Regulation 14 Consultation Response

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.

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 3rd December.

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.

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.

On 9th 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:-

- 4 were agreed
- 2 were not supported
- 3 still being considered but open for me to submit a Reg.14 response.
- 1 still being considered

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 coupe of other points.

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.

Character Assessment

I raise the concern about Figure 8 titled Natural Features and Landmarks in Norton St Philip and the accompanying text in section 4.6.

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.

2. In 4.6 it states that '*the landscape survey detailed in figure 8 shows'……..* 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 *'key variable therefore in the guidance for the different Norton character areas'.*

    a. If the landscape survey in figure 8 is a *'key variable in the guidance for the different Norton Character areas'.* 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.

    b. The concern I raised, prior to the Reg. 14 consultation, was that figure 8 was not an accurate *landscape survey'* 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 *'abundance of trees'* 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.

    c. In further response to this concern, I was told that after discussion with the NP planning consultant a point made was that *"we have not done a tree and landscape survey; its about perception from public spaces and roadways".* If figure 8 is not in fact a *'landscape survey'* then it should not be referred to as such in section 4.6. If it is simply to give a *perception from public space and roadways'* 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.

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.

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.

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.

5. Shepherds Mead- please see comment below.

<u>Neighbourhood Plan</u>

LGSNSP010- 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.

Councillor Linda Oliver
24th January 2019