

## Representations in Full from Parish Residents

a) Parish Residents. b) District and County Councillor

### a). Representations from Parish residents

Respondent	Policy	Comment	Response	Amendment
1	3	We are concerned that the Policy 3 Exception Sites for Affordable housing will risk inappropriate development outside of the development limit where the criteria is biased towards the property types rather than how appropriate the location is. The Local Plan should define where extension to the boundary should be rather than leaving it to random speculative applications.	Defining exception sites beyond the boundary would make them not exceptions, and raise hopes that a speculative development proposal for market housing would also be acceptable. Policy 3 c) relates to design and landscape setting. Other criteria are set, incl PC support	None (but see respondent 47)
2	5	Very much in favour of keeping as many green spaces as possible. It would be such a pity to destroy such a beautiful village with over development	Noted	None
3	3	Exception Site for affordable starter homes is good idea. Thank you to the committee for all your hard work, it is much appreciated	Noted with thanks	None
4		The Plan has our full support.	Noted with thanks	None
5	3	Policy 3 is too broad and needs to be more specific as to where these exception sites may be. Have they been identified?	No sites identified. See comment to respondent 1 above	None

## a). Representations from Parish residents (cont'd)

Respondent/	Policy	Comment	Response	Amendment
6	2 3	The Housing sites within the development boundary are sensible and largely reflect permissions sought or previously granted (even if non longer extant). The lack of information about possible exception sites adjacent to the development boundary is less reassuring. It would be good to know if any sites have been identified and also whether the criteria for local occupation are enforceable. It is to be hoped that further proposals for non-housing policies (particularly sustainability and employment) will form part of revisions to the NP in future years	See comment to respondent 1 above.  It is proposed to review the plan with a view to including a wider range of topics in the medium term.	None
7	5	Excessive use of LGS simply to prevent development	Don't agree. The village is characterized by green corridors separating development and forming a crucial landscape setting of the historic form. Designations are based on the attributes required for LGS.	None
8	2 3	The Plan will hopefully provide much needed smaller houses which recent developments have failed to do. This should help both young people looking to start families and get on the housing ladder and also some of the more elderly residents who might want to downsize and stay in the village. The exception site ,if properly controlled by the criteria proposed, could be of great benefit to local people.	Noted	None
9	1 5	I support the Local Plan and its emphasis on defining the limits of the village and areas for development and protection. I particularly back the exclusion of the southern aspect and land joining Fortescue Fields and its preservation of its rural, unspoilt and open aspect with agricultural and leisure use.	Noted with thanks	None

## a). Representations from Parish residents (cont'd)

Responent	Policy	Comment	Response	Amendment
10	2 5 3 6	I consider the draft plan to be a thoughtful, comprehensive and well presented document, and I wholeheartedly support the key proposals in respect of nominated development sites and local green areas. I agree that in order to retain the rural and historic character of the village, any further development (beyond the sites proposed) must be on a strictly exceptional basis and solely to meet the needs of the local community in respect of affordable housing. I also agree strongly that future housing developments must be designed to minimise any impact on existing drainage infrastructure and to ensure that they do not add in any way to the real and current risk of flooding in the lower parts of the village.	Noted with thanks	None
11	1	I strongly support the proposed limitations on development and maintaining the rural aspects surrounding the current village boundaries.	Noted with thanks	None
12		Extremely well documented and publicised to meet the aspirations of the community whilst recognising Government requirements for development in the countryside and villages such as Norton St Philip <hr/>	Noted with thanks	None
13		This forward looking plan is carefully considered and reflects the needs of Norton St Philip for the community, the environment and the characteristics of a Somerset village. It is both realistic and imaginative in its assessment of land use, ecology and rural impact. It has my full approval.	Noted with thanks	None

## a). Representations from Parish residents (cont'd)

Respon dent	Policy	Comment	Response	Amendment
14		We disagree. The housing stock is low. As a family who want to raise children here it limits the possibility of us being able to stay in the village	The exception sites policy aims to provide more affordable homes. There has been a lot of market housing built over the last 15 years, and the general feeling in the village, is that a period of consolidation is required. The LPA and Part 2 of the Local Plan concur.	None
15		Well considered in a fair and equitable manner	Noted with thanks	None
16		In complete agreement	Noted with thanks	None
17		It is vital to protect, for future generations, our beautiful village views, from any further development. If any development is allowed to take place, the views and all that pertain to them will be lost for ever.	Noted	None
18	5	We do not agree with the NSPPC view that LGS004(Ringwell Meadow) can be dealt with as separate sections. This must be treated as one single parcel as per the boundary from the previous DP2 and OALS004 protections. We own the larger proportion of this land and would expect the whole of this (including the land owned by others) to either be protected or released for development. We will oppose any move to create a differentiation between sections of this land including judicial process if required.	The plan designates the whole of LGS004 as a LGS. It is accepted that the details of the boundary may be challenged during the neighbourhood plan process. The PC will continue to support designation of this open land as a LGS.	None

## a). Representations from Parish residents (cont'd)

Responent	Policy	Comment	Response	Amendment
19	2	My only concern is about the impact of the development at Bell Hill Garage on parking on Bell Hill. Parking on Bell Hill frequently exceeds capacity during evenings and weekends and my concern is that any expectation that Bell Hill would be expected to manage additional cars from new housing would be very concerning for an already busy road, used to enter/exit the A36.	It is considered adequate parking, including on-street visitor parking, is specified in the development brief, and will be a requirement of any planning permission. Policy 4 requires minimum SCC levels of off street parking whilst not reducing on street parking capacity	None
20		It is vital to protect our beautiful village views, which are so unique, to any further development.	Noted	None
21		I feel that parking needs to be carefully considered with any new housing. Bell Hill already suffers from overcrowded parking with pub customers at the weekends. Any planning for new housing must include off road parking and also adequate parking for their visitors. When we looked at new housing developments in the past there were always a small number of shared visitor parking spaces in new developments. We always park carefully locally and wherever possible do what we can do reduce the number of visitor cars we have, but with new housing parking could be a much bigger problem than it already is.	Policy 4 requires minimum SCC levels of off street parking whilst not reducing on street parking capacity (Also see response 19)	None
22		I confirm that I fully support the approach and detailed provisions of the plan	Noted with thanks	None

## a). Representations from Parish residents (cont'd)

Respo ndent	Polic y	Comment	Response	Amendment
23		I am fully in agreement with the content of the Neighbourhood Plan	Noted with thanks	None
24		I am in complete agreement with the concept and contents of the Neighbourhood Plan, including specifically the policies it contains which are fully commensurate with the need, and with my express wish as a Parish resident, to restrict any further housing development and to protect and preserve the special character and beauty of our village.	Noted with thanks	None
25	5	I agree if there is no more development in the Local Green Spaces listed in Policy 5	Noted	None
26	3	I am in agreement with Policy 3 - the provision of Local Affordable Home - but since the two sites already identified for development (Policy 2) are for smaller houses/flats, I am not sure why there need to be 'Exception Sites' for local affordable homes, outside the development limit.	Exception sites are specifically for low-cost housing, the majority of development at the Bell Hill Garage Site will be market housing.	None
27	5	Local green spaces must be retained and no development to take place.	Noted	None
28	3	I think it would be acceptable for there to be infill on large plots should some one wish to demolish the current building and replace with two or more smaller ones. E.g. Chatley Furlong. This might be preferable to building affordable homes outside the development limit . Policy 3.	There would be no requirement for acceptable infill development of the type described to be affordable.	None

## a). Representations from Parish residents (cont'd)

Responent	Policy	Comment	Response	Amendment
29	5 3	I agree if there is no more development in the Local Green Spaces listed in Policy 5. Policy 3 - I do not think local affordable homes work as the developers use this as a way to expand their site, and few young village people want them. As an example only one is occupied by a village family at Fortescue.	Noted	None
30	3 2 5	We applaud the considerable efforts which have gone into this important document. As noted, the NP seems likely to be examined before LPP2 and so is an essential defence against further inappropriate development. We strongly support the proposal that apart from any possible use of appropriate exception sites (to be identified after further local consultation) for local affordable homes the only further housing permitted within the existing settlement boundary should be confined to existing brownfield sites, enlarged very slightly in the case of the Bell Hill Garage site, within the proposed new development boundary. This must not encroach in any way into LGSNSP003. We strongly support all LGS proposals, including what are now referred to as 'private gardens' where these plots have been hitherto protected as Q2/3, AOVS or OALS. Some LGS proposals will be strongly contested by landowners and/or developers and we suggest it will be necessary to engage professional representation at NP and/or LPP2 hearings to counter such objections, with crowd-funding for such representation organised well in advance. We had been inclined to question the inclusion of LGSNSP 002 (Lyde Green) and 005 (Church Green) as the prospect of either of these tiny spaces being developed seemed so preposterous that there was little point in their inclusion on a list which developers will suggest is already too long. We have reconsidered our view since it is clear that MDC wish to include these sites and defend them against any future proposal to surface them for car parking.	Noted with thanks	None

## a). Representations from Parish residents (cont'd)

Respon dent	Policy	Comment	Response	Amendment
31	2 3 5 6	<p>Mr [REDACTED] and Mrs [REDACTED] continue to object most strongly to the inclusion of our back garden as a component of LGSNSP004 Ringwell Lane. 2. Po [REDACTED]</p> <p>2: Housing Sites within the Development Boundary The policy does not make it clear what, “allocated for housing development” means.</p> <p>3. Policy 3: Exception Sites for Local Affordable Homes Who would set the criteria, how and by whom would they be enforced, and how would they be maintained?</p> <p>4. Policy 5: Local Green Spaces The policy states that that LGSNSP001 through LGSNSP010 are designated as Local Green Spaces. Such designations are not yet agreed and are the subject of ongoing review within the Mendip local Plan Part 2, which will assess their appropriateness. The draft Neighbourhood Plan is therefore both incorrect and presumptive, and Policy 5 should be removed or amended to better articulate what the policy statement is attempting to say.</p> <p>6. Policy 6:the policy as articulated is subjective to the point that it would be impossible to enforce and challenging to design against. it is questionable whether such a policy adds any value</p>	<p>Objections noted. When a site is allocated for housing development, this means that a planning application for residential development is likely to succeed subject to the details of the proposal being acceptable.</p> <p>We feel that Policy 3 is clear that criteria would be enforced via a planning obligation under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.</p> <p>Local Green Space designations are a power offered to neighbourhood plans as well as local plans in national planning policy guidance (para 99).</p>	None

## a). Representations from Parish residents (cont'd)

Respondent	Policy	Comment	Response	Amendment
33	2	Whilst we do not oppose the planning, our property backs onto the Bell Hill Garage site. At present the properties on Bell Hill are not overlooked by properties at the rear. We would therefore request that any properties are built at the lower level of the site and that no windows overlook the properties on Bell Hill.	The privacy of adjacent residents has been addressed with the landscape strip proposed in the development brief. Further details of measures necessary to protect the amenity and privacy of adjoining residents will be dealt with in any future planning application when details of the built form are known.	None
34	3	I am both a commercial and residential property developer. Policy 3 is a flawed proposal because: A) it invites a savvy developer to use loopholes to obtain consent, then amend the scheme to either substantially reduce or remove all affordable housing at appeal on "economic viability" grounds . I know- I have succeeded with this. B) affordable by its nature means aesthetically poor housing; this on a site at the boundary to the village encourages an ugly edge of village development C) The local plan will insist on affordable on sites over a certain size D) The village would not be deemed a sustainable location - the bus service is too infrequent to offer sustainable transport. I STRONGLY suggest amending the policy so that it only applies within the development limit of the village; this will still encourage affordable but will not encourage a likely eyesore site. Ideally I'd scrap the policy altogether because despite its good intention it WILL lead to an unwanted development in an unsustainable location. Please feel free to contact me to discuss	Exception sites are by definition outside of the usual limits of development, which enables them to be developed cheaply and thus provide affordable housing. The policy stipulates that design and landscaping will need to conform with requirements of this Plan and the Development Plan generally.	None- but see respondent 47

**a). Representations from Parish residents (cont'd)**

Res pon dent	Policy	Comment	Response	Amendment
35	3	My greatest concern would be that if planning was to be approved to build what ever type of property on Exception Site, this will inevitably create a precedent and result in a significant expansion to the size of Norton St Philip with it ramifications.	The exception site policy is an exception to other policies in the DP and is limited to a max of 10 houses	None
36		In my opinion the draft plan takes the views of the majority of residents into consideration, focusing on concerns to protect our countryside while keep the integrity of the village secure, safe and able to meet the needs of the number of residents.	Noted with thanks	None
37		A well thought through plan covering all aspects of the village	Noted with thanks	None
38		Keep the Orchard as it is we do not want another upset as the last planning	Noted	None
39		In complete agreement	Noted with thanks	None
40		In complete agreement	Noted with thanks	None
41	3	Policy 3 on Exception sites seems a bit too vague and could be open to manipulation by a potential developer	Don't agree, the policy tightly constrains development to be affordable in perpetuity.	None- but see respondent 47

## a). Representations from Parish residents (cont'd)

Res pon dent	Poli cy	Comment	Response	Amendment
42	2  5	it is good to read that at last the imbalance of housing types caused by the planning /parish policies has at last been recognised. I am concerned that the suggested development site of the garage will deprive / remove the facility from the village.. I would also query the designation of great orchard as a local green space since it is not accessible to the general public	LGS does not have to be accessible to the public. The designation as set out in national guidance is about protecting valued green spaces, sometimes for their visual and ecological value not their recreational value.  Comments re garage noted, but there have been planning permissions granted on this site previously, indicating that it is likely to be offered for residential development.	None
43	2	A well structured plan aimed at meeting the current and future needs of the village.I fully support the proposals for smaller dwellings on the sites identified within the settlement boundary.	Noted with thanks	None
44	3  5	In agreement, would prefer to see no housing increase. Any affordable homes could be planned within current approved sites. Support the designated local green spaces	Noted	None
45	1 2 3 5	Full support of restricting any further building within the village boundary, beyond the two sites already agreed - Bell Hill and former Church. 10 affordable homes should not be an exception adjacent to the development area, they should be planned within the two available sites above, along with open market homes. Agree with all designated local Green Spaces.	Noted	None

**a). Representations from Parish residents (cont'd)**

Responent	Policy	Comment	Response	Amendment
46		We feel we have already exceeded development and want to keep future development to a minimum to retain the feel of the village.	Noted	None
47	3	I am concerned the low cost housing element will allow developers to build via stealth by fully using the 30% allocation on each site. This option should be removed	Agree that current 30% level is too high, and that any Viability Appraisal should be made available to the PC and community as well as the LPA.	Amend Policy 3 to allow for max 20% open market. Add condition that viability appraisal available to PC as well as LPA
48		Having gone through the Neighbourhood Plan that has been developed by the Norton St Philip team, I would like to express my support to the policies and statements that are contained within it.	Suggest paragraphs numbered for clarity.	Para numbers inserted

b) District and  
County  
Councillor  
Comment

Policy	Comment	Response
CA Title page	<p><i>Character Assessment (CA)</i></p> <p>1. Would the photo at X be better for the front of the CA? (It would then be different from the front of the NP.) The reason for suggesting the change was that it was a very recent picture (Ian confirmed so and said the one used was a very old one). More importantly, it clearly demonstrates the abundance of trees on the skyline in certain areas not shown currently, while still maintaining the impact the existing photo provides.</p>	2 cover photos are different
1.4	<p>2. 1.4 Second line would be clearer if it said ‘...construction company, and the 14<sup>th</sup> century George Inn, claimed to be one of Britain’s oldest taverns.’ (The reference to the brewery on the George website - historic section - does not say what the draft CA says.)</p>	Agreed
1.4	<p>3. 1.4 Last line would be clearer if it said ‘Frome, but evening services are less frequent, and Sunday services are limited.’ (This comment is worth making because it dispels any idea that additional housing would be particularly well served by the bus service – and that’s while the service remains <i>as at present</i>.)</p>	Agreed
Fig 8	<p>4. P.19 As to Fig.8 on p.19, Linda will mark missing substantial trees and hedges, in particular the ones you can see on the skyline in the part of the village with which she is particularly familiar, ie near where she lives; and also around the church. (The photo on p.9 shows the significance of the sort of trees that it would be helpful to include.) Note section 4.6 for an example where there is a reference to an abundance of trees around the Church, Wellow lane and Chevers lane yet there is no abundance of trees shown on Fig 8. There are a number of photographs in both documents that clearly show where trees clearly form part of the landscape.</p>	The CA considers views from public spaces, footpaths and roads.
Fig 9	<p>5. P.22 Fig 9. Minor road needs to be put in the right place - see sheet marked A; and the PROW between the Upper Farm Close entrance to Shepherd’s Mead and Town Barton needs to be included.</p>	Agreed
Fig 10	<p>6. P.25 Fig 10. The V on the western side of Shepherd’s Mead (SM) should be replaced with a focused view arrow. It is suggested that the next page should include the focused view shown in the photo marked Z. Currently there is no focused view shown for SM but other LGS sites include one.</p>	Considered to be a panoramic view over roofs of High Street and beyond to open country
Fig 11	<p>7. P.27 Fig 11. The three houses marked in red ‘1’ (see sheet marked C) should be informal mix. They were formerly in the Conservation Area and have large and leafy gardens with significant tree cover and original stone walls which</p>	Agreed

b) District and  
County  
Councillor  
Comment  
(cont'd)

Policy	Comment	Response
<b>Fig 11 (contd)</b>	<p>reflects its conservation status at the time the land (large Orchard) was developed and the listed buildings that surround it. (This is exemplified by the photo at B.) Also in Fig 11, the houses marked in red '2' should be terraced cottages, not least because that description was used by the PC to argue why Laverton triangle should not be developed. These cottages are 'close knit' and in the Conservation Area. See Area 5, Fortescue Fields section where there is a reference to the fact that the terraced front in Town End is an extension to the High Street and ties the most visible part of the development in well to the historic form. This clearly demonstrates that the cottages opposite should be classified under the terraced cottages category.</p>	<p>The area is considered to be informal mix, which includes a variety of housing types</p>
<b>Photo FF Ponds</b>	<p>8. P.35 Under the photo, refer to 'Fortescue Fields Drainage Ponds' to be consistent with the text elsewhere (and because they are indeed drainage ponds, albeit with aesthetic merit.)</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<b>Text p 38</b>	<p>9. P.38 Para.2 Line 6 should refer to 'building materials' (not 'building forms' as it is the <i>materials</i> to which attention has been paid, ie the stone).</p>	<p>Amend reference</p>
<b>Text 16.17</b>	<p><b>Neighbourhood Plan</b></p> <p>10. P.44 New penultimate para. needed to strengthen the argument and minimise vulnerability to Lochailort pointing out that that Appeal related to 'up to 49 houses.'</p> <p>'Although that Appeal related to up to 49 houses, the Inspector's comments remain valid and relevant to development <i>generally</i> on this site.'</p>	<p>Amend text</p>

b) District and  
County  
Councillor  
Comment  
(cont'd)

Policy	Comment	Response
General	<p><b>Regulation 14 Consultation Response</b></p> <p>I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone involved in producing the Neighbourhood Planning documents in such a short space of time and in such detail. Its clearly involved a lot of work and commitment which I very much appreciate.</p> <p>In my capacity as the local District and County Councillor I undertook a detailed review of both the Character Assessment and the Neighbourhood Plan. I also live in the village and have a wide breadth of knowledge relating to it. In addition I had a number of meetings to seek confirmation on when any changes would be made. These meetings were with the Parish Council Chair and Chair of the Neighbourhood planning group and at a Parish Council meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> December.</p> <p>There were a number of amendments made as a result of my suggestions. Some of these were implemented in the draft documents, others had not. I was advised that some of them would not be implemented until after the Reg. 14 consultation period had ended but there was still a question mark about others.</p> <p>Since the Reg. 14 consultation process had now commenced it was necessary to seek confirmation on what exactly was going to be included, what was not and if there were any that might need a response as part of the Reg. 14 consultation process.</p> <p>On 9<sup>th</sup> January I met again with the Parish Council Chair and it was established that there were 10 remaining items for consideration. Further discussion between the PC Chair, the Neighbourhood Planning Committee and the Neighbourhood Planning Consultant established that, of these 10 remaining points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 were agreed</li> <li>• 2 were not supported</li> <li>• 3 still being considered but open for me to submit a Reg.14 response.</li> <li>• 1 still being considered</li> </ul> <p>The Parish Council Chair talked me through the rationale for their views, which I very much appreciated. As a result I would like to formally bring forward under the Reg.14 consultation process one of the remaining items, where I did not agree with the rationale given, and raise a couple of other points.</p> <p>Before doing so I feel it is important to mention that my Reg. 14 response is based on the fact that all other documented comments I have made have been accepted that the changes will be implemented after the consultation period ends. If not, I respectfully reserve the right to bring these points forward again.</p>	

b) District and  
County  
Councillor  
Comment  
(cont'd)

Policy	Comment	Response
CA  CA	<p>I raise the concern about Figure 8 titled <i>Natural Features and Landmarks in Norton St Philip</i> and the accompanying text in section 4.6.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is a typing error for correction. The Figure 8 is referred to in section 4.6 as Figure 9 in error. In my consultation response I refer to it as Figure 8.</li> <li>2. In 4.6 it states that <i>'the landscape survey detailed in figure 8 shows'.....</i> The following text then describes what figure 8 'shows' in terms of lack of vegetation; variable amount of trees and hedges, abundant soft landscaping, no soft landscaping and highlights a green area around the church and suggests that this will be a <i>'key variable therefore in the guidance for the different Norton character areas'</i>. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If the landscape survey in figure 8 is a <i>'key variable in the guidance for the different Norton Character areas'</i>. It surely should be as accurate as possible. The character assessment is a document will be a tool to show the landscape, character and setting of areas of the village and help to ensure any future development respects and maintains or enhances that setting.</li> <li>b. The concern I raised, prior to the Reg. 14 consultation, was that figure 8 was not an accurate <i>landscape survey'</i> and therefore not a true representation of the amount of soft landscaping in the village. By way of an example was where reference was made to areas of the village with an <i>'abundance of trees'</i> that these were not detailed in figure 8. I also highlighted other areas of significant soft landscaping that were not shown on the diagram, or that were shown where it does not exist. At the time I was advised that there was not enough time to amend the figure 8 diagram and was asked to mark up on a copy areas where I was more familiar with that changes needed to be made. This I did and also provided recently taken aerial photographs showing the extent of significant soft landscaping not shown in figure 8.</li> <li>c. In further response to this concern, I was told that after discussion with the NP planning consultant a point made was that <i>"we have not done a tree and landscape survey; its about perception from public spaces and roadways"</i>. If figure 8 is not in fact a <i>'landscape survey'</i> then it should not be referred to as such in section 4.6. If it is simply to give a <i>perception from public space and roadways'</i> then that should be made clear that it is not a true representation of the landscape and therefore character of the village or specific areas of the village.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p style="text-align: right;">2</p>	Corrected

**b) District and  
County  
Councillor  
Comment  
(cont'd)**

Policy	Comment	Response
<p>CA</p> <p>5</p>	<p>d. If it is accepted that it is merely a "perception from public spaces and roadways" then the figure 8 is still not correct. There are significant hedges and trees that are visible from roadways and public spaces that are not included in figure 8 and therefore should be.</p> <p>3. Can I suggest that if it is not feasible to do a comprehensive landscape survey to ensure that figure 8 is accurate that consideration is given to removing the trees and hedges from figure 8 and substituting them with some of the many aerial photographs that give a clear picture of the significant soft landscaping evident in large parts of the village. In the 4.6 text it could be made clear that these are examples and not indicative of the whole village. I have attached some examples of aerial photography that could be used.</p> <p>4. The designated village green on Shepherds Mead is not marked on figure 8 and should be. It's a significant area of land for community use, hence its village green status and should be identified on this figure 8 diagram.</p> <p>5. Shepherds Mead- please see comment below.</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood Plan</u></p> <p><b>LGSNSP010-</b> Shepherds Mead includes a designated area of land with village green status. It is a land, which currently has 3 PROW with 4 routes, with a further route that has been agreed and is subject of an application for Local Green Space designation. The conservation area borders it on two of its boundaries. One particular view from a PROW is into the historic core of the village, the High Street, with listed buildings in view and the Grade 1 listed George in the background. This photograph was included in the LGS application and is the view that is highlighted in the Character Assessment in figure 10. The views across the village are mentioned in the Neighbourhood Plan in the section relating to this application. I therefore feel that it is important to include that view in the relevant section of the Neighbourhood Plan. I can supply another electronic copy of the photograph if required.</p> <p>Councillor Linda Oliver 24<sup>th</sup> January 2019</p> <p>3</p>	<p>Survey was undertaken by volunteers on the ground who marked significant trees and hedges on plans of the village</p> <p>Fig 8 is a survey of natural landscape features</p> <p>Agreed</p>