

| Sheet ref | Policy | Comment |
|-----------|------------------------|---|
| 1 | General | Thank you for your clear representation of proposed plans for NP in NSP. We found the presentation informative extensive and relevant as well as inclusive and democratic. There would seem to be a high degree of research and gathering of local opinion and need behind it. We understand the need for phased development of the plan for optimum effectiveness and look forward to further information. Thank you also for your time and patient answering of questions. |
| 2 | General | Looks as if the work is coming together very well. Impressed with scope and content of the work. Some graphics could be improved- Local Green Spaces page is not easy to relate quickly to the listing for example. Work addresses 'new work' issues but did not see much of the maintenance of the existing character- an aspect much commented on by visitors. Listed buildings are restricted but what about the others? Thanks for all the work done |
| 3 | General | Thank you for laying out the plan so clearly and logically. I have no outstanding questions and wish you every success - which is always more likely when preceded by some consultation and good old-fashioned human interaction! |
| 4 | General | Thank you for your hard work- looks promising. Good luck! |
| 5 | General 2 5 3 | I find the draft neighbourhood plan to be a highly impressive piece of work. Very thorough and carefully thought through and well presented. I agree that the proposed development sites are appropriate together with the recommendations for the nature of housing on the sites. Also I completely support the proposed LGSs particularly the Fortescue south/west which I feel are most at risk of further planning applications notwithstanding previous failed appeals. Also support the potential for 'exceptional' small development of affordable houses given the policies outlined which would shape the nature of each development-particularly in relation to climate change and flood mitigation |

| Respondent | Policy | Comment |
|------------|------------------|--|
| 6 | General | Well thought out. Obviously a lot of work has gone into the plan which shows. Fortunate to have people working on this on our behalf |
| 7 | General | Excellent presentation - very informative - well done! |
| 8 | 5 6 6 4 | Well done! May I suggest that the following be considered : 1) strengthen the requirement about green corridors. Where such exist they should be enhanced and made more durable. Some enlargement may be possible. The green infrastructure should be a strong design feature. Landscape architects should be employed by the PC as advisors. Developers may not wish to do the above! 2) Solar power. This should be a given for new developments. The latest solar energy capture methods should be incorporated. The wording in the plan should reflect this. 3) Street lighting for 'new' areas (and existing) should be moderated and reduced in line with best practice |
| 9 | General | Thank you for all the effort that has gone into this plan. Easy to follow and makes sense. Very informative. Covers all topics of interest. |
| 10 | General | I fully support this plan. |
| 11 | General | Fantastic work for the benefit of all Norton residents |

| Respondent | Policy | Comment |
|------------|-------------|---|
| 12 | General | Well produced and clear and informative. Reflects local people's views as shown in previous surveys. Interesting aspects providing information which we were not totally clear on before re. parish limits ,greenbelt etc. Thank you for producing this. |
| 13 | General | Very impressive work |
| 14 | General | I fully support this plan |
| 15 | General | Just dropped in to get an idea of what is going on. George Hitchins gave me a run through the tables and a preliminary summary and let me loose on the reading material. It's clear that a great deal of thinking and hard work has already been invested in this whole thing, and I think the people of NSP can be grateful that these people (The Steering Group) are in the front line |
| 16 | General | Absolutely delighted that I managed to get here. I am very impressed by the whole presentation and grateful to the people who devoted time and expertise to benefit us all. I have a much clearer idea of developments and proposals for our community now |
| 17 | 5 3 1 | Well presented plan - we strongly agree with 1) proposed green spaces 2) affordable housing idea 3) the fact that Mendip district Council must be aware we have already fulfilled ++our housing developments in the village |

| Respondent | Policy | Comment |
|------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| 18 | General 2 3 | Brilliant! If (big if) a more significant affordable housing development was planned I would favour trying to change the greenbelt to allow development of the field on the left side of the A366, just behind Norton house. This would feed traffic onto the main road rather than into the already congested village streets and would provide more customers for the pubs shops and school |
| 19 | General | I fully support the plan |
| 20 | General | What a lot of work! This looks very thorough. The policies look good to me! Thank you to all for so much effort. |
| 21 | General | Very good |
| 22 | 5 2 2 3 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome the designation of all the green spaces which we want to see protected from development. • We have no objections in principle to the development of the RC Church site • No objections to the BH garage development provided it is restricted to the Brownfield site and does not encroach on the hillside (Great Orchard) • No objections to the exceptions policy in respect of affordable housing providing secure arrangements are in place to ensure that these houses are not for sale on the open market • We welcome an awareness of the importance, if the schemes go ahead, that all new houses have gardens (already a drainage issue in the village) parking (already an issue) and limited external lighting (light pollution already an issue e.g. the preschool) <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment and all the work you have put in on this</p> |

| Respondent | Policy | Comment |
|------------|------------------------|--|
| 23 | General | Fantastic! Thorough and comprehensive. I could not support it more strongly. Thank you for all your hard work let me know if there is anything I/we can do to help in the future |
| 24 | General | The neighbourhood plan is an impressive piece of work, which takes a mature approach to prioritising planning options to meet the future needs of this historic Rurel village. It addresses the inevitable need for development well setting appropriate boundaries to safeguard the village and its unique culture. Great work team |
| 25 | General | Excellent. A great piece of work and I know how much effort goes into these things! Many thanks |
| 26 | General 5 3 4 | We think it is incredibly sensible and proactive to do this work beforehand and are supportive of the proposal. Having recently moved to the village it would be a shame to lose lots of green space which attracted us to come. On the other hand we are very supportive to assist with affordable houses for locals. Perhaps if they can have first refusal. We would appreciate if new houses are in keeping with current house characteristics. We like the proposal is to add hedgerows and trees etc so as to detract the eye from the road. As we live close to the proposed Bell Hill site we would hope the majority would be set back from the road and locals would be supported during any disruptive development work. A thought might be to allocate some parking spaces for the residents of Church Street and Bell Hill so as to avoid parking on the road. Living on Church Street it does feel quite dangerous with fast traffic coming up and down the hill when cars (Residents) are parked on the road. We do however want to support the local amenities e.g. school and pub and appreciate the need to rebalance the village. |

| Respondent | Policy | Comment |
|------------|--------------------------------|--|
| 27 | <p>General</p> <p>5</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comprehensive, thorough and clear 2. Well constructed to show the joint approach of both <u>local</u> and <u>national</u> needs 3. Given the new rules on development for the future this plan offers a blend of protection alongside responsible awareness of the national situation (housing) 4. Excellent to see how well 'sustainability' is absolutely <u>integrated</u> into the whole plan 5. Plans / maps etc very clear and helpful 6. Proposed designation of Local Green Spaces is very appropriate 7. Would be good to identify some village car parking but I can see how difficult this is 8. Thanks to all who have spent so much time on behalf of the neighbourhood |
| 28 | General | <p>Very impressive body of work that will insure future development is framed within criterion that is acceptable to the village's -and wider regional and national- needs and aspirations</p> |
| 29 | General | <p>In favour of the Neighbourhood Plan</p> |
| 30 | <p>General</p> <p>3</p> | <p>We have looked at the information provided and it seemed to be very clear and comprehensive. We are in favour of sustainable affordable housing without which the village will lose its coming generations. A balance must be struck between the provision of appropriate housing in the area and preserving the rights of local landowners. However a close watch must be kept to insure that inappropriate development does not spoil the character of the village and parish as a whole</p> |

| Responden | Policy | Comment |
|-----------|-----------------------|---|
| 31 | General | <p>Yes on balance I think it does (<i>properly address the parish housing development issues</i>). I am impressed with the focus and speed of progress and think you are right to push this on before the rules change. Clearly housing development is the core. I am relieved that is to be a part two and hope that it will deal with areas not so far covered such as business and local facilities. I hope it will be possible to be more ambitious about environmental and green issues at that time.</p> |
| 32 | General | <p>We support the neighbourhood plan. We already struggle with lack of adequate infrastructure causing parking and traffic congestion on the two roads in and out of the village. Very limited public transport between Nsp and outlying towns. This is likely to worsen over the years as roots and provision decrease</p> |
| 33 | General 2 5 | <p>Absolutely the draft neighbourhood plan does address the parishes housing development issues and makes everything clear. Wonderful that the green spaces are being protected and redundant spaces are being utilised appropriately</p> |
| 34 | 3 4 5 CA | <p>Thanks for all the hard work, planning and thought that has gone into this plan to date. My thoughts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I appreciate that affordable housing is to be directed to local needs • That design takes consideration of green corridors energy conservation gardens and fits to local character (which Fortescue Fields does not -in my opinion- except for energy conservation!) • I fully support designation of green spaces but was disappointed that Laverton Triangle is not included. Any development there should be sympathetic to its locality (i.e. Townsend older properties) so as not to further distract from the aspect on entry to the village. • I appreciate the focus on maintaining views of the village from the aspects which I appreciate daily. • Also good to include sufficient parking for any new housing and to facilitate access for walkers and cyclists <p>We are fortunate to live in such a beautiful historic village which has in recent years been subject to some inappropriate housing development.</p> |

| Respondent | | Comment |
|------------|--|--|
| 35 | <p>General</p> <p>5</p> <p>2</p> | <p>Overall very pleased with the plan, especially the proposed Local Green Spaces. Very important to maintain the green spaces in the village. I do have a concern over the increase in traffic on Bell Hill and the junction by the George if the Bell Hill garage development goes ahead.</p> |
| 36 | <p>4</p> <p>4</p> <p>2</p> <p>6</p> <p>6</p> <p>General</p> | <p>Comments</p> <p>Page 8- Objectives- suggest “promote energy-efficient buildings biodiversity and increasing....”</p> <p>Page 21 -policy 4- The green corridors as referred to in general guidelines don't appear to be defined. Where are they? I would be happy to prepare a map of same for the approval of the steering group.</p> <p>Restricting new houses to 2 storeys precludes three-storey houses which in appropriate locations can add to diversity. I suggest removing “partially or wholly within the roof space”. “context and character” adequately cover this point.</p> <p>Could something be added to say “retention of existing buildings which are part of the historic character will be encouraged” e.g. why can't the handsome barn on the Bell Hill garage site be retained? It is an important feature in the streetscape and could be retained and enhanced with a bit of design skill.</p> <p>The guidelines really ought to promote the use of solar panels properly integrated into new roofs.</p> <p>Policy 6- could something be added to encourage measures to improve not just “retain” biodiversity.</p> <p>Finally I may have missed it but does the Plan deal with the community infrastructure levy (C I L)? The parish ought to have a policy on what developers etc should be adding to the village as a condition of planning permission</p> <p>I hope the foregoing is taken as “constructive”, I congratulate the group on their work so far!</p> |

| Respondent | Policy | Comment |
|------------|---------|--|
| 37 | General | Fully support moves to protect the development of the village |
| 38 | General | <p>P4- the last paragraph. Reference should be made to talk and workshop with Dan Stone on low carbon neighbourhood planning attended by about 38 residents.</p> <p>p5-Second paragraph – the steering group recommended that this initial NP should be reviewed within two years. Ian made a clear statement of this intention at extraordinary PC meeting on 7/11/18</p> <p>P8 I agree with Neil Pollard's comment that the last bullet should include promoting diversity</p> <p>F[redacted]e useful to have a definition explanation of “infill” (in the same way as you have dealt with definitions on page 4)</p> <p>p16&17-I am concerned about the amount of traffic that will be exiting onto Bell Hill from 20 houses. This will almost undoubtedly mean 40 cars minimum. I think 20 houses is too many for this site. It will not allow for green spaces/gardens/ green corridors</p> <p>2 P21-Green corridors needs to be defined. What constitutes a “green corridor.” It should also read “Green corridors should be maintained and wherever possible enhanced....”</p> <p>P21/22- I support Neils comment that the guidelines should promote the use of solar panels / solar tiles. The technology is advancing apace; by the time that NP is made there will be various types of solar roof tiles / solar shingles / solar slates</p> <p>4 P27- why do we need to have the statement “Government policy discourages the setting of.....NP”? It adds nothing to that sentence. I suggest it is deleted so that the sentence starts with “Policy 6 aims....”</p> <p>P28-I would like to see the inclusion of a bullet reading “Any proposed development should assess the opportunity to include solar panels / solar roof tiles / solar roof slates”</p> <p>P28- Second section 2nd bullet reads “The proposed development does not have an unacceptable impact on a feature of natural or biodiversity importance”. 2 things - 1) I'm not sure what a feature of biodiversity important is. 2) if this sits in policy 6 I think it should also sit under policy 4, Good Design</p> |

| Respondent | Policy | Comment |
|------------|--------------|---|
| 39 | General | I attended the NPSG exhibition and discussion in a somewhat apprehensive condition. I had read the plan and needed further help particularly in affordable and starter homes. The staff available took on all the points I raised. I felt a lot more satisfied after those conversations and was very glad that I had attended the meeting |
| 40 | General 4 | Excellent! Only one area of concern -page 22- “No flood lighting of large external sports or community facilities”. I believe this to be unreasonable. What is the definition of large? As there are no current facilities for 8 to 18 year-olds what plans are there to encourage families with children of that age group to come to or remain in the village. Yes there is cricket in the summer and one football net. What about basketball hoops or table tennis. There is absolutely no outside activities after 3.30pm during the winter. Lights for a limited period say 3.30 to 6.30 for table tennis or basketball would at least keep children active and outdoors. Wellow and Freshford have multi use tennis courts with lighting providing a strong community and less likelihood of petty crime. Areas that have no street lighting are more prone to burglary. At Halloween we had 22 children some from Bath Farleigh Hungerford and Rode- why? because Fortescue is safe with lighting and no cars. I know knowledge that we do need the right sort of lighting. Question - once a neighbourhood plan is adopted can it be amended during its lifetime? |
| 41 | 3 | There is a need for affordable homes. Myself and my wife have lived here for 69 years and my mother and grandmother as well. Having three sons and one daughter they would have loved to have stayed in the village but as everyone is aware the price of houses were out of their reach. Personally if families and their children are not able to stay eventually it will become a very lonely village. Hope there is something on the horizon because it's a very pretty village and needs young people to make it a prosperous place |