH COUNCIL FINANCE

a) Approval of Payments

Approval given to the following payments -

- 1) Clerks Salary for December £405.14 and January £379.18 including 3 bank holidays
- 2) SALC courses
 - inv 2598 & 2501 Code of Conduct, Cllr Stafford & Cranfield £50
 - Inv 2588 Annual Governance Statement Cllrs Stafford, Cranfield & Clerk £50
 - inv 2544 Responding to Planning Applications Cllr Cranfield £35
- 3) Parish Council Websites domain name renewal £36
- 4) Village Hall hire £110
- 5) Village reimbursement of hedge cutting £96.75
- 6) Peter Farrant grass cutting £121.61
- 7) January Newsletter printing costs to Jump £80

b) Payments made since the last meeting

Received and signed as a correct record, the payments list and the bank reconciliation figures against the bank statements as detailed on the monthly financial report (see attached).

Current Account £1355.56, Saving (instant access) Account - £ 24673.36 TOTAL £26028.92

c) Budget vs Spend to Date

Received and signed as a correct record, the latest budget Vs spend to date in the cashflow spreadsheet which correlates with the bank reconciliation figures.

11.26 APPROVAL OF 2026/27 BUDGET AND PRECEPT

Approved precept recommendation of £12150, Clerk to submit form to Somerset Council.
The draft budget presented was approved.

Meeting closed at 9.45pm

Signed:

Dated:

Clerk and responsible financial officer to the Council: Caron Potts
Withy Lane Farmhouse, Silver Street, Barton St David, TA11 6DD.
Telephone 01458 850875 Email clerk@bartonstdavidparish.gov.uk

BARTON ST DAVID PARISH COUNCIL CONSULTEE

PLANNING APPLICATION 25/03038/FUL – OFF MAIN STREET, BARTON ST DAVID

Erection of 24 homes together with new vehicular access, parking and associated landscaping

References

A. Planning Application 25/03038/FUL, Land Off Main Street, Barton St David, TA11 6BZ.

1. **Recommendation.** At the meeting of Barton St David Parish Council on 26 Jan 2026, Councillors unanimously recommended this Application is **REFUSED**, on the basis of 3 key Material Considerations: **Highways Safety, Sustainability and the Impact on Flooding and Existing Flood Management** as detailed below. Additional Material Considerations are listed in Annex A.

2. **Background.**

a. The Barton St David community very much welcomes and encourages appropriate new developments to grow our community and to keep it a vibrant and good place to live. In particular, we welcome affordable housing to encourage young people to stay or move into Barton St David. This Application is simply in the wrong place – it is unsafe.

b. Our draft Neighbourhood Plan¹ emphasises this local need and identifies **alternative, safe sites in the village which also are more sustainable with lower flood risks**.

c. This response takes into account comments by the community collated at 2 x Parish Council (PC) Meetings (each attended by ~30 residents), the Village Carnival and the developer's open meeting, and from Councillors and the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group after the developer's briefing.

3. **Material Consideration: Highways Safety.**

a. **The Issue.** The site's location is **not safe** for vehicles and pedestrians.

b. **The Causes.**

- i. **Blind Bend to the East.** There is a sharp 90-degree, blind bend into the village very close (~25m) to the east of the proposed site entrance. The bend is narrow and only allows one-way traffic with opposing traffic forced to stop and wait. The proposed visibility splay does not change this fact or mitigate the risks. A recent accident between the site entrance and the bend resulted in a local resident being cut out of their car – luckily, they were not injured.
- ii. **Blind Bend to the West.** There is a blind bend ~ 60m to the west of the proposed entrance and ~30m from the proposed build-out. The proposed visibility splay does not reach this bend.
- iii. **Traffic Volume and Speed.** The PC funded a traffic survey² during the period Saturday 29th November to Friday 5th December 2025. One location was on Main Street where the build-out is proposed, ~30m from the proposed site entrance and where the speed limit is 30mph.
 - (a) The data shows considerably higher volumes and higher speeds than estimated (and observed) in the Application's Traffic Audit.



¹ At Regulation 14 draft, awaiting Somerset Council to publish the parish level housing requirements.

² Traffic Data Centre, Email, 15 Dec 25, (www.trafficdatacentre.co.uk). The Survey also included 3 other locations in the village.

(b) The data shows that the daily average number of vehicles (in both directions) is 831 and the percentage of traffic travelling at over the 30mph limit is 42.1%.

(c) Traffic volumes are highly likely to increase with the recent approval to build 100 houses in Keinton Mandeville, 1.5km to the south.

Main Street Traffic Survey 28 Nov-5 Dec 25 - Site 3 (Main Street)			
	Eastbound	Westbound	Combined
Total Number of Motorised Vehicles in the 7-day week	2806	3013	5819
Number of Vehicles Over 30mph in the 7-day week	1303	1146	2449
Percentage Over 30mph in the 7-day week	46.4%	38.0%	42.1%
Average speed 85%ile	34.7	32.9	33.8
Average vehicles per day	401	430	831
Average Number of vehicles per day 0800-0900	27	51	78
Average Number of vehicles per day 1700-1800	39	35	75
Percentage of Trucks and Buses	2.9%	2.8%	2.9%

iv. Proposed Build-Out.

(a) The build-out will be positioned ~30m from the blind bend to the west of the site (see map above). The proposed visibility splay will not create visibility around this bend. Given the speed and volume of traffic, the build-out will create a new risk and hazard to traffic from the west.

(b) The actual width of the road at this location is 4.8m, NOT 5.5m as stated in the Application. The 2.4m wide build-out will **constrain** the passage of **emergency** and refuse collection **vehicles** and **prevent** the passage of larger **agricultural vehicles** in what is a rural area of farmland.

v. No Footpaths. There are no footpaths or passable verges on either side of the road to the east or west. Villagers rarely walk along the road because the speed and volume of traffic makes it too dangerous. The proposed site entrance and the added volume increases risk to pedestrians.

(a) The Application proposes installation of a ~30m footpath from the site entrance eastwards to the 90deg bend on the north side of the road, offering no onward safe route. This footpath does not reduce the risks – it would stop at the west end of the bend. Private land, abutting the road, is further to the east and south on both sides.

(b) The Application refers to the build-out “also creating a low-risk pedestrian route from the application site to the existing PRow along the western boundary”, despite no continuous, safe pedestrian connection. The Application does not state how this can be achieved.

vi. Local Comments. Local residents’ are extremely concerned that the site is simply not safe; comments on its selection include “lunacy”, “unbelievable”.

c. **Recommendation.** It is recommended that the Application is REFUSED as the location of the site is simply not safe for vehicular traffic and for pedestrian use by the residents of the proposed site – contrary to NPPF Paragraphs 109, 115, 116, 117. There are alternative, safer potential development sites in the village identified in Somerset Council’s SSDC Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment 2017, Review August 2021, and in Barton St David’s draft Neighbourhood Plan.

4. **Material Consideration: Sustainability – Access and Proximity to Local Services and Amenities.**

a. **The Issue.** There is **no safe pedestrian access** between the site and village amenities and services. The overriding concern is the **lack of a footpath to provide a safe route for children to the school buses bus stops** 500m from the proposed site.

b. **The Causes.**

i. No Footpaths. The primary amenities and services in Barton St David are: the playing field, the children's play area, the village hall, the Barton Inn, the church, local bus services bus stops, the school buses bus stops and Local Green Spaces.

(a) All these are between 400m and 900m to the south of the site.

(b) There are no pedestrian footpaths at all for the first 500m from the site. The only pedestrian routes from the site are on the road, Main Street. Data from the Traffic Survey funded by the PC shows that, on average, 831 vehicles use this road per day and, on average, 77 vehicles in each of the 2 rush hours.

(c) The Application proposes a ~30m footpath from the site entrance east to the start of the tight 90deg bend. There is then no footpath around the bend or onwards for 400m to provide a safe onward route.

(d) There is physically no space to create footpaths and the adjoining land is privately owned.

(e) The Application also refers to a Public Right of Way (PRoW) going south in the village to the west of the site – this is a footpath with 3 x styles across 2 x fields and a ford through a stream, and is clearly not a viable pedestrian access to the amenities.

(f) Local Comments. Local residents feel particularly strongly about the safety of children living at the site who would walk to the school bus stops; comments on the site location have been strong and emotional, and include “irresponsible”, “horrendous”.

ii. No Pedestrian Access to the Wider Natural Environment. There are no safe pedestrian routes to the wider natural environment.

(a) The Application proposes access from the site to the “PRoW along the western boundary” of the site. The western boundary of the site is, in fact, the Barton Brook, a main watercourse carrying run-off out of the village; the PRoW is on the other side of the Brook. Clearly, the Application is incorrect – it does not provide access to the PRoW and the wider natural environment.

(b) The Application states that the creation of the build-out on Main Street will create “a low-risk pedestrian route from the application site to the existing PRoW along the western boundary”. How this is achievable is not clear, and there is no provision for a footpath from the build-out around the blind bend to the west to the PRoW.

(c) Safety Risk to Site Residents. The risks to pedestrians who would live on the site is emphasised by the high volume and speed of vehicles identified above.

c. **Recommendation.** It is recommended that the Application is REFUSED as the Application **fails to demonstrate safe and suitable sustainable access to village amenities** and therefore fails to provide sustainable travel alternatives to vehicles, contrary to NPPF paragraphs 109, 110, 111. There are alternative potential development sites identified in Somerset Council's SSDC Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment 2017, Review August 2021 and in Barton St David's draft Neighbourhood Plan that provide safer and closer pedestrian access to village amenities and services.

5. **Material Consideration: The Impact on Flooding and Existing Flood Management.**

a. **The Issue.** Main Street, adjacent to the proposed site, regularly and frequently floods and is impassable to vehicular traffic. Wessex Water have informed the PC that the local sewer pumping station is at capacity. This development will increase the risks of local flooding and local overflow of the sewer system.

b. **The Causes.**

i. Key Watercourse. Barton Brook, on the site's western boundary, is a major watercourse – one of only 2 x watercourses that carry run-off water from the village to the River Brue and, eventually, the Bristol Channel. 4 x watercourses (ditches and road drains) converge to Barton Brook at the southwest corner of the proposed site.

(a) The Application appropriately proposes an attenuation pond and other mitigation measures. However, the Application states and acknowledges that outflow from the pond will be controlled and **outfall into Barton Brook**.

(b) The current landowner accepts their responsibility for clearing and maintaining Barton Brook (in conjunction with the landowner on the other side) and has recently cleared the Brook to ensure the free flow of water.

(c) The Application shows the **boundary of their development site as excluding Barton Brook** – responsibility for the Brook's maintenance is therefore not clear and could be interpreted that the developer will not take on their responsibility. (3 other landowners have also recently cleared their ditches to mitigate the flood risk and the PC funds the clearance of road gully pots and interconnecting pipes.)

(d) The Application does not appear to address how contaminants from surface water run-off will be prevented from entering Barton Brook and has not addressed the impact of increased surface run-off elsewhere beyond Barton St David.

ii. Flooding in Immediate Area.

(a) Main Street, next to the site, floods with medium and heavy rainfall, preventing vehicle access, and regularly results in cars breaking down in the flood water. Despite the PC and landowners' mitigation activities outlined above, flooding continues.

*Immediate Area Flooding
Jarmany Hill, looking east towards the site, 27 Jan 2026*



(b) Data from the Environment Agency, and shared with the PC by the Somerset Rivers Authority, clearly shows that the frequency of heavy rainfall and the intensity of that rainfall will increase over the next 20 years. The Application does not appear to address these climate change impacts (as required by the NPPF).

(c) The site is currently agricultural and naturally absorbs rainfall and run-off from nearby fields. The Applicant's photos show that in high summer the water table is only ~1m below the field surface. The mitigation measures identified in the Application are acknowledged, but as ¾ of the field would be covered with housing, development of the

site will increase the risks and impact of local flooding and the closure of the road which, as identified in Paragraph 3, is a local major through-road.

iii. Sewer System at Maximum Capacity.

(a) Wessex Water have informed the PC³ that both sewage pumping stations are at capacity after rainfall due to infiltration into the system. There are also 2 locations in the village where raw sewerage leaks onto lanes.

(b) Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs Event Duration Monitoring data from 2023 and 2024 shows unacceptably high frequency of releases of sewerage into the River Brue and watercourses:

Spill Count / Year	2023	2024
Butleigh Storm Tank	147	132
Barton St David Tootle Bridge (directly into the Brue)	119	116

(c) Wessex Water have recently surveyed most of the village sewer system – but not the sewer pipe on the western boundary that the Application proposes to use.

c. **Recommendation.** It is recommended that the Application is **REFUSED** as the Application **fails to demonstrate adequate drainage and the possible impact on flooding and existing flood management, climate change and sewage disposal**, contrary to NPPF paragraphs 162, 163, 164, 170, 172, 174, 181. There are alternative, lower risk potential development sites in the village identified in Somerset Council's SSDC Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment 2017, Review August 2021 and in Barton St David's draft Neighbourhood Plan.

6. **Summary.**

a. The Barton St David community very much welcomes and encourages appropriate new developments to grow our community, to keep it a vibrant and good place to live and to provide affordable housing to encourage young people to stay or move into the village. This Application is simply in the wrong place – it is unsafe.

Barton St David Parish Council recommends that Application 25/03038/FUL is **REFUSED**, on the basis of 3 key Material Considerations: the site location is not safe from both a vehicle and pedestrian viewpoint; the site does not provide sustainable, safe pedestrian routes to local amenities and services; and the Application fails to adequately address the impact on flooding and existing flood management. There are safer, lower risk alternative sites in the village that are nearer to and provide sustainable access to local amenities and services.

ANNEX A – OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

	Material Consideration	PC Comment
1.	NPPF Misrepresentations in the Application	- Applicant not clear: name given as Blue Spruce Ltd; address given as BoonBrown; no mention of Stonewater - Application states that the site is NOT part of an Agricultural Holding – the field has been used for grazing for decades. - Design and Access Statement completely misrepresents the meeting with and presentation to the Parish Council – notably on road and pedestrian safety
2.	NPPF: Affordable Homes	- Jul and Aug 25 Stonewater and BoonBrown public presentations: development of 24 affordable homes - Application: only 9 x affordable; 15 x market
3.	NPPF: access to water for firefighting	The Application does not appear to address the accessibility to water for firefighting.

³ Wessex Water Customer Relations Email 14 Jan 26.

4.	Previous planning and appeal decisions relating to the site	• An application to build houses on the adjacent field to the west was rejected with the lack of sustainable pedestrian access to village amenities given as one reason
5.	Sustainability	• There is nothing in the plan to encourage the use of public transport, cycling or walking. In fact, the location and design encourages the use of cars. • The nearest pre-school and primary school are in Keinton Mandeville, 3km from the site ○ Safe travel can only be made by car ○ The primary school is full • The nearest high schools are in Street, 8km. Unsafe pedestrian route to the school buses stops; adds to vehicle traffic • Nearest convenience store: Keinton Mandeville, 2.5km • The Planning Statement states “whilst generating employment during both construction and operation phases”. This is not supported by evidence and is clearly incorrect. • Public Bus Services. Public bus timetables are not aligned with the working day, forcing the new site occupants to drive, further increasing traffic flow and the associated safety hazards. • Utilities – insufficient electricity supply. From data on the National Grid website. The 3 x local “Low Voltage” transformers have very limited capacity. Subject matter expert calculations suggest that there is sufficient capacity for about 8 new homes, not the 24 in the Application. • Utilities – mobile phone coverage. From data on Map-Your-Mobile on the OFCOM website. None of the 4 major suppliers can deliver indoor use to the site area
6.	Highways Issues	• Parking: ○ Application states 52 car spaces ○ 12 are in tandem (one in front of the other) ○ No provision for motorcycle parking ○ No provision for cycle parking ○ Somerset parking strategy 2013: site requires 68 car spaces • Visibility Splay: will require removal of an ancient hedge. Not mentioned in the Application. Page 14 of Design and Access Statement states the hedge will be retained – if it is, the required visibility splays cannot be achieved. • Misrepresentation in the Application Transport Statement. States: “therefore allowing for the free-flow and safe movement of traffic along the surrounding highway network”; clearly not supported by evidence. • Private Road: the impacts and responsibilities of the site being a private road and not adapted are not known; which entity will be responsible for maintenance? • Applicant’s Transport Statement states: “For the initial extent without footway, the forward visibility along the route is excellent with wide verges / access driveways provided on either side and it is therefore assumed that vehicular / nonvehicular movements are shared along the route.” Totally incorrect presentation of the facts • Traffic Volumes. Applicant’s site visit was in August (school holidays) and for 30 mins. Insufficient evidence to support the Application

		• Applicant's Road Safety Audit states "in no way, imply that a formal design process has been undertaken". Therefore, insufficient evidence to support the Application • Applicant's Travel Plan states that the Application "encourages alternative transport [to vehicles]". Not supported by any evidence • Access for construction traffic. The road is narrow: it is unlikely that construction traffic will be able to access or egress the site without damage to verges and ancient hedgerows. • The Application maps show that the site excludes the south boundary at the western end of the site. Why? Who will be responsible for maintaining the road-side hedge?
7.	Visual impact of the development	• The proposed development is out of character of the village • No other part of the village has this layout; the majority of the village is ribbon development. • The development gives the impression of being separated from the rest of village and not part of the village. Therefore, residents will feel separated from the village.
8.	Adverse impacts on nature, biodiversity or trees	• Application Form states the proposal is NOT within 20m of a watercourse. Factually incorrect: the western boundary is the Barton Brook watercourse (as stated elsewhere in the Application). • Application states there are no trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development. Factually incorrect; there are ancient hedges and trees. • Application states there are no protected and priority species. Factually incorrect. Bats, deer, rabbits, foxes, badgers are known to use the field. This is a rural community, and every other planning application acknowledges this and adds mitigation measures. • The Application mentions on 3 occasions that trees will be planted on the site "where possible". This is not a commitment.
9.	Site layout and density	• The layout as a separate entity on the edge of the village is very different from the rest of the village, and fundamentally changes the character of the area – fields, a riding stable and yard, a single cottage and associated wooden structure and, opposite, the start of the ribbon-nature of the village. • The density of the proposed housing is noticeably higher than the rest of the village
10.	Drainage and possible impact on flooding and existing flood management	• There are no gully pots or interconnecting pipes on the section of Main Street alongside the development site.

11.	Impacts on the Wider Community and Environment	• If this Application is Approved, then the following consequences of the development will need to be considered and FUNDED solutions identified: ○ Maintenance of Barton Brook – a key watercourse ○ Maintenance of site attenuation pond ○ Maintenance of the site's road-side hedges. (To note: Stonewater do not maintain their road-side hedgerow or drainage ditch on their current Barton St David site.) ○ Alleviation of local flooding issues ○ Increase capacity of the sewer system ○ Increase capacity of electricity supply ○ Provision of mobile phone coverage ○ Provision of high-speed, full-fibre broadband ○ Provision of additional children's play area facilities ○ Expansion of local education facilities and resources
-----	--	--