

Objection Part 3

Commentary

Bleadon Parish Council notes that, within the submission, the Applicant exhibits at worst a fundamental lack of respect for the Planning Process, or at best a lamentable lack of care through a series of demonstrably inaccurate and misguided assertions.

In the Planning Access Design Statement, the Applicant asserts “the application site consists of approximately 8 hectares of pasture land”.

In the Utility Assessment Report the Applicant asserts “The proposed development site consists of 10.6 hectares”. This is a difference of some 25%.

If the Applicant has overlooked such discrepancies (or could not be bothered to update the plan) then it calls into question the veracity of other statements made.

It is evident from the information enclosed as support material (e.g. the LVIA) that whilst a great deal of generic information is provided on methodology the concluding statements with reference to the impact of the Proposal are largely subjective, rather than objective, in nature.

Comment has already been passed on the inaccuracy of information regarding frequency of public transport.

The Applicant also claims in the PADS :

“The village is close to Weston-Super-Mare (sic.) where services are achievable quickly and easily, indeed access to the hospital, the sea-front, the major shopping centre of Weston-Super-Mare (sic.) are all within a 20 minute walk or 5-minute bus ride”.

From the designated development-site entrance to the hospital entrance is a distance of 1.4 miles (via the a370). To reach the hospital on foot, along a footpath too narrow in many places for two people to walk abreast, and adjacent to speeding traffic, within 20 minutes would require would require a steady pace of 4.2 mph. The hospital is a five minute bus-ride away. The

nearest beach access point is a 40 minute walk. The shopping centre is a 17 minute (scheduled) journey; or a walk in excess of one hour.

A Community Consultation Event was held by the Applicant in September 2017. It was noted that those villagers who work normal office hours were effectively excluded by the 11:00 to 18:00 timing of the event.

The Applicant's representative appeared ill-prepared and under-resourced (being in possession of only two A3-size plans of the development proposal) and found it difficult to respond to the reasonable requests and observations of villagers. For example, when asked about the Flood/Precipitation Run-Off survey she was unable to give any information but insisted that this had been carried out. Documentation accompanying the Proposal shows that this was not completed until the following February – why say that it had already been done? Earlier in the summer of 2017 a team of surveyors (sporting the Sutherland's logo on their uniform) were seen using theodolites to establish levels for the site. When approached, one of the surveyors responded to a villager's query by claiming to be conducting an Archaeological Survey. This matter was raised at the Community Consultation event and the Applicant's representative supported this assertion. If so, then where is the Archaeological Survey report? Many in the village regard this "consultation" as a cynical attempt to gain an insight into possible objections to the plan.

In the Statement of Community Involvement the Applicant claims that following the Community Consultation Event "The scheme was substantially redrawn as a result of the feedback received" thus "reducing the size by almost a third". This statement is disingenuous because the size reduction resulted from one of the landowners withdrawing from the scheme when the extent of opposition to the proposals became evident. Additionally, if the figures of 8ha and 10.6ha are accepted, it takes only a cursory glance to establish that the "reduction" is of the order of a little more than 20% rather than the 33% claimed. Given other examples quoted in the Parish Council's response, it is strongly recommended that any figures supplied by the Applicant are carefully and independently validated.

It is true that the "unwanted" Primary school was deleted from the original proposal but villagers are also aware that there never was any support (financial or otherwise) to be forthcoming from the NSC Education Department.

In the PDAS, the Applicant makes rather naive statements in an attempt to justify the plans. For example “The villages (sic.)...aspired to better health care, retail offer, employment opportunity, and highway improvements”. This statement could conceivably be applied to any community in the land.

The villagers have no realistic expectation that the Doctor’s Surgery/Health Care Centre will ever become a reality.

The Applicant has consistently ignored the wishes of the overwhelming majority of villagers. It is hoped that more attention will be given to the 300+ objections to this Proposal.

Bleadon Parish Council reaffirms its stance on the proposal and requests, on the behalf of the apparent majority of Bleadon residents, that planning proposal ref. 17/P/5545/OUT should be rejected by North Somerset Council.

-o0o-