**Addingham Neighbourhood Plan Section 16 Consultation**

**INTERIM Comments on the Addingham Parish Council’s Consultation Statement**

the comments refer to references reproduced in red

Front cover

Note 1-THIS PAGE IS MISLEADING - THE PHOTOGRAPH WAS TAKEN AT THE PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION WHICH WAS PROPERLY CONDUCTED THERE WAS NO CORRESPONDING CONSULTATION ACTIVITY WITH RESIDENTS AT EITHER THE SECTION 14 OR THE SECTION 16 CONSULTATION STAGES THE COUNCIL REJECTED A PROPOSAL BY FORUM MEMBERS TO ORGANISE AN OPEN MEETING EVENT FOR THE PUBLIC AT THE SECTION 14 STAGE

Note2- THERE IS NO RECORD OF THE COUNCIL APPROVING THIS DOCUMENT

4. Since designation the Parish Council has been working on the preparation of the document and has engaged stakeholders and local residents in the neighbourhood development planning process throughout.

THIS STATEMENT IS UNTRUE—AT THE MAY AGM THE COUNCIL DISPLAYED THAT IT HAD CEASED TO CONSULT THE FORUM REGARDING POTENTIAL STRUCTURAL CHANGES TO THE PREFERRED OPTIONS DRAFT– NEITHER THE FORUM MEMBERS NOR THE PUBLIC WERE CONSULTED ABOUT THE PROPOSAL OR OPTIONS

5 A Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group was established by the Parish Council in November 2015, comprising councillors and volunteers from the local community. In September 2016, this was replaced by a Neighbourhood Plan Forum, again with membership comprising councillors and local residents, and with formal Terms of Reference approved by the Parish Council (Appendix 1). THE STATEMENT OMITS TO RECORD THAT THE FORUM DID NOT FUNCTION PROPERLY AFTER A DISPUTE BETWEEN ELECTED MEMBERS AND RESIDENT MEMBERS FOLLOWING THE COUNCIL’S ACTIONS AT THE MAY AGM AND JUNE EGM.

All notes of meetings were published on the Parish Council web site (http://www.addinghampc.gov.uk/neighbourhood-plan/). This enabled all interested parties to track progress on the ANDP.

THIS IS UNTRUE - ON 29TH JULY I WROTE TO THE CLERK REQUESTING COPIES OF A NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS INCLUDING THE NOTES OF A MEETING OF THE FORUM HELD ON 29th JUNE 2018. THE NOTES WERE CONCEALED ON THE BASIS THAT THEY WERE “DISPUTED”.

AN FOI REQUEST FOR COPIES OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE CLERK AND A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE DISATIFIED EX AND REMAINING MEMBERS OF THE FORUM WAS REFUSED. THE MATTER REMAINS THE SUBJECT OF ONGOING COMPLAINT PROCEDINGS .

THE NOTES WERE REWRITTEN. THE REVISED NOTES WERE “APPROVED” BY THE REMNANTS OF THE FORUM AFTER THE SECTION 14 AFTER THE SECTION 14 CONSULTATION.

THE MINUTE RECORD SHOWS THAT THE PARISH COUNCIL CONCEALED FROM RESIDENTS

- THE FAILURE TO CONTINUE WITH A PROPER ENGAGEMENT WITH THE FORUM MEMBERS

- DISPUTED NOTES

- AND THE RESIGNATIONS OF RESPECTED PROFESSIONAL MEMBERS OF THE FORUM, UNTIL AFTER THE SECTION14 CONSULTATION

6. Throughout the stages of developing the document, a number of events and other activities have been organised by the Parish Council itself, or by the Forum on its behalf. …..

THIS IS UNTRUE. THERE HAVE BEEN NO ”EVENTS” SINCE THE PREFERRED OPTIONS SUCCESSFUL CONSULTATION MEEITING/EXIBITION. THE MOST QUESTIONABLE ACTION OF THE COUNCIL IS THAT OF IMPOSING A MAJOR STRUCTURAL CHANGE TO THE PREFERRED OPTIONS DRAFT, WITHOUT PROPER CONSULTATION AND DISPLAY OF OPTIONS. GIVEN THE AGENDAS PUBLISHED FOR THE MEETINGS-THE ARGUMENT THAT ORDINARY MEETINGS OF THE COUNCIL WERE “CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES” IS OUTRAGEOUS’ IT IS FOR THE EXAMINER TO DECIDE WHETHER THE OTHER, PREVIOUSLY UNANNOUNCED, SELECTIVE INITIATIVES - OUTSIDE THE FORMAL CONSULTATION WERE LAWFUL

Page 9 4 June 2018-20 June 2018 Parish Council decision taken at 2 meetings, held in public, and with advice from planning consultants (Kirkwells), to remove site allocation policies from the draft Plan in the light of feedback from the planning authority …

THE DECSIONS WERE TAKEN WITHOUT WRITTEN PUBLISHED MOTIONS. THIS REPRESENTS A BREACH OF STANDING ORDERS

THE AGM DECISION WAS TAKEN ON THE BASIS OF AN OFF-AGENDA ACCOUNT OF A CONVERSATION WITH A DISTRICT COUNCILLOR. THE DISTRICT COUNCILLOR GAVE A VERBAL REPORT TO THE EGM

WE HAVE WRITTEN TO BOTH KIRKWELLS AND COUNCIL OFFICERS – THE REPLIES WE HAVE DO NOT SUPPORT THIS STATEMENT.

by leaflet drop, posters around village and press articles

THE LEAFLET DROP WAS INCOMPLETE, POSTERS AND PRESS ARTICLES WERE MISLEADING.

later public statements issued by local authority giving notice of a review of the Core Strategy to be carried out at the same time as a review of the Green Belt

“LATER PUBLIC STATEMENTS” HAVE NO BEARING ON THE DECISION MADE IN JUNE THE REVIEW HAS NO BEARING ON THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PROCESS.

Page 10

- THE SECTION14 CONSULTATION PROCESS DID NOT COMPLY WITH GUIDANCE

RESIDENT MEMBERS OF THE FORUM WERE NOT ENGAGED IN THIS AND OTHER "Consultation processes" UP TO 9 OCT 2018 OTHER GROUPS WERE NOT CONSULTED THERE WAS NO CORRESPONDING CONSULTATION PROCESS WITH RESIDENTS --THE COUNCIL REFUSED FORUM MEMBERS' PROPOSALSTO ORGANISE AN OPEN EVENT FOR THE PUBLIC

THIS CONSULTATION WAS SELECTIVE AND REPRESENTATIVE OF AN INTEREST GROUPRESIDENT MEMBERS OF THE FORUM WERE NOT ENGAGED IN THIS AND OTHER "Consultation processes" UP TO 9 OCT 2018 OTHER GROUPS WERE NOT CONSULTED

Page12 Para 10

- NOT TRUE -DISPUTED MINUTES WERE CONCEALED --THE REACTION OF RESIDENT MEMBERS OF THE FORUM TO THE COUNCIL'S UNILATERAL DECISION WAS CONCEALED BY THE PARISH CLERK -EXCHANGE OF LETTERS WITH CHAIRMAN OF THE CIVIC SOCIETY- ACTING FOR RESIDENT FORUM MEMBERS CONCEALED -- FOI REQUEST REFUSED

Page 16 CBMDC also provided a detailed of comments. These are set out in Appendix 5 of this Statement alongside the final Parish Council response and action

THIS IS UNTRUE - THE DECISION TO REMOVE THE SECTIONS OF THE PLAN WAS TAKEN ON THE BASIS OF VERBAL REPORTS FROM ONE DISTRICT COUNCILLOR AND ONE PARISH COUNCILLOR

22. To ensure that the changes to the Preferred Option draft and the decision not to proceed with housing site allocations were taken in a transparent and open manner, THE KEY ISSUE IS THE LACK OF CONSULATTTION- RESIDENTS WEREE PRESENTED WITH A MATTER OF FACT. WE UNDERSTANG THAT A MATTER OF THIS MAGNITUDE IN THE PROCESS SHOULD HAVE BEEN THE SUBJECT OF ASEEPARATE ROUNGD OF CONSULTATION ON THE ISSUE AND THE OPTIONS

two Parish Council meetings were organised on 4 and 20 June respectively. Residents were notified of these meetings and their significance by using a leaflet, posters and articles in the local press.

THIS IS WHOLLY MISLEADING -THE AGENDAS\* INDICATE THAT THE 4TH JUNE MEETING WAS AN EGM, \*Neighbourhood Plan - "To receive an update from the councillor members of the Neighbourhood Plan Forum, review the draft policies of the Neighbourhood Plan prepared for Regulation 14 consultation, agree amendments as necessary, and decide any other action as required"THE ORDINARY MEETING OF 20TH JUNE APPROVED A MOTION TO HAVE A LEAFLET PRINTED. THE EGM AGENDA READ \*(-UNDER MATTERS ARISING) Neighbourhood Plan – to receive a report on progress and consider proposals for communicating recent developments to village resident

At the same time,…

THIS IS MISLEADING THE GREEN BELT REVIEW METHODOLOGY HAD BEEN WIDELY CONSULTED UPON. OTHER REVIEWS WEER LONG EXPECTED AND WIDELY REGARDED AS OVERDUE

CBMDC had committed to an early review of the CSLP

WE CANNOT FIND ANY EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATION ON THE BRADFORD WEBSITE

which was to run in tandem with the preparation of the Site Allocations Plan. This was a significant change in circumstances affecting the preparation of the ANDP, particularly any site allocations, had they still been included in the draft plan

THIS IS AN ASTONISHING STATEMENT FOR A RESPONSIBLE BODY TO MAKE AND ARGUE RETROSPECTIVELY. IT IS A CLEAR INDICATION OF THE COUNCIL’S FAILURE TO RECOGNISE THE WELL-UNDERSTOOD QUESTION OF PRECEDENCE WHEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS PROCEED MORE QUICKLY THAN LOCAL PLANS. IT CONCEALS FROM RESIDENTS THE IMPORTANCE AND WEIGHT WHICH THE EMERGING PLAN CARRIES.

Page 18 23. A final meeting of the Forum was held to agree the Regulation 14 Draft Plan and to agree the Regulation 14 consultation on 29 June

THIS IS UNTRUE. THE NOTES OF THE MEETING ESTABLISH THAT NEITHER DOCUMENT HAD BEEN FINALISED -- "THE DRAFT WOULD THEN BE PUBLISHED FOR FORMAL CONSULTATION OVER THE SUMMER PERIOD"

Page 19 24. The public consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Plan was carried out pursuant to the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (SI No. 637) Pt 5 Pre-submission consultation and publicity, Regulation 14. ………………………….

NOTICES DID NOT SPECIFY

(i)details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan **[**[**F2**](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/637/regulation/14#commentary-key-1dc2e6b3be524036ffd48212bd06b7d3)or modification proposal**]**;

\*(ii)details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan **[**[**F2**](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/637/regulation/14#commentary-key-1dc2e6b3be524036ffd48212bd06b7d3)or modification proposal**]** may be inspected;

(iii)details of how to make representations; [**F3**](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/637/regulation/14#commentary-key-df44b266925a426f60dfb7b7d5cd97b0)..

\*A. MEMORIAL HALL- THIS VENUE IS ONLY OPEN FOR EVENTS AND BOOKINGS

\* B. COMMUNITY LIBRARY - OPENING HOURS: MONDAY CLOSED, TUESDAY 9AM TO 12 NOON, WEDNESDAY CLOSED, THURSDAY 2PM TO 6PM, FRIDAY CLOSED, SATURDAY 9.30AM TO 12PM,SUNDAY CLOSED

\*C. MEDICAL CENTRE AND D. ROWLANDS PHARMACY (BY THE MEDICAL CENTRE) -CLOSED EVENINGS AND ALL DAY SATURDAY AND SUNDAY

\* E. TELEPHONE KIOSK ON CHURCH ST. F. CO-OP G. POST OFFICE THIS CANNOT BE TAKEN SERIOUSLY

\*F COOP

- NOWHERE TO SIT

\*G POST OFFICE

\*CLOSED EVENINGS AND SAT AND SUN PM

EQUALLY IMPORTANTLY --- RESIDENTS WERE NOT INFORMED OF THE QUESTIONS AND ISSUES WHICH THEY ARE BEING CONSULTED UPON

29. Prior to formal consultation, the Parish Council had circulated a leaflet to all homes and businesses in the area, explaining revisions that had been made to the draft following the final informal consultation. Posters and press articles were also used to publicise the changes and give advance information on the forthcoming formal consultation THIS IS NOT TRUE -- COUNCIL MINUTES RECORD THAT THE PURPOSES OF THE LEAFLET WERE " to publicise the preparation of a new draft of the Neighbourhood Plan"

31. Publicity material, letters, the Parish Council website and the Regulation 14 Draft all contained the relevant details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan could be inspected; details of how to make representations; and the date by which those representations must be received were included. Note 27

OTHER THAN A WEBSITE POST AND E FEW MISLEADING POSTERS THERE WAS NO "PUBLICITY MATERIAL" PRODUCED AFTER THE LIMITED CIRCULATION LEAFLET IN LATE JUNE WHICH CLEARLY DOES NOT “contain~~ed~~ the relevant details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan could be inspected; details of how to make representations; and the date by which those representations must be received….”

**Page 21-**

38. The detailed representations received and the responses to them are set out in the Consultation Response Table, Table 3 of this Consultation Statement

THIS IS MISLEADING –THERE IS NO ANALYSIS TO SUPPORT THE ASSERTION REGARDING " BROADLY COMMENTED" AND "SAME ISSUE”? THERE IS MUCH EVIDENCE TO DISPLAY THAT REPRESENTTIONS HAVE NOT BEEN PROPERLY REPORTED

40. following the formal consultation, the parish council consulted a number of representative groups in the village

THIS STATEMENT HAS SHOCKED RESIDENTS . THERE IS NO RECORD THAT THE PROCESS WAS AUTHORISED BY COUNCIL FORUM MEMBERS WERE EXCLUDED THERE IS NO EVIDENCE TO DISPLAY THAT THE PROCESS, TIMING AND SELECTION OF "CONSULTEES" WAS ANYTHING OTHER THAN SELECTIVE AND UNREPRESENTATIVE THE PROCESS SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN UNSTRUCTURED

**Page 25-**

THE PARISH COUNCILS RESPONSE TO THE HIGHWAY AUTHORITY COMMENT “No housing allocations included in ANDP – comment noted. “ DOES NOT ADDRESS THE ISSUE RAISED THE (FREQUENTLY USED ( >20 OCCASIONS) TERM “NOTED” IS MEANINGLESS WITHOUT A DEFINED CONSEQUENTIAL ACTION.

**Page 26**

THE RESPONSE TO WEST YORKSHIRE POLICE INPUTS FAILS TO ADDRESS --ITEMS 1, 3,4,5 AND 6

**Page 28**

THE COUNCILS reply TO THE INPUT FROM GLADMANS FAILS TO ADDRESS THE ARGUEMENT FOR ROBUST AND PROPORTIONATE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THE POLICY. THE STATEMENT IS CONFUSING – THE LANDSCAPE STUDY IS COMPLETE

**Page 29**

THE REPLY TO BARTON WILMORE IS UNTRUE-- THE PARISH COUNCIL IS ABLE BUT UNWILLING TO ADDRESS THE NEW POWERS ON PLANNING FOR GREEN BELT EMERGING FROM THE REVISED NPPF

THE STATEMENT " AND HAS DECIDED NOT TO PROCEED AT THIS TIME WITH SITE ALLOCATIONS" . INFERS THAT SITE ALLOCATIONS WILL BE REVISITED IN FUTURE. --- THE COUNCIL HAS BEEN INFORMED THAT THIS IS NOT POSSIBLE YET CONTINUES TO MISINFORM RESIDENTS

Page 32- I)This objection is based on a misunderstanding, on the part of a few village residents, of the Parish Council’s reasons for revising the draft Plan.

THIS STATEMENT IS A CLEAR INDICATION OF THE PARISH COUNCIL’S FAILURE TO ADHERE TO THE BASISC REQUITEMENT FOR ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION. IF THERE IS A MISUNDERSTANDING --THE COUNCIL HAS FAILED TO COMMUNICATE, ENGAGE CONSULT AND, INFORM. THE MISUNDERSTANDING IS NOT CONFINED TO A FEW VILLAGE RESIDENTS. SINCE THE COUNCIL SIDELINED THE FORUM IN MAY, RESIDENTS HAVE BEEN DENIED MANY KEY ELEMENTS FOR COMMUNICATION AND ENGAGENENT WHICH WERE ESTABLISHED IN THE RESIDENT MEMBERSHIP OF THE FORUM.

2.The PC is aware that, in spite of NPPF guidance, it will be extremely unlikely that a draft Plan containing housing site allocations could progress through the system in the face of objections from the planning authority and at a time when the planning authority is engaged on a review of its own district-wide housing numbers and a review of the Green Belt. IF THE COUNCIL WISHES TO GUIDE DEVELOPMENT -- THE MECHANISM IS THROUGH A NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WHICH INCLUDES SITE STUDIES AND ALLOCATIONS. THIS PROCESS IS BECOMING COMMONPLACE IN MANY SITUATIONS WHERE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS ARE PROGRESSING FASTER THAT LOCAL PLANS

THE COUNCIL HAS PROVIDED NO EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THE ASSERTIONS “In spite of NPPF guidance,”

“ it will be extremely unlikely”

“ that a draft Plan containing housing site allocations could progress through the system in the face of objections from the planning authority”

**Page 33-** 3.The PC intends to modify the Plan at a later stage, when the planning authority’s reviews have been completed, and it is possible to put a housing site allocation policy in place in a neighbourhood plan which can be in conformity with the Local Plan.

THIS IS JUST ONE OF MANY EXAMPLES OF THE PC IGNORING AND CONCEALING THE FACTS ABOUT “modifying the Plan”(LETTER FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR TO JOHN GROGAN MP) DELIBERATELY MISLEADING RESIDENTS

4.In the meantime, the PC is advised that the best protection for the village against “aggressive developers” is the existing Green Belt boundary. THE PC HAS NOT PRODUCED, IDENTIFIED OR PUBLISHED ANY FOUNDATION , ORIGIN, EVIDENCE TO ILLUSTRATE ILLUSTRATING THE SOURCE OF THE ADVICE

Page 34 the PC wishes to take advantage of the increase in CIL funding

THIS STATEMENT IS THE ONLY RELIABLE EVIDENCE BASE FOR THE ISOLATED ACTIONS AND ARGUMENTS OF THE PC SINCE MAY 2018. IT IS EVIDENT THAT FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS ARE ATHE ONLY CREDIBLE BASIS FOR THE COUNCILS ACTIONS IN MAY/JUNE2018. EVEN PRIORITISING FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS OVER THE UNSUPPORTABLE ANALYSIS / RECORD OF PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS RAISES LEGAL ISSUES.

THE STATEMENT IN RESPONSE TO BARTON WILMORE The Parish Council cannot allocate this site…….. IS UNTRUE

Until the Green Belt review is completed by CBMDC, Addingham NDP cannot address this issue-

THIS IS UNTRUE -- CHANGES MADE TO THE NPPF IN 2018 PROVIDE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN MAKERS WITH EXTENDED POWERS

Page 36The mechanisms for modification of an NDP are set out in Regulations. Residents did not “vote” at the informal consultation stage; the overwhelming support shown for the draft Plan was in relation to its policies as a whole, not just the housing site policy. A significant number of residents opposed the policy in respect of one of the 3 sites proposed. THIS COMMENT IS IRRELEVANT UNREPRESENTATIVE AND AN ARGUMENTATIVE INSULT TO THE MANY PEOPLE WHO ARE GENUINLY CONCERNED

Page 39 –

ISSUES ARE - NOT ADDRESSED

Page 41 Implementation will be matter for the planning authority

THE MATTER WHICH WAS RAISED HAS NOT BEEN ADDRESSED

PAGE 42 –

THE CONSULTEES’ INPUT REINFORCES POINTS I HAVE MADE ABOUT THE REQUIREMENT FOR A DEDICATED DISTINCT CONSULTATION PROCESS TO DEAL WITH THE OPTIONS AND OUTCOMES ASSOCIATED WITH THE MATTER OF DELETING HOUSING SITES AND ALLOCATION

Page 43 Specific comments relating to the housing site allocations may be reflected in later modifications of the Plan when it is possible to bring forward a policy for housing site allocations again.

THE STATEMENT IS UNSUPPORTABLE , GROSSLY MISLEADING

Addingham residents have been given the *full* facts relating to the development of the neighbourhood plan at *each stage* in the process. In all, we have held 3 council meetings, all in public*, to debate* the approval and publication of the Reg14 Draft Plan. We have sent a printed flyer to *every* household in the village explaining the reasons for amending the draft presented for informal consultation.

THERE IS A CONSIDERABLE BODY OF EVIDENCE TO THE CONTRARY.

THE STATEMENT ABOUR “explaining the reasons for amending..” IS CONFIRMATION THAT THE COUNCIL FAILED TO UNDERSTANDTHE REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPER CONSULTATION

It is the view of the Council that the comments listed in the Response Table are not representative of the vast majority of village residents.

THERE IS NO RECORD OF THE COUNCIL’S CONSIDERATION OF THIS QUESTION

Page 44 The Parish Council is not in a position to provide clear details about when and how the Plan would/could be modified to include a policy on housing site allocations, as this process is subject to statutory guidelines and will need to take place in such a way that the Neighbourhood Plan remains in conformity with the Local Plan

WE QUESTION HOW A RESPONSIBLE BODY COULD PUBLISH THIS INCOMPETENT STATEMENT

Page 45 None of the members of the Forum were working for the Council as “professionals” THERE ARE MANY UNDERTONES IN THIS STATEMENT -- PARTICULARLY THE TERM “working for”, IT IS EVIDENCE OF IRRATIONAL UNREASONABLE CONDUCT BY THE COUNCIL IN ITS’ DEALINGS WITH THE MEMBERS OF THE FORUM WHO CHALLENGED THE UNILATERAL , UNDEMOCRATIVC UNEVIDENCED DECISION TAKEN AT THE EGM. IT DISPLAYS THE COUNCILS SHIFT IN STANCE MAY/ JUNE2018 EMPHASISING “ADVISORY” – A CONTRADICTION OF THE CONSENSUS PRINCIPLES BUILT INTO THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN ACT

Page 46 K) This objection is based on a misunderstanding of the role, composition and powers of the Forum.

EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THE ISSUE HIGHLIGHTED ABOVE

Residents’ comments inaccurately refer to “the Forum” when they mean the individual views of some of its volunteer members. Members of the Forum also include councillors and the view of “the Forum” is the view of the whole body reached at one of its meetings.

THIS COMMENT HAS NO PLACE IN THE NP PROCESS – IT ILLUSTRATES FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS UNDERLYING MANY OF THE ISSUES BEING DEALT WITH

PAGE 46 The decision to revise the Plan for formal submission purposes was a matter for full Council. The volunteer members of the Forum were not, however, excluded from the process - the meetings at which the Parish Council made its decision were held in public and Forum members, both councillor members and volunteer members were present (see the Consultation Statement for the full sequence of events).

TO ARGUE THAT FORUM MEMBERS WERE INCLUDED IN A DECISION TAKEN BY THE PARISH COUNCIL IS NOT WORTHY OF CONSIDERATION. IT IS SIMPLY WRONG FOR THE PARISH COUNCIL TO ASSERT THAT ANY FORM OF ENGAGEMENT WITH THE FORUM TOOK PLACE LEADING UP TO OR AT EITHER THE AGM OR THE EGM

Page 47 The Parish Council’s consultant had advised that the additional work required by the planning authority was likely to take considerable time and resource, and even when and if completed, could be followed by a request for further work to be carried out.

THE COUNCIL FAILS TO REGISTER THE JUDGEMENT GIVEN BY PROFESSIONAL MEMBERS OF THE FORUM THAT THE WORK AND PROCESS COULD BE COMPLETED IN A MATTER OF WEEKS

THE CONSULTANT HAS FAILED ANSWER WRITTEN REQUEST FOR EVIDENCE OF OR ADDITION DETAIL REGARDING ADVICE GIVEN TO THE COUNCIL.

THE PLANNING AUTHORITY HAS MADE SPECIFIC STATEMENTS AND EXPLANATIONS IN RESOPONSE TO REQUESTS WHICH DO NOT SUPPORT THE CONCLUSION REACHED

As noted by one respondent, the Forum’s TORs have provisions regarding public engagement, but the Forum must act as a body within a properly constituted meeting. Once the volunteer members had disagreed with the Council’s decision, in spite of the professional advice provided to it, the Forum as a body was unable to meet effectively

THIS IS A CLEAR ILLUSTRATION OF THE COUNCIL’S CONCEALMENT OF IMPORTANT MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC. THE PUBLIC HAS NOT BEEN MADE AWARE OF THE ISSUE AT THE ROOT OF THE DISAGREEMENT. IT IS UNACCEPTABLE THAT A LOCAL GOVERNMENT BODY , WORKING UNDER LEGISLATION, WITH PUBLIC MONEY, WAS INCAPABLE OF PROPERLY MANAGING AND FINDING A SOLUTION TO A SIMPLE DIFFERENCE OF OPINION, WITHIN A PROPERLY CONSTITUTED BODY.

Unfortunately, individual exmembers of it may have publicised and sought to justify this disagreement publicly, to the detriment of the Council’s aims for public engagement.

THAT -A RESPONSIBLE PUBLIC BODY PUBLISHES THIS RUMOUR-MONGING, ACCUSATIVE, INACCURATE, STATEMENT LEAVES RESIDENTS WITH QUESTIONS CONCERNING GOVERNANCE AND LAWFULNESS IT NOW REMAINS WITH THE EXAMINER TO ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS

PAGE 48 Comment 4 I was shocked at the decision by the PC to omit the HA from the NP. I believe this decision was arrived at without real agreement of the Forum. I was also aware that as a Forum member (communications) I was excluded from the involvement in the flyer’s message out to the village. I consider that my exclusion left me with no reason to remain as a member of the Forum. My main concern is the major decision made re HA was made without the agreement of the Forum and made public with no mention of the Forum’s opposition!

IS NOT ADDRESSED

Page 55 resident 3-

THE COUNCIL’S RESPONSE TO THE DETAILED POINTS MADE REGARDING CONSULATION AVOIDS AND EVADES THE ISSUES

HOWEVER, THE COUNCIL’S HANDLING OF THE CONSULTEES’ INPUT REGARDING PROPER CONSULATION ABOUT MAJOR CAHGES QUOTING \*[1]SEDLEY LJ IN R (BAPIO ACTION LIMITED) V SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT [2007] EWCA CIV 1139 AT [43][47] SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN BEEN MISREAD AND MISQUOTED THE CONSULTEE DID NOT REFER TO ANY IMMIGRATION CASE

THE COUNCIL’S RESPONSE IS ININTELLIGABLE. IT IS TROUBLING THAT THE COUNCIL WASTS ITS OWN TIME, THAT OF RESIDENTS AND THE EXAMINER BY THIS ARGUMENTATIIVE STANCE – IF CLARIFICATION OF AN ISSUE IS REQUIRED IT CAN BE DELIVERED WITHOUT CONFLICT AT AN EARLY STAGE

FROM PAGES 55 ONWARDS IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO CONNECT/CORRELATE CONSULTATION INPUTS , COUNCIL RESPONSES AND RESULTANT ACTIONS RELIABLY WITHOUT MAKING ASSUMPTIONS BECAUSE OF THE LAYOUT -LACK OF SEPARATION MAL-ALIGNMNT OF THE COLUMNS

IIT IS NOT CLEAR WHICH CONSULTATION RESPONSES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

**FOR THE TIME BEING, THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS ARE PROVISIONAL UNTIL THE PROBLEM IS RESOLVED**

Page 56 The Parish Council’s consultation has met the 4 requirements of procedural fairness, in that the consultation, carried out pursuant to the 2012 Regulations:

RESIDENTS HAVE BEEN INFORMED THAT CBMDC’S STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT GOVERNS HOW CONSULTATION ON ELEMENTS OF THE LOCAL PLAN WILL BE CONDUCTED. THE PARISH COUNCIL’S ACTIONS DO NOT COMPLY WITH THE SCI.

THE COUNCIL FREQUENTLY REFERS TO ADVICE FROM COnSULTANTS AND OFFICERS—THERE IS NO WRITTEN RECORD FOR THE REFERENCES

RETROSPECTIVE STATEMENTS ATTEMPTING TO EXPLAIN AND JUSTIFY A DECISION DO NOT CONSTITUTE CONSULTATION

IS INCOMPREHENSIBLE -- IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO CORRELATE ACROSS COLUMNS – IT WOULD BE IRRESPONSIBLE TO ASSUME CONNECTIVITY

THE ABSENCE OF ANY CONTEMPORARY WRITTEN EVIDENCE/ REPORTS/ANALYSIS/MEETING PAPERS IS PROBLEMATICAL AT THE EXAMINATION STAGE-- WHERE THE EVIDENCE BASE WILL BE SOUGHT.

ON PAGES 59/60 A RESIDENT RECORDS

Para 4.25 is misleading and badly informed. Vulnerability to flooding is governed by a number of factors including infrastructure geography, geology , new development and climate change. The plan is not informed by the work required by law of the lead local flood authority to produce records of flooding, a register of structures, to investigate flooding incidents, to assess local flood risks and to produce local flood risk management plans The plan should register the lack of such information and establish appropriate precautions to avoid inappropriate development. This paragraph is an illustration of the complete inappropriateness of including statements about flood risk management in a neighbourhood plan. In law the duty and responsibility for local flood risk management rests with the lead local flood authority. The Parish Council has no locus in the matter. The parish council is not competent to discharge the flood risk management function. Works On ordinary water courses are controlled by the LLFA If the council intends to leave any mention of flood risk management in the plan, then the legal consequences of doing so should be explored and displayed. It is likely that any engagement or action in this sphere or statements inferring so would be ultra vires

THE COUNCIL’S RESPONSE? ON PAGE 59 IS “noted no action” RESIDENTS CONCLUDE THAT THE FREQUENTLY USED TERM “noted no action” MEANS MORE THAN “ignored” –THAT WOULD BE IMPROPER.

**IN GENERAL**

THROUGHOUT THE DOCUMENT, THE COUNCIL DISPLAYS THAT IT FAILED TO PROPERLY ENGAGE RESIDENTS , EVEN THE FORUM, IN THE DESIGN, CONTENT AND STRUCTURE OF THE SECTION 14 DRAFT

THE SECTION 16 DRAFT INCLUDES CHANGES WHICH DO NOT DERIVE FROM THE SECTION 14 AND EARLIER CONSULTATION

THE CONSULTATION REPORT ILLUSTRATES THAT THE COUNCIL HAS FAILED TO PROPERLY ADDRESS ISSES RAISED BY CONSULTEES

THE COUNCIL HAS IGNORED PROTESTS FROM MANY INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS REGARDING THE FALSEHOOD IN REPEATED STATEMENTS REFERRING TO " FUTURE WORK ON SITE ALLOCATIONS" AND "MODIFYING THE PLAN."

THE PUBLIC WAS EXCLUDED FROM OBSERVING OR ATTENDING FORUM MEETINGS

THE PUBLIC HAS BEEN MISLED REPEATEDLY SINCE APRIL2018

THE COUNCIL DISSOLVED THE FORUM AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SECTION 16 CONSULTATION PERIOD. THE DECISION WAS MADE IN COUNCIL WITHOUT A WRITTEN MOTION - CONTRAVENING STANDING ORDERS. THIS MECHANISM CONCEALS COUNCIL'S INTENTIONS AND PROHIBITS PUBLIIC ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

Appendix 11

THERE WAS NO CORRESPONDING CONSULTATION PROCESSWITH RESIDENTS

THE COUNCIL REFUSED FORUM MEMBER' PROPOSAL TO ORGANISE AN OPEN EVENT FOR THE PUBLICAT THE SECTION 14 CONSULTATION STAGE

THE REFUSAL EFFECTIVELY SILENCED THE DISSENTING MEMBERS OF THE FORUM

THIS CONSULTATION WAS TOO LATE IN THE DAY -POST SECTION 14 CONSULTATION - TO HAVE ANY REAL PURPOSE OR REAL INFLUENCE.

THERE APPEARS TO BE NO OUTCOME