
4th August 2019

Dear Jo,

RE: Norton St Philip Neighbourhood Plan & Independent Examiner's report

As you are aware, I submitted consultation responses to the above Neighbourhood Plan (NP) during the regulation 14 and 16 consultation process. Throughout the development of the NP I was doing my utmost to provide constructive input and raised all my points during the pre-consultation process in order to avoid bringing anything forward through the formal consultation process. Many of my comments, corrections and factual updates were taken on-board. However, one key area of concern relating to the Character Assessment was not acted upon despite containing incorrect and misleading data. I was then advised to send in my concerns through the regulation 14-consultation process. My request for changes to one particular element of the character assessment was not taken forward through that process and I was then told by the PC chairman that I had to make further representation through the Regulation 16 process. Clive Abbott said in a public meeting last week that he was advised by you that this was the process I should be advised to follow.

I have attached a letter dated the 11th April that I sent to the Planning Policy Team that gives some background information on why it was necessary for me to send in a Regulation 16 consultation response. It was however clear from the Regulation 16 consultation guidance that this was not a policy matter but simply a question of detail of the supporting text and one particular diagram in the Character Assessment.

Subsequently in the Independent Examiner's report of the 19th July 2019 the examiner said, "*They are not modifications I need to make in respect of the basic conditions. The same principle applies to detailed matters raised about the Character Assessment*".

I have always made it clear that I support the NP and fully recognise the endeavour undertaken to get it finalised in such a short amount of time. I think my support was demonstrated in the effort I put into providing constructive feedback through the development and consultation process. I also made it clear in my Regulation 16 consultation comments that neither of my responses were intended to impact the basic conditions and I am genuinely pleased that the examiner feels that the basic conditions have been met.

However, the examiner does say in her report that representations made (which are presumably the ones from me) makes suggestions for changes in both the Consultation Statement and the Character Assessment; that "*if the parish council feels it would be helpful to undertake these in full or in part, that that might go some way in addressing the concerns raised*".

At the NSP Parish Council (PC) public meeting on the 1st August I asked if the PC would, in light of the examiners comments, make changes to the character assessment in relation to the detailed comments I had made. The chair of the PC Clive Abbott said that the PC was unable to make any changes since the NP is now in the hands of Mendip District Council. This statement seems to be at odds with what the examiner said in her report, but is a clear message from the PC that they are not able or willing to make any changes to the diagram and/or the text of that particular section.

For your information I have attached a copy for your information of a letter I sent to the PC in response to the Regulation 14 consultation in January 2019. This outlines on page 2 the detail of my concerns in relation to section 4.6, and figure 8 and in particular that it just did not accurately represent the landscape on the ground. I had taken the time to carry out a more detailed survey, and was able to submit (as requested by Clive Abbott) a replacement for figure 8 and aerial photography. I was therefore amazed when the PC again declined to make any changes.

I understand the NSP NP is on the cabinet agenda Monday 5th August and that Ian Hasell; the NP Chairman is speaking at the meeting. I have also asked to speak at that meeting and do so because it seems that it is 'through the cabinet' is my only opportunity to seek these changes. As the examiner stated in her report my proposed changes will make no difference to the basic conditions but will go some way to addressing my genuine concerns. The purpose therefore is simply to request that Figure 8 is either updated with the correct information to include the significant trees that are in public domain and in the supporting text make it clear that it is not a full and comprehensive survey.

If there is an alternative way to take this forward please let me know. I appreciate there is not much time but I have only just found out that this item is on the agenda and that the PC feels unable to assist.

I am able to share aerial photography with you and the Cabinet of the village to clearly prove the point.

Yours sincerely,

Linda Oliver