

Q11 Is there anything you would like to add?

Answered: 137 Skipped: 64

#	Responses	Date
1	What we really need is a secure car park (especially for residents in the High Street) Please send paper copy of the results	3/1/2015 2:28 PM
2	Village - small, community, intimate, connected Town - less connected, more impersonal, no sense of community - (easy) Would like the result of the survey and thanks for correlating the info [REDACTED]	3/1/2015 2:25 PM
3	Results of the survey to [REDACTED]	3/1/2015 2:19 PM
4	Would like to receive results to the survey.	3/1/2015 2:16 PM
5	The local infrastructure will not support any further development in the village. Results of survey to [REDACTED]	3/1/2015 2:11 PM
6	We would like to help manage and maintain a new village hall but we both work full time and have very busy jobs! Sorry! Result of survey to [REDACTED]	3/1/2015 2:07 PM
7	Yes I would like to receive results of the survey.	3/1/2015 2:00 PM
8	The village has been overdeveloped. If any planning were to be passed I would prefer more village orientated development like that on the garage site.	3/1/2015 1:59 PM
9	Yes I would like to receive results of the survey to [REDACTED]	3/1/2015 1:57 PM
10	Nothing on a green field	3/1/2015 1:55 PM
11	The development proposed does not in my view represent current village housing need. There is no support from me in respect of the proposed development. It would represent an undesirable precedent upon land which should not be developed. Please email results of the survey to [REDACTED]	3/1/2015 1:54 PM
12	£400,000 on what? That's a lot of money and the big lorries are still coming through the village.	3/1/2015 1:46 PM
13	Yes, I would like to receive the results of the survey	3/1/2015 1:45 PM
14	We don't need any more houses, or green fields made into the eyesore they are now.	3/1/2015 1:44 PM
15	Yes we would like the results of the survey	3/1/2015 1:43 PM
16	I am very much against bribery.	3/1/2015 1:42 PM
17	The disadvantages of a further large increase in population and traffic would far outweigh any benefits offered by the developers. This is a village not a town.	3/1/2015 1:40 PM
18	Without flood lighting, the MUGA is of no benefit to most working people and a lot of school children for 6 months of the year. More vehicles at the pinch point on the southerly end of the high street would make traffic issues.	3/1/2015 1:38 PM
19	We have enough houses here and do not need any more. We will lose the feel of the village, and all the fields will be taken away our country life will be gone and all we will see are houses. No thank you.	3/1/2015 1:38 PM
20	There are too many new houses in Norton already the road system simply could not sustain any more leading to health & safety hazards. It would completely ruin the historic rural character of the village.	3/1/2015 1:33 PM
21	I am against ANY large scale development of housing in the village. Already the inappropriate style of houses at the Fortescue Fields has detracted from the visual amenity and the additional traffic created is adding to problems on commuter routes. The conditional inducements being offered by Lochailort to my mind, would be of little benefit generally and could become a liability requiring both running and maintenance funds.	3/1/2015 1:33 PM
22	The Parking in the village is bad now. All the new houses as it affects all services. ie water phone lines etc	3/1/2015 1:29 PM

23	The village needs more parking spaces not houses. The village cannot cope with the traffic at present so would certainly not cope with more houses which means more cars £400,000 has not solved problems, how could £75,000. More houses would mean more problems at the bottom of the village regarding flooding or perhaps sewerage. More houses as we have already seen does not mean more houses for village folk which are affordable.	3/1/2015 1:27 PM
24	We already have adequate provision for village events (not necessary) There were allotments on Farleigh road and in Faulkland (were only used for 5 minutes and finished up a derelict mess) Think of the so-called shop situation!	3/1/2015 1:24 PM
25	Norton St Philip was the first conservation village in Mendip. It is already being changed into a concrete jungle much to my disgust as this village used to be a quiet beautiful green village and this is being destroyed.	3/1/2015 1:21 PM
26	The advantages of the proposed enhancements to the village infrastructure do not outweigh the disadvantages of the introduction of what will be in excess of 120 new houses. Norton St Philip has more than met its fair share of the local demand for new homes and there comes a point where enough is enough. the village is in danger of rapidly losing its unique identity, especially when brown field sites are available.	3/1/2015 1:18 PM
27	We do not think that any further homes are necessary in the village which would probably overburden the infrastructure (schools etc.) However, if planning permission is permitted for these homes we should try to get as many amenities as possible as a quid pro quo.	3/1/2015 1:17 PM
28	We strongly feel that more building on the scale planned by Lochailort would seriously damage the character of the village, bringing extra pressure on local services to no advantages.	3/1/2015 1:13 PM
29	There is no need for a village hall. As far as I am aware only 6 households thought that a new village hall would be 'nice to have' in a recent survey. Norton St Philip has been expanded more than it should already.	3/1/2015 9:50 AM
30	I think the existing village hall is fine for now; in the fullness of time a new one will be needed. It should not be sited behind the sports pavilion and its provision should not be linked to permission to extend the Fortescue Fields site, which is large enough as it is.	2/28/2015 3:56 PM
31	The village already has far too many houses and the traffic is ever increasing. We do not need any further new housing.	2/28/2015 10:54 AM
32	Lochailort has promised bribes before and they have not all materialised	2/28/2015 10:06 AM
33	Whilst Section 106 agreements are the norm it does appear that the developer is bending the 'rules' and trying to "buy" approval by offering 'rewards' if the plans are accepted. This is not good for the community or for the Council as the line for good decision making is getting blurred by offers and counter offers. The answer should be NO. We don't do business like that.	2/28/2015 8:55 AM
34	Nothing can compensate for the damage to the Norton St Philip conservation area already suffered by the current development. That would only be exacerbated by any further development.	2/28/2015 8:02 AM
35	██████████ and I are not against appropriate development, and considered the original Fortescue Fields development to be acceptable. However, the additional build now under way, further development by the mead and/or 20 houses in the Mackley Triangle is over and above any reasonable capacity for the village and will further encroach on the the setting and garden view of Grade 1 Listed George Hotel. We strongly support Mendip's rejection of these additional proposals ██████████	2/28/2015 4:35 AM
36	The village has already met and exceeded its allocation of new houses specified by the Mendip Local Plan.	2/28/2015 3:33 AM
37	I feel there have been more than enough developments in the village already & we will soon have no more green spaces available. Having viewed Fortescue fields many times during the building works, it feels to me that we now have two villages - an upper & a lower one & the time to stop further development is well overdue. I also feel that any "contributions" to village amenities i.e. a new village hall is a paltry offering considering the changes to the village & the impact it will have in the future.As for "traffic solutions" I do not think the amount offered will be adequate to cover the cost of the future influx of traffic, parking etc	2/28/2015 1:59 AM

38	1. Historical heritage has always been given as one of main assets of NSP. The traffic posts and alteration to road widths, etc. has added little to traffic calming, and the area outside George Inn is no longer 'unspoiled'. 2. The shop has not proved to be the asset it was intended to be. Had this included an artisan bakery, fresh local farm produce, small cafe, with supplementary support of local arts and crafts it may have been more beneficial to the village as a whole. 3.. Past planning applications have insisted that the village should not become merely a 'dormitory' but remain a traditional working village based on past agricultural engineering industries. NSP has many rental properties, many used for holiday lets, which alters the dynamics of housing for villagers versus income for outside investors. An ideal opportunity for creating a village hall close to Mead, Church, Schools, with sufficient room for parking and/or outdoor sports courts, etc. would have been the site of Bell Hill Garage, which is itself likely to become an inappropriate housing development within the boundaries of the village.	2/27/2015 6:47 AM
39	We don't need any more houses !!!	2/27/2015 5:29 AM
40	I feel the village has more than exceeded it's remit to provide more housing with the developements that are already completed and ongoing not to mention several planning permissions that will result in more housing being built in other areas of the village anyway, enough is enough!!	2/27/2015 2:16 AM
41	Cash to improve traffic flow would only be needed as a result of more residents using the roads. No more houses should hopefully mean no more road users, if the council can help reduce current numbers. Also, there is plenty of land in other areas, why NSP? It won't be as desirable if it's spilling over.	2/27/2015 1:50 AM
42	The village is already full to overflowing. There is no need for any more dwellings whatsoever during the life of the recently adopted plan	2/26/2015 2:47 PM
43	My name is [REDACTED] Close. We bought the house because it had open views at the back of rolling countryside, the chicken factory was hidden from our view because it was only 2 stories high and was surrounded by trees. All that changed when the developers bought the factory land and built 49 houses on the site's footprint. This we accepted, because it was a brownfield site. They then expanded that site and built more houses and apartments and called it Church View. Now they want to steal not only my view of the green fields. where horses and sheep have always grazed, but the iconic view that all of the village has looked at for millennia , along with all the tourists who travel from around the globe. To build on this piece of land, right next to Church Mead would be a travesty of the right of village people who reject this audacious application outright. It would make our village green look like an urban recreation ground. Lochailort's plans show there is insufficient spaces for all the residents' cars and their guests. This has become quite apparent on Fortescue Fields: residents are now parking their extra cars on the high street and in the spaces reserved for people shopping in the village shop. I would say to Mr Hugo Haig stop treating us as though we are all village idiots by bribing us with a new village hall, allotments and sports areas, we have not got the finances to maintain them. As regards my view, I couldn't ,oppose the original application for Fortescue Fields based on a view, but it's interesting that Hugo Haig realised the value of an un-interrupted view. All those new houses who face that way are being sold for a million pounds plus for that "country side view". Finally hasn't the village had more than its quota of new houses, I think so. So I say to Lochailort, go and develop elsewhere and leave us with our green fields.	2/26/2015 2:26 AM
44	I believe the developer is already indebted to the village to provide 106 money from the last lot of houses built. I understood they had been in discussions with the Youth Club organisers.	2/25/2015 9:26 AM
45	Yet further new housing developments are far too many, considering our roads/lanes and rural aspect.	2/25/2015 2:05 AM
46	More concrete, more water run off, more flooding. Huge strain on infrastructure. Financial implications for Parish Council in maintaining MUGA and hall. More houses will be a huge increase on our expected building target. Massive change in the character of an ancient village should not be allowed.	2/24/2015 2:43 PM
47	The village needs no further housing. Lochailort offered off street parking to Townend residents in return to build on the chicken factory site to help traffic and reduce accidents on that stretch of road. Lochailort then backtracked once planning went through and no parking was made available on the new site (A maximum of 6 spaces would be required). It will just happen again and the offers they are putting forward are not needed in such a historic village. Enough is enough!	2/24/2015 10:46 AM
48	No	2/23/2015 6:58 AM
49	LOCHAILORT GIVE WITH ONE HAND AND TAKE AWAY WITH THE OTHER. THE ALLOTMENTS THEY GIFTED TO THE VILLAGE ARE BEING TAKEN AWAY. THE VILLAGE HAS BEEN SWAMPED WITH NEW HOUSES AND IT IS LOSING ITS UNIQUE CHARACTER & CHARM. SUGGEST THAT BIGGER TOWNS, SUCH AS BATH, COULD ABSORB SIZEABLE DEVELOPMENTS OF HOUSES MUCH MORE EASILY. LETS NOT SPOIL OUR BEAUTIFUL RURAL VILLAGE ANY MORE!	2/23/2015 5:45 AM
50	They have already ruined the village with their inappropriate faux looking, over priced houses and we do not need any more.	2/23/2015 4:52 AM

51	The extra 20 house on Mackley Lane completes the current development as this land has been used as site management area. We now need to absorb what has already been built.	2/23/2015 4:41 AM
52	No, thank you	2/23/2015 4:41 AM
53	The land being gifted for the recreational area was supposed to be part of the original development. So have no faith that the other "benefits" would ever be seen. Also concerned about the pressures on other facilities locally for example Doctors surgery is already serving a large area and with new developments in Beckington and Rode (proposed) will only add further pressure and extending waiting times for appointments.	2/22/2015 12:46 PM
54	The village cannot sustain such rapid growth and retain its unique character. It's obvious.	2/22/2015 10:49 AM
55	I don't feel the village infrastructure is developed or could be developed enough to cope with additional residents and traffic.	2/22/2015 8:40 AM
56	We feel that the present development of the chicken factory site has had a substantial negative impact on the village and conservation area, towering above the historic village skyline. The proposed further development would impact on the conservation area and particularly the setting around the Mead and Church which are key areas within the village and intrinsic to it's character. We have had to accommodate a large number of new houses within a comparatively small community and now feel enough is enough.	2/22/2015 6:06 AM
57	The roads through NSP are not equipped to deal with further housing/higher population. We are losing all our green belt land. As a dog walker...this is terrifying. We certainly don't any further housing here!	2/22/2015 2:33 AM
58	My house is situated on the road that leads to the builders depot. My quality of living is being disturbed by the constant flow of large vehicles & machinery passing my front window, this is both weekdays & weekends. The roads are constantly covered in mud which is a danger to drivers & pedestrians.	2/22/2015 1:41 AM
59	The questions in this survey are worded in such a way as to encourage respondents to say No. Consequently, the result may be deemed to be biased. Particularly bearing in mind that the Developer appears to be responding to the needs identified by the Parish Council.	2/21/2015 11:15 AM
60	we do not have the interstructure to cope with any more houses	2/20/2015 10:48 AM
61	Norton St. Philip is a historic rural village whose character will be irreparably eroded by further housing development. Lochailort housing built thus far does not reflect the promises they made: That they would be consistent with the designs and materials of existing properties. Rather, they stand in stark contrast to our natural rumble dwellings and stand-out in the otherwise harmonious countryside, particularly when viewed from the direction of Faulkland. My wife and I also disagree with Lochailort's continuing efforts to buy favour with residents, either through donations to various groups and events or the promise of 'benefits' tied to development approvals. The community should be free to judge development proposals on their merits (or lack of them) without coercion or bias. We were never opposed to there being modest, organic and sympathetic development within our rural village, but Norton St Philip has now been forced to absorb more than its fair share of property development that, while doubtless having benefitted the Lochailort coffer, has only brought frustration and deep concern for the future character of the village to those who will remain once the construction vehicles have gone. Finally, Norton St Philip evolved around the crossing of two ancient byways, now the A366 and the B3110, but the further housing being proposed by Lochailort will shift the village-centre away from the historic 'George Inn' toward the development sites and their struggling new 'village shop'. So, with further development it is quite likely we will see the very character and layout of our village change, to resemble more that of an embryonic town instead of our much-loved rural settlement. Please, no more housing development (or Lochailot-serving benefits). We've had enough.	2/20/2015 4:31 AM
62	Norton St Philip has has enough housing proposals already. We do not need 'up to 69' more	2/20/2015 3:36 AM
63	Lochailort Investments have been consistent in demonstrating their only motive is profit, not the needs of NSP. Their cynical methods have already lost them the trust of the new residents of Fortescue Fields and established residents alike. They cannot be trusted to dictate the future needs and design of Norton St Philip.	2/19/2015 11:59 PM
64	Think its a great village that doesn't need the amount of houses proposed	2/19/2015 3:16 PM
65	The historic village of Norton St Philip doesn't need any more houses especially of the type and style being built on Fortescue fields. They are hideous, out of all proportion to the surrounding historic houses, the wrong colour, wrong colour roves and a general eye sore when seen from a distance. The road network through the village cannot support anymore houses either.	2/19/2015 2:27 PM
66	A few years a go lochailort said this would never happen if they got planning to build on the old chicken factory site.Look at what a mess that looks.They are nothing but liars.PS i was on council but objected to that eye sore	2/19/2015 11:42 AM

67	To many people moving into norton st philip forcing there unwanted opinions on to the true locals please move back out	2/19/2015 11:22 AM
68	When the first development was proposed we were promised a car park for residents and this does not seem to have happened so I would be reluctant to support any further development with promises attached even though it would be nice to have a multi sports area for the young people of the village.	2/19/2015 10:47 AM
69	Not all the properties previously built have even been sold. We do not need any more building in the village. The houses built were completed under false pretences of providing a shop and post office - the shop is useless and the post office has already gone. The number of houses built was based on our village having a primary school - we don't - it's a first school. They have got through too many loopholes already - we should not let them get away with any more.	2/19/2015 10:39 AM
70	NSP has already exceeded the quota for new homes set out by Mendip Council's 5 year plan.	2/19/2015 8:04 AM
71	This is a beautiful historic village and adding more buildings will alter it and not for the better as can be seen from the current building programme. The village skyline has already changed considerably. Please leave or village for future generations to enjoy.	2/19/2015 8:02 AM
72	There are too many new houses in Norton st Philip already so I strongly object to plans to build even more - especially on green field sites.	2/18/2015 2:27 PM
73	I am not against development in the village but feel that there has been a great deal of development in the last few years without considered investment into the infrastructure of the village - pavements, telephone/internet access etc. Where investment has been made for the community such as the shop this has been done in a way that does not actually seem to consider what is actually needed - the shop looks to be struggling to me, and I cannot see it surviving in the long term without a re-think on how it can cater for the community. The village needs time to settle into the recent developments, identify any impacts, ensure it can adjust to them and then assess what can be done after that point. This to me would take a much much longer period of time for the number of houses that have recently been added.	2/18/2015 1:36 PM
74	As a new resident to the village on Fortescue Fields I am keen to protect my personal investment. I think it would a great shame for these plans to be permitted just down to some relatively low cost and out of date incentives to cover that word 'greed'.	2/18/2015 11:29 AM
75	we still need traffic calming on Bell Hill but not bargained against new housing.	2/18/2015 4:11 AM
76	We thought this was a listed village, but the why its going it will soon be a small town ??	2/18/2015 12:46 AM
77	There is already too much traffic passing through the village with the main road already being too dangerous to cross for our younger residents. Please send a planner to try & cross at our end of the village. I am shocked £400,000 has been spent on traffic calming with only a couple of speed bumps to show for the money, which have encouraged drivers to speed up in between , believe me we can hear them. With a majority of new houses in Fortesque Field still on the market & proving hard to sell , this should be an indication to the planners of the basic rules of supply & demand if no-one wants them don't build more.	2/17/2015 1:08 PM
78	The land was 'gifted' previously as were other items like the community hall and games area, all of which have been removed. Lochailort are like politicians, promise much deliver nothing. They are clearly not to be trusted or believed as until they are done with ruining the village thier plans will never end. Why not get them to provide the amenities promised first then once completed the planners could then have a meeting to decide wether they can have planning permission.	2/17/2015 12:28 PM
79	Norton St Philip is ABSOLUTELY full enough with existing houses!!	2/17/2015 10:16 AM
80	We strongly object to these developments and remain opposed to Lochailort trying to buy planning permissions by offering spurious planning gain.	2/17/2015 9:42 AM
81	These offers are a very crude attempt at bribery, a way of influencing the inspectorate in order to get planning permission passed. NSP cannot support any more housing for all the reasons stated by the villagers and Mendip Council.	2/17/2015 6:07 AM
82	The problem we see is that our support for the houses is conditional on the type and cost of them as NSP is rapidly becoming an elderly wealthy dormitory with a deminishing young working population to use the benefits proposed.	2/17/2015 3:20 AM
83	To me there is an overwhelming problem with developing the site next to Churchmead. The open vista are essential to what make NSP such an attractive village. I do not want to be "brought off" with compensation.	2/17/2015 12:22 AM

84	The infrastructure (both utilities and transport) is barely fit for purpose now so more housing will just exacerbate this problem. My view is that the village is becoming a less attractive place in which to live because of the new housing.	2/17/2015 12:04 AM
85	1. The last development was bought with the promise of a shop. A total white elephant: too big & with a tiny carpark + no street frontage, it seems set up to fail. When this happens, the building can be conveniently converted to housing. If not a confidence trick, this shop is in my opinion a scandal. What evidence can we believe that further promises of community benefits would be any more desirable or viable? 2. It is hardly any wonder that developers are keen to exploit Mendip's seemingly lax planning constraints on Norton St Philip which stands just one village outside B&NES which more strictly imposes regulations (this degree of expansion is not happening in Hinton Charterhouse). With house prices in Bath easily topping £1m & the new rail link with London likely to increase this, greed is the motivation. Meanwhile, Fortescue Fields houses & many old properties in the village remain on the market. There really is no shortage of property to buy here. 3. I am astonished to hear that so much money has been spent on road improvements & that further housing development promises more. And what exactly would that bring? There is still a problem on the constricted part of the High Street - how can more homes & more resident cars improve that? Living on the A366, I can see no improvement at all. Nothing. No 20 mph opposite the school. No road markings or flashing signs on approach to the 30 mph zone. Nothing.	2/16/2015 4:29 PM
86	I thought allotments were coming anyway, as part of the promise for the current development? I am appalled at any more development in the village, especially so close to our beautiful mead. Thank you for organising this survey.	2/16/2015 2:13 PM
87	Norton St. Philip was designated a conservation area in 1969 by Somerset County Council and the boundary amended and extended in 1996. "Planning authorities have a duty to protect these areas from development, which would harm their special historic or architectural character". Also, the current development activity in Norton is unprecedented - the village has fulfilled its quota under the adopted five year plan - Norton St. Philip does not need more houses, Norton St. Philip does not need a larger village hall and the quality of life of the existing residents needs to be strongly taken into consideration.	2/16/2015 11:34 AM
88	The MUGA that had been promised in the past was only going to be temporary, would it be the same with this one? The only improvement to traffic in this village would be the reduction of houses built, not more. The increased congestion since building Fortescue Fields has already led to two of my cars being written off and numerous close shaves. No one on the High Street will want to park their car in a car park miles away from their house, especially if they are elderly or have small children so a car park for residents is not the answer.	2/16/2015 7:41 AM
89	No.	2/16/2015 7:02 AM
90	We've had enough development. We bought our house to live in a village not a town.	2/16/2015 5:54 AM
91	As stated there is clearly useable space in the 2 pubs, church and Palairt Hall...as a community we need to support these rather than introduce further amenities. The shop at FF does not appear to be commercially successful at present and the village may end up with a further space there that is redundant. Further traffic calming probably is required through the main roads of the village but that should not be dependent on making the problem worse in the first case by building more properties and therefore more vehicles.	2/16/2015 5:40 AM
92	Lochailort has already built/is in the process of building 49 homes at Fortescue Fields. None of these houses contribute to the housing needs of the local area being well above average house values. Local people cannot afford them and they contribute nothing to local amenities/services, such as the school.	2/16/2015 5:38 AM
93	The view from the George Car Park above Church Mead is priceless - the conservation zone should be respected.	2/16/2015 5:37 AM
94	I cannot think of any 'benefits' which would outweigh the harm to the village of 69 new houses.	2/16/2015 5:16 AM
95	The facilities in the village i.e. medical care, school, public transport, traffic increase and internet provision cannot sustain this growth.	2/16/2015 4:38 AM
96	The village has met and exceeded the new home build needs within the planning requirements. There is nothing in the "benefits" being suggested by having 69 additional new homes built that would add value or be any benefit whatsoever to the current village, its environment, or current residents. The Traffic volume and flow, is already critical and would not be enhanced by 69 additional homes in any way	2/16/2015 4:26 AM
97	Norton St 'Fullup' has already had more than its fair share of new buildings on greenfield sites and is in danger of losing its rural character. The Fortescue Fields development is already too grand for its more humble surroundings and should be limited to the original brownfield site of the chicken factory. We view the proposed 'benefits' offered by Lochailort as 'Trojan Horses' to force more houses through, especially as NSP does not need what they are offering.	2/16/2015 3:09 AM

98	I think we need one bedroom bungalow for old or young people to rent at reasonable rents especially self employed people who find it hard to rent in the private market. We do not need more expensive houses.	2/16/2015 2:48 AM
99	I am really concerned about this piecemeal creep of further housing development and oppose in particular the plans for housing adjacent to the mead. This feels like a form of bribery to me and a step further to more housing development being allowed in future even beyond current proposals.	2/16/2015 2:28 AM
100	The development of Fortescue Fields West in particular is inappropriate and no additional benefit to the village could offset the damage to the environment around Church Mead. We are actually quite positive about the development that has been carried out to date, but enough is enough and more houses would be detrimental to the village.	2/15/2015 11:22 PM
101	We have allowed more than our fair share of houses to be built in the village within the last couple of years. Do we really want more development - NO WE DON'T! ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!	2/15/2015 1:20 PM
102	The proposal of these new houses will only put more strain on our very over loaded infrastructure. Also our precious green belt next to the mead where barn owls and other wild bird nest and hunt is VERY valuable to the village.	2/15/2015 12:26 PM
103	The infrastructure, especially roads are not designed to carry these kinds of increases. Living on a permanent building site with dangerous heavy lorry traffic for years to come is unacceptable. I cannot open the windows due to the filth stirred up by old inefficient road sweepers.	2/15/2015 12:04 PM
104	Our property backs onto the Fortescue East (Laverton Triangle) site, a piece of land which is substantially higher than the land upon which our property lies. 1] Privacy, or the potential lack of it is a serious issue for us. 2] The existing planning permission for the existing Fortescue Fields development stipulated a 15 metre depth planting behind our (and neighbouring) properties once the development had finished. There is no reference to upholding this stipulation if the proposed Fortescue East development proceeds. Is this allowed? 3] The proposed Fortescue East development (as indicated on the diagram) has 2 access points, one of which would bring traffic into a very narrow part of Fortescue Street, which once the existing development is completed will be a private, non-maintained, road.	2/15/2015 11:47 AM
105	Based upon the questions asked I do not feel the resources the developer is offering are needed or provide any tangible gain. I feel what the village has are sufficient and meet the need and I am keen to support. Also if £400,000 has already been spent on road improvement what will an extra £75,000 provide in real terms? I feel road improvement is the responsibility of the local authority and it is for them to manage. I do not feel it is road improvements, but the weight of traffic. A view articulated in various information sheets I have seen from candidates for parliamentary elections. In sum, I believe the approach the developer is following is nothing short of a wolf in sheep' clothing to overturn the initial decision to decline planning permission.	2/15/2015 11:38 AM
106	We would accept a small number of additional houses however the current plans are excessive in our opinion and would be a detriment to the character of the village and would not bring no significant benefits to the village.	2/15/2015 11:25 AM
107	No more housing is required in the village.	2/15/2015 11:03 AM
108	I moved to this village because it was a village. We have more than enough 'toy town' houses which have already SPOILT the appearance of our village. Fortescue Fields is an unsympathetic eyesore, which, in my opinion does not enhance the village	2/15/2015 11:01 AM
109	Norton St Philip has more than our quota of new housing. The traffic situation has become worse in the High Street since the development of Fortescue Fields. Parking is insufficient on the site and residents are now parking in the High Street opposite the entrance to the site causing an unnecessary hazard. The so called "traffic calming" measures near the site have not improved the situation at all.	2/15/2015 9:12 AM
110	If we lose the appeal we should seek as a quid pro quo the agreement of Lochailort to contribute an agreed sum which would be worth at least as much in total as their present offers of a new hall, a MUGA and traffic improvements, so presumably several hundred £k; doubtless Linda is already on the case? This would need to be negotiated before we go to appeal or we shall have lost any leverage. The sum would be for the village to spend in whichever way it sees fit. If there's majority support for a new hall then so be it, but there may be other ideas which would be more popular. If there is to be a new hall then we should favour the creation of a village library. This would need easy chairs, a couple of desktops with internet access, a writing desk, bookshelves, coffee machine and so on. Its modest running costs could be met by donations or small subs (£10 a year but free for children, students and some others.) It would provide a quiet haven for those wanting this. Residents would donate books to be borrowed by others. Those who buy subscriptions to magazines could donate these after they'd finished with them. The budget might stretch to a couple of daily newspapers. It would give the new hall more purpose. If the hall doesn't happen because the village prefers something else then perhaps there's scope for building a library into any new development? Hopefully, of course, we'll win the appeal, so there won't be any need for a S106 agreement!	2/15/2015 8:48 AM

111	s106 agreements are not valid at a time when there are public sector cuts, as they rely on public services to utilise, else they fall to local residents to support. I have neither the time or inclination to do so, as I doubt many other residents have. In addition we moved here to enjoy a peaceful village location, which we will be reconsidering if planning is given the go ahead.	2/15/2015 8:47 AM
112	These 'benefits' could more properly be called bribes. There is no such thing as a free lunch and any one of these 'benefits' would become a millstone around the Parish Council's neck and a village eyesore.	2/15/2015 8:03 AM
113	The village has suffered from too much development in recent years.	2/15/2015 7:46 AM
114	We are strongly opposed to this development on the green fields sites which will ruin the aesthetic of the village, views from our house to green fields and countryside and increase traffic. To propose that a new village hall, which seems completely superfluous given existing capacity and usage at existing facilities, would adequate compensation for the permanent changes the development would make, is completely absurd. We are also concerned than the running of any such hall or games development could be expected to be funded by a service charge levied on the existing fortescue fields properties - which we would not be willing to fund given we do not see a benefit or need for such facilities given existing facilities in the village and demand locally.	2/15/2015 7:13 AM
115	We have enough houses in the Village already,we don't need anymore!!!	2/15/2015 6:59 AM
116	The village does not require further houses... As part of the Mendip Council plans the areas proposed are outside of permitted development. Further the village infrastructure cannot support a further 60+ houses... And a village hall is certainly not the answer to this.	2/15/2015 6:40 AM
117	The village should remain a village there are houses already built and these are still vacant at the time of this survey. Traffic is already an issue more houses will only add to this. If they are going to do anything build a bypass so the traffic avoids the village altogether. NO MORE HOMES enough is enough	2/15/2015 6:10 AM
118	Norton St Phillip is a secondary village. There is no Post Office and there is no Primary School. There is only a first School. The village already has a village hall in the form of the Palaiet Hall and the Cricket Pavillion. The village does not need yet another village hall. If planning permission is given it will ruin Church Mead as the houses will be too close and the very nature of the village as a whole which has existed since the 16th century. There are real concerns about drainage and traffic congestion.	2/15/2015 6:07 AM
119	I feel the development is large enough and I don't feel the drainage system can cope with more houses. The High Street can barely cope with the traffic now. Do we really want 69+ cars adding to the congestion in our village.	2/15/2015 5:25 AM
120	I feel strongly that the harm that would be caused by these unnecessary new houses far outweighs the benefits being offered by the developer, particularly given that these benefits are, except for traffic calming, not even needed by the village.	2/14/2015 10:14 AM
121	It was our understanding that partial funding had already been secured towards a MUGA as part of the existing development. We are in principal in favour of a games/ tennis court but we object strongly to the proposals to build on green field sites so would not want a MUGA on these terms. We have serious concerns about a village hall of the size and at the site proposed and believe it would be of great detriment to the rural setting of the Mead. We believe a village hall of this size would become a white elephant. We are particularly concerned about the traffic/light pollution issues that would be created by siting a village hall and car park at this location.We would be more in favour of financial contributions towards updating and maintaining our current hall for village use.	2/14/2015 10:01 AM
122	A condition of permission for Fortescue Fields was the planting of a 15m tree belt in the Laverton Triangle(the east site). There is no sign of this in the proposal.	2/14/2015 8:33 AM

123	The high street is at saturation with frequent problems with the flow of traffic. Increasing the population of NSP with out addressing this is irresponsible .	2/14/2015 8:32 AM
124	These developments should simply be rejected based on the original reasons for the refusal and subsequent adoption of the local plan.	2/14/2015 8:19 AM
125	None of these benefits would significantly impact me which is why my responses are definitive. The benefit of traffic calming is countered with an increase in traffic so that's not a benefit as such. We would also lose some things too potentially e.g. Firework display ?	2/14/2015 7:52 AM
126	The village is suffering from an excess of new housing, the High Street cannot cope with the extra traffic, most of the new housing is expensive and ordinary families cannot afford them, this puts the village school at risk. The houses in fortescue fields are densely built, the gardens are very small and there are no trees, it has made an expensive ghetto in the village.	2/14/2015 7:32 AM
127	I feel annoyed by all the offers being made by an investment company we need to develop independently and without bribes. we already have enough houses - more will destroy our village	2/14/2015 6:53 AM
128	Development is not required under local plan. Fortescue Fields is a prime development and the introduction of lower grade housing would diminish the appeal of the existing development. The site roads are not adequate to accommodate the increased level of development proposed. Surface water drainage has yet to be resolved for the existing development the increased runoff from these new developments would exacerbate the situation.	2/14/2015 5:49 AM
129	if you build any more new houses in the village you will spoil the whole historical conservation and beauty of this village which would be an unnecessary tragedy.	2/14/2015 5:40 AM
130	Enough is enough. Norton St Philip has already had far more than its fair share of new developments, the majority all approved on appeal by the governments inspector, without any more of our green field spaces being developed. I also have serious concerns over the likelihood of even more flooding at the bottom of the village as a direct result of this virgin land being cover by more developments and I am staggered to discover that EA, Mendip and the developers do not consider this a serious issue. Over the past 8 years NSP has already grown at a rate never ever seen in the 800 years this village has taken to evolve and the very character of our historic community is being destroyed bit by bit by greedy developers and land owners who only have one thing in mind - profit at any cost. This rate of expansion is not needed clearly evident by the very slow uptake of the properties currently for sale on the Fortescue Fields development and we already face serious traffic issues which will be further increased by yet more new properties.	2/14/2015 5:17 AM
131	£75k is a drop in the ocean and would not make any noticeable improvement. We have an under utilised village hall, 4000sq ft is unrealistic and unsustainable	2/14/2015 5:15 AM
132	No more houses in the village at all - we are full up!! We shouldn't have to rely on being blackmailed into accepting benefits by way of approving housing applications but if we can't have a hall, playground etc then so be it.	2/14/2015 4:36 AM
133	The village hall and traffic calming issues don't have to be linked to housing developments. We must not run away with the idea we can't have one/two without the other.	2/14/2015 4:24 AM
134	There is no convincing case for additional new housing of the type proposed . There is no need to build on these sites to further increase the housing stock of the village at this time . The views of the villagers are extremely important and building on these two sites is not supported .	2/14/2015 3:32 AM
135	Proposed hall as a location for car parking also inappropriate. I'm equally concerned about proposals to develop Sherpherd's Mead.	2/14/2015 2:42 AM
136	They already had promised the land for sports facilities and allotments in the last package. So they've failed to deliver that this time. The traffic scheme has been a disaster with little to no thought put into how they have been conducted. The quality of materials used was substandard and already looks shoddy. The chaos caused in the village during the work when the work was conducted was major, especially in view of the fact that there were people doing work much less of the time than they were doing it. Why on earth should Lochailort be permitted to destroy the village when there is simply no demonstrable need for further housing?	2/14/2015 2:21 AM
137	I feel that it is MDC's responsibility to assist with traffic calming and not Lochailort's.	2/13/2015 9:23 AM