

From: Bleadon BOB Community Website <bleadon@live.co.uk>
Sent: 11 March 2019 02:09
To: Sara.Saunders@n-somerset.gov.uk
Cc: Bleadon Parish Clerk
Subject: Fw: NSC Standards Committee re: Bleadon Parish Councillor

Dear Sara/Monitoring Officer,

Events have moved on since our last correspondence. Most notably NSC's Standards Committee has upheld a resident's complaint against a Bleadon Parish Council (BPC) councillor in regards to openness and leadership, residents have informed me via BPC's recently published March agenda. Unfortunately, as you are aware, the NSC complaints procedure is designed for individual councillor complaints not overall council culture. Without proper councillor and clerk training, along with a significant culture change, we believe the openness and leadership issue will not be resolved. We therefore hope that NSC will continue to monitor BPC's actions and inactions to ensure that their Code of Conduct is not breached again and that residents, including us/BOB and councillors, will be treated in a more professional manner.

You previously advised that I try to discuss issues again with BPC but, as their recent response below indicates, this is ultimately a futile exercise that we've tried many times before, using both verbal and written forms of communication. The fact that this is a BPC cultural problem complicates the issue. For more information please read my hurried annotated blue notes in the email below (Please note that although I've been informed by Bleadon residents of this issue but I'm currently abroad, 7 hours behind UK time and suffering from severe jetlag).

I'm mainly writing to you to make NSC aware that although we/residents welcome the complaint outcome we have concerns over repercussions by BPC, not least the potential public and private bullying of the resident concerned as experienced by me, my partner, BOB, friends, current and former councillors. Please appreciate that Bleadon is a small community where various groups overlap, sometimes making it difficult for people to freely raise alternative views without unpleasant consequences, which is why they ask BOB. In our experience BPC undertake collective direct and indirect forms of bullying via their verbal, written/unwritten documentation and the way in which they publish/do not publish information. (NB The public are not allowed to speak, clarify BPC statements or defend themselves after the 'Public Participation' section of the meeting has been completed) We/residents believe that if properly considered policies, guidelines and best practice were actually clearly, accurately, timely and accessibly published, truly owned and followed by BPC, including its Code of Conduct, then the risk of people feeling bullied would be significantly reduced.

This is why I have copied BPC's Clerk into this correspondence, to again make BPC aware of our/resident very valid ongoing concerns and to show our support of the brave resident who submitted an official complaint to NSC. NB In June 17 BPC decided to remove the 'Public Right of Access' to information section from their 'Vexatious Correspondence and Complaints Policy', with the then Chair proceeding to implement it against me/my partner/BOB in Aug 17 without even going through any due process, conversation with us or full council agreement (e.g. nothing in Aug 17 minutes). It was then re-implemented six months later in Feb 18 without any due process. In June 18 we/residents were still asking the six new councillors appointed in May 18 for an amicable discussion, who were continuing to ignore our correspondence. In June 18 we also sent the attached background document to a councillor who was trying to mediate the situation, who subsequently resigned in Nov 18 (Min 315.4). In June 18 (Min 310.3 and 310.21) residents, former councillors and some current councillors were openly encouraging BPC public to discuss this problem in a public forum. In a closed discussion in July 18 (Min 311.19) BPC finally removed their block on us/residents in an unprofessional and

publicly misrepresented manner, but without the key issues being resolved as reflected in the recent resident Feb 19 complaint to NSC. The lack of openness and general unpleasant BPC culture towards us/residents has continued. As far as we're aware we/residents have been asking for and denied access to timely, accurate, easily accessible public decision making and expenditure information, whether via BPC website, or via email if it would take BPC months or even years to update their website.

In my experience, even when we/residents are undertaking rightful scrutiny, BPC tend to publicly and privately bully any resident with a contrary view to theirs. E.g. following an unwelcome query/clarification, a request for information or an unwanted action/inaction, with February's BPC public meeting being no exception. In one two hour meeting the BPC Chairman directly named a resident as an alcoholic; another named as antisocial for lighting a 'lawful' bonfire(s) (re: Min 319.18a); yet another as disruptive for nervous laughter, telling them they'd be asked to leave the meeting and that it would not be 'bullying' (this strange statement was presumably a direct yet veiled reference to the resident complaint upheld by NSC?).

Indirect bullying was also evident in the Feb meeting in the way BPC again avoided publicly discussing their knowledge of the contentious issue of potential 'fracking' in and around Bleadon, which they have known about for over 2 years (Min 319.3.i & i and Min 319.11). Also the closed way BPC has undertaken the NDP project, including the NDP Chair now publicly informing residents that the project group has anonymous members and the BPC Chair stating that if residents didn't like that then '*tough!*' Where is the openness, professionalism and respect in that statement? As indicated in this one 2 hour public meeting, despite presumably knowing the outcome and more detail of the complaint to NSC, BPC continue to publicly verbally name, shame and effectively bully residents who rightfully scrutinise their actions.

BPC's bullying is not restricted to residents, as seen last year with active councillors contacting us/BOB stating, 'I know I shouldn't break ranks but ...' and 'I know I shouldn't be speaking to you but ...' Another example is how BPC poorly managed the November 2017 NSC's sub-committee decision to uphold a public complaint against another councillor. The issue and the councillor concerned were made well known in the community before they were discussed in BPC's public November main and Extraordinary meetings. There were rumours of unofficial BPC pre-meetings in a councillor's house, as indicated in Cllr Strong's November public resignation letter/speech. Undocumented and unprofessional BPC public discussion then took place in November but reference is only indirectly made to this in their minutes. E.g. Councillors wanted to amend BPC Standing Orders to try to remove the 'offending' councillor from office, and publicly humiliate them with a vote of no confidence. NB BPC's currently published Standing Orders clearly contains 13h & 13i, which councillors publicly voted against, but with 13i immediately documented as voted back in again (Nov 17 ExM 302.9)?

As indicated above BPC also misuse their published documentation to support and/or justify their actions/inactions. Example 1. Compare published NDP TOR stated as adopted Jan 19 with Jan 318.12 agenda item and correctly minuted lack of public discussion and non-adoption of the TOR in minute 318.12. (BPC still hasn't responded to our concerns regarding its content sent in January). Example 2. Current BPC councillors knowingly approved the incorrectly minuted APM NDP resolution and its related outcome to push through its Neighbourhood Plan project. NB. Some councillors attended training shortly after and recognised that the APM was supposed to be a resident not a council meeting, yet still haven't answered project overview questions or held a public open meeting to discuss issues nearly a year later. Example 3. BPC also refuse to publish information in order to push through their decision making and projects, frequently stating that it'll update their website soon, e.g. it has taken over 18 months to publish some recent minutes and information on their NDP project.

We/residents are concerned that BPC appears to have assigned little importance to this new upheld resident complaint, assigning it as the 23rd item on its 11 March agenda (Min 320.23)! It will therefore be interesting to hear how BPC deal with it, whether they again hold closed pre-meetings with some councillors, whether it becomes common knowledge in the community beforehand, whether they defend the councillor or the resident, whether they use Standing Orders above, etc.

We welcome NSC's suggestion of councillor training but we have concerns regarding its effectiveness, especially as the Clerk that advises councillors, and on whom they openly state they depend upon, is as far as we're aware is unqualified. A simple example is last year's APM that was highjacked by BPC with no true open forum. Despite some previous training BPC appear to be again misinforming/misleading residents as to the purpose of an APM (e.g. BPN 111 editor/Cllr note page 3 re: Annual Parish Meeting). As seen last year this may then unfairly affect how the meeting is held, who attends, what is/is not raised and discussed and by whom, what is ultimately agreed, etc.

I'm aware that sending this email to you may result in more personal direct and indirect bullying, but as previously stated we believe we're only asking for BPC to follow their own policies, best practice guidelines and to give residents access to public information. We hope that NSC will continue to monitor BPC's actions and inactions to ensure that their Code of Conduct is not breached again and that all residents, including us and councillors, will be treated in a more professional and less stressful manner.

Kind regards,

Jo

email: bob@bleadon.org.uk

web: www.bleadon.org.uk

twitter: @bleadon

facebook: BleadonBOB

latest news: <http://www.bleadon.org.uk/news.html>

From: parishclerk@bleadonparishcouncil.co.uk <parishclerk@bleadonparishcouncil.co.uk>

Sent: 12 February 2019 14:44

To: bleadon@live.co.uk

Subject: RE: NDP Questionnaire & Related Fracking Issue

[We/BOB has been made aware of BPC's Mar 19 agenda. We are concerned that BPC appears to have assigned little importance to a new upheld resident complaint to NSC regarding openness and leadership, assigning it as the 23rd item on its 11 March agenda \(Min 320.23\)!](#)

[To show support to the resident, and to illustrate similar problems BOB has had with BPC's lack of openness and leadership, I've made hurried notes on BPC's last email to](#)

BOB, received 7 weeks after our original request and after the NDP questionnaire had been distributed to residents.

Hello Jo

I acknowledge receipt of your email. I am responding in my role as Clerk to the parish council and support to the NP Group to you as an individual as no-one else has asked these questions and no-one else has asked me to regard you as their representative.

Again BPC states, "*no-one else has asked these questions*". This echoes a similar public statement over BPC's lack of concern over its missing adopted Parish Plan, the one that currently documents residents views costing £000s of precept! BPC actually minuted, " ... *no other Parishioner had raised a query about the Parish Plan, other than the questioner*"? (Apr 17 APM). Where does BPC policy state how many people have to ask for a public document before they will release it?

We/residents/BOB are again concerned that BPC is missing the fact that as far as we're aware we are requesting BPC decision making information that is/should be in the public domain, in accordance with BPC policies, government and best practice guidance, and BPC's/national (ICO Model) Publication Scheme, and therefore should be easily and quickly accessible. At no point has BPC stated that we/residents don't have a right to the requested information, or given any valid reason not to send/publish it, only stating that 'we are the only ones requesting it'. As indicated by the resident 05 Feb 19 public complaint upheld by NSC, BPC's lack of openness and transparency continues. This is despite councillors reconfirming BPC's public adoption of the ICO Publication Scheme and agreement to release information through its website several times, yet not delivering, not even via email whilst waiting for the website to be updated.

As we have previously informed BPC, residents/including current and former active councillors have contacted us/BOB to raise questions, rather than BPC directly, so that they will not be identified, or potentially publicly or privately bullied/'vilified' by councillors (as residents have seen happen to us over the last few years).

This institutionalised internal and external bullying approach by BPC is also evident to us from the recent upheld resident complaint to NSC re: openness and leadership (05 Feb 19 SSC18), undocumented public comments by councillors at the last Feb 19 BPC meeting and various former councillor public statements and associated concerns.

Rather than emailing everyone everything everytime – which results, at best, in no-one knowing who will reply - it would be helpful if you would email me as Clerk. I can then either reply or forward your email on. Of course, you can continue to email whomsoever you wish – I'm just trying to make the email relationship between you as a resident (not a representative) and me as a Clerk a little easier, as you are clearly very dissatisfied with what's going on at the moment.

As we have previously informed BPC, we first ask the Clerk for public information that is not available on its website (e.g. TOR, agenda, minutes, reports, etc.); or ask the Clerk for clarification of contrary/conflicting decisions/minutes or missing public consultations. If a request/clarification is ignored, left unacknowledged after weeks, unnecessarily delayed or if there is a time deadline for a meeting or consultation then we involve all councillors. Example 1: We've asked for access to various sub-group decision making information with BPC delaying this recent response 7 weeks then stating, "*Some of these [questions] are no longer relevant*". We/residents believe that this is the whole reason why BPC delays and/or ignores public access requests, in order to push through their decision making and public expenditure without full public

awareness and/or consultation. Example 2: BPC convened a resident/BAT led A370 road improvements meeting, at which residents rejected BPC proposals. BPC still hasn't published any agenda, minutes, or associated resulting resident response/report for that meeting. Nor is there any information on BPC's A370 working group (July 18 Min 311.8 and Aug 18 ExM Min 312.7 & 312.8). NB It is our understanding that both the inaccurate Apr 18 APM and unpublished A370 meeting minutes will need to be publicly available and presented for approval by residents at the Apr 19 APM.

It would be helpful if you would email me simple questions rather than very long 'chapter and verse' justifications for everything you ask. It would make my time as parish clerk more effective, and I'm sure you appreciate the need for that. Pages of notes, references and reiterations just make it difficult to understand what you really want to know.

Simple individual requests become a long list of outstanding email requests. BPC has repeatedly refused and/or ignored our requests to openly publish information and/or discuss outstanding key issues. Therefore, the notes and iterations come from months, and sometimes years, of BPC not delivering basic public information. Examples: We've asked BPC to correct incorrect and/or misinformation with no response; Our request for the Asset Register took several years to receive a draft copy; Decision making information and expenditure on closed BPC convened, budgeted and Cllr led project groups is still not published (e.g. Newsletter, Bleadon in Bloom, Neighbourhood Plan, A370, Play Park, etc). We also believe that BPC convened resident meeting information should also be correctly minuted and publicly available (e.g. resolution & outcome knowingly incorrectly minuted and no A370 resident feedback report).

NB it has taken BPC since July 2017 to start releasing NDP decision making information, with its associated NDP working group taking over 7 weeks (this email) to even acknowledge our NDP survey question. Both BPC responses and the released website information came after the survey had been published and distributed to residents; after NDP Chair's (unminuted) comments in the Feb BPC public meeting; and after Locality's minuted courtesy call to BPC in Feb 19.

The NP Group has members who do not wish to be identified ...

It is difficult for any resident to understand the aim of the Neighbourhood Development Plan group when it doesn't identify its members. Anonymous members who want to keep development away from their land/property may work behind the scenes to move it elsewhere and exclude potential developments near their area. Anonymous members who want to develop their land/property may work behind the scenes to get them included in the plan, and therefore secure an easier ride through the planning process, which I believe is one of the main aims of a Neighbourhood Development Plan, so why the secrecy?

The NP Group has members who do not wish to be identified due to the vilification that some people received over the previous NP discussions – as a resident you will know far more about that than me as it was before my time as Clerk. Sad but true - if only people could be respected for the part they wish to play in discussing Bleadon's future without fear of personal attacks on social media sites. We are all entitled to our own opinion and should respect others' opinions, however strongly held – but not where they stop free expression.

We agree, noting that the public vilification of residents, both directly and indirectly, initially comes from BPC's actions/inactions as seen and heard at the last month's public meeting in February. E.g. In one two hour meeting the BPC Chairman directly named a resident as an alcoholic; another named as antisocial for lighting a 'lawful' bonfire (re: Min 319.18a); yet another as disruptive for nervous laughter, telling them they'd be asked to leave the meeting and that it would not be 'bullying' (Looking at this month's agenda item 320.23 this strange

statement was presumably a direct yet veiled reference to the resident complaint upheld by NSC?). Indirect bullying was also evident in the way BPC has not publicly handled the contentious issue of potential 'fracking'. Also the way BPC has undertaken the NDP project, with residents being informed that the project group had anonymous members and if residents didn't like that then 'tough', where is the openness, professionalism and respect in that statement? As indicated in this two hour public meeting, despite presumably knowing the outcome and more detail of the complaint to NSC, BPC continue to publicly verbally name, shame and effectively bully residents who scrutinise their actions.

At the same February meeting the Chair of FFNS spoke about potential fracking in Bleadon, as minuted, yet BPC councillors didn't publicly acknowledge that they've been aware of the current Bleadon fracking issue for over two years, as recently reminded by BOB (Min 319.3), why? Only the NDP Chair publicly acknowledged the issue and the working group's rejection of the fracking survey question, but this came after the Chairman of FFNS had left the meeting. Our fracking question was minuted as a unconnected and non-descript/generic survey 'question' (Feb Min 319.11), why? All this without the courtesy of the NDP group even acknowledging our email sent 7 weeks previously. We feel that BPC's one-sided use of its public meetings and minutes is less than open and transparent, nor do we feel that it complies to its own Code of Conduct, and therefore feel NSC's complaint findings apply to the overwhelming majority of BPC councillors. Why do BPC public discuss and/or convene resident public meetings for their/BAT personal projects (e.g. A370 project reflected in July Min 311.8 and Aug 17 Min 317.8 & 317.9; also 200+ Housing development in Feb 19 Min 319.7) but not for the parish wide issues such as fracking, airport expansion, NDP, settlement boundary, openness and transparency, etc. as requested by other residents?

The Clerk's selective use of published Correspondence also adds to the communication/bullying problems, e.g. "*Out ... Response to questions from two residents [usually BPC's cryptic minuted reference to us/BOB] regarding information on the website and the Neighbourhood Plan [i.e. a request for closed working groups/NDP information to be published as seen below]. In: courtesy call from Locality regarding a complaint from a resident re Neighbourhood Plan activity – no case to answer, no action required.*" (Feb Min 319.22 also NDP Feb Minutes). BPC is fully aware that it refused to send/publish any NDP decision making information for over the last 18 months, only releasing limited information on its new NDP website after Locality had contacted BPC in Jan/Feb 19, and after the NDP Survey had been distributed to residents. BPC has still not published answers to residents' NDP questions since they were requested at last year's Apr 18 APM. Conversely, BPC has stated several times that a NDP will be useful in the up and coming 200+ housing development appeal (Dec 317.9) as supported by BPC and its 5 lead BAT members who have Rule 6 appeal status.

We feel that the above examples, from only one 2 hour public meeting in February, show the extent to which BPC as an organisation tolerates bullying. Not one councillor, or the Clerk, objected to this public direct and indirect, inappropriate and unprofessional behaviour towards residents, why? BPC has been fully aware for many years that residents, including former councillors, are concerned re: BPC's lack of openness and transparency, and its 'bullying' culture. This has been indicated by the current upheld NSC complaint, former councillor's written and public statements and resignations, and our emails, but BPC as an organisation continue to let it happen, why?

The NP Group does not require BPC authorisation for every action, with the exception of the overall budget and any increased spend. The Chairman reports to BPC's monthly meetings.

As far as we're aware BPC is ultimately responsible for the NDP project and its funding. As far as we're aware the NDP group is yet to publish any information on how it's spending BPC reserves and/or precept. Nor has it

answered questions raised by residents at the 2018 APM, nor queries re: its unadopted Jan 19 TOR, especially with regards to the question of when sub-groups were given 'full delegated authority' and why its TOR restricts accessibility to information. Why are reports and the Asset Register that are generally created electronically, only available in paper format and chargeable? Why are not all non-confidential BPC reports that are submitted to council for consideration automatically published, or sent on request to us/residents (see BPC's published Publication Scheme)?

Fracking – no discussion at council, not mentioned by any resident on any of the surveys I have seen (which is only about 100 of the 281). You ask 'why' fracking was not on the survey – well, your email requesting it be put on the survey was noted but the issue was not considered relevant to this early stage survey. The Group decided the questions – you were not on the group. No other resident requested any particular question.

BPC is fully aware that if residents are not made aware of fracking in their neighbourhood they wouldn't think of putting in the survey! As you say, BPC has been fully aware of the Bleadon fracking issue for over 2 years yet it has repeatedly decided not to make residents aware, or to publicly discuss the issue, why? BPC didn't even mention their awareness after FFNS raised fracking issues at yesterday's public meeting, it's not even on the following Mar 19 agenda, why? We believe that the parish wide issue of fracking should not be given to an undemocratic sub-group to choose to ignore. NB as the recently published NDP Dec & Jan minutes indicate, the NDP group was not even quorate when this undocumented decision not to exclude the fracking question was supposedly discussed and made.

There is always a balance of what will be put on the agenda vs specific requirements and time available – and that is not your decision.

BPC has previously stated that it is ultimately the Clerk's decision what is put on the agenda, not councillors or residents. BPC has also stated many times that residents have asked and have been permitted for certain items to be raised and discussed, we/residents/former councillors therefore suppose it depends on whether the Clerk/BPC wants to put issues on the agenda to publicly discuss or not. E.g. BPC has publicly discussed former councillor and councillor raised issues relating to Declaration of Interest (BAT vs Cllr roles) and their BPC owned Newsletter (re: independent/private use of public precept/reserves and free use of services) but still have not answered the original key questions raised (e.g. openness, accountability, liability)

NB As BPC was reminded in Jan 19, to support councillors in their duties BPC resolved on Nov 2017 (Min 301.12) "... *that the Risk Assessment should be contained on every Parish Council Meeting agenda to review the high risk elements first, working through to the low risk items.*" This adopted register clearly indicates access to information duties, liabilities and risks, yet despite obvious ongoing issues this register is still is not included on any agenda, why?

Minutes are available – they should not be verbatim but should capture the decisions of the council.

When minutes do not capture the actual decisions and/or discussions, residents may raise the issue with us/BOB, we may then raise the issue with BPC e.g. Dec 18 (Min 317.2 & 6) Cllr Williams re: declaration of interest - publicly and adamantly declared she was not going to declare an interest, minuted as declared, and then minuted as voting (i.e. all councillors present voted)? Jan 19 non-adopted TOR are published on BPC website as adopted (compare published TOR with Jan 318.12 agenda and correctly minuted lack of public discussion and non-adoption minute 318.12?) BPC's NDP newsletter article by the untitled NDP Chair, which is hand delivered to all households, states a 50% survey return, yet BPC's lesser known official NDP

Working Group Feb minutes by the same Chair states only nearly 30%? It is interesting to note that NDP minutes, etc. weren't released to residents until after the courtesy call from Locality (Feb Min xx).

We feel that this misuse of BPC communications is not in accordance with BPC Code of Conduct, especially with regards to openness, honesty and transparency. This type of practice follows the published 2017 Standing Orders that includes sections 13h & i, contrary to minuted actual contradictory decisions in Nov 17 ExM 302.9? Having attended the latter meeting I believe BPC's public (unminuted) discussion and minuted outcome can also be considered public bullying of a councillor, i.e. lead councillors openly wanted to publicly humiliate and remove a councillor from office. BPC is not adverse to implementing decisions that have not gone through council. Again, not in accordance with BPC Code of Conduct.

Most documents are online, I am slowly reducing a backlog.

As BPC is well aware 2017 documents, especially some those of the NDP, have only just been put on its websites (its new NDP website launched Jan 19). It also doesn't take months and or even years to email an existing document or to update a website. NB the 'reducing the backlog' excuse has been used by BPC since it relaunched its third website in Jan 2016! The current main website doesn't even show recent meetings e.g. July 18 A370 resident meeting (Min 311.8 & Aug 19 Min 312.7 & 312.8 - is it because residents rejected BPC/BAT's proposed recommendations and public expenditure?); nor the 07 Feb 19 Planning minutes, which are absent even though BPC declare that's where issues will be more fully debated (Jan 19 Min 318.10); yet BPC usually publishes its minutes within a week? Councillors have already acted on these sub-group recommendations (e.g. Feb Min 319.7 yet it doesn't minute that they have stated that they will organise transport for residents to attend the appeal?). The January Finance meeting had to retrospectively agree 3 sets of previous minutes (Min F&P 55.5, with more still to be approved?); and all 2018 Finance minutes appear to have been recently removed from the BPC website? As current BPC Cllrs/Clerk are aware BPC used to freely publish end of year financial information on its website and in their newsletter, but hasn't done so since 2015/6?

You are welcome to join the NP Group if you are interested in progressing the Plan through draft to consultation – but if you are not keen on developing a Plan then perhaps you feel your contribution would not be positive.

BPC again makes it clear that anyone who asks questions about its projects, and its openness/transparency, are automatically against them and that any differing opinion would be considered negative. It is difficult for anyone to be involved in/develop a neighbourhood development plan when BPC and its associated working group have undertaken discussions and actions behind closed doors to date. It's good to see a request to Locality for access to information has led to a courtesy call from them and the release of some project information. It also difficult for residents to appreciate what the few councillors/residents involved in the project are trying to achieve with an NDP when BPC refuse to publicly answer key questions raised by residents for/at the 2018 APM nearly a year ago. NB BPC publicly verbally agreed, but didn't minute, that they would answer these questions several times. This is less than open and transparent communication.

Perhaps you would like to use your considerable research skills to help craft documents showing trends in the village in terms of population/demographic, business/entrepreneurism, housing tenure, building styles, and so on.

It appears over this last year that BPC is focusing more on local businesses and housing development issues but still not addressing long term very serious resident concerns re: easy quick access to timely accurate information, as indicated in the recent complaint upheld by NSC. E.g. BPC has delegated its own publicly funded newsletter to an independent editor, without any TOR, protocol, contract, etc., the content of which is

overwhelming business oriented rather than more BPC related communication to residents. If it's a BPC owned newsletter surely it should have majority BPC content? BPC appears to be avoiding key public parish wide consultations, even stating at the last minute that were not aware of some them even though BPC is residents' statutory consultee e.g airport expansion, fracking, Local Plan, Settlement Boundary, NDP, etc.

With regards to housing development more open public communication and clarification is needed. When is BPC's NDP group going to explain to residents where the 5 sites suggested to Locality in their grant submission are located? When is BPC going to clarify its public response to NSC Local Plan and developers, "*The current policy should be amended to ensure that the size of any housing development adjacent to the boundary is limited in number to no more than 10% of the existing homes in the parish (currently circa 500 homes)*"? To date statements referring to adjacent to the boundary indicate those outside the village fence/boundary which would involve a flexing/expansion of it, so this statement seems contrary to BPC's own previous statement and residents views in BPC's adopted Parish Plan?

As the Parish Council represents the electorate in its entirety so it welcomes such contributions of a positive and constructive nature.

As indicated above, it appears that BPC doesn't want to address anything that may contradict their views. We/residents feel that open, honest and transparent communication, with all sides of an issue raised and discussed, is a positive and constructive contribution. We therefore feel that BPC's one-sided, closed approach does not represent its electorate as indicated by us/residents/former BPC councillors/Chairs, etc.

Those would be really useful for the village now and in the future. Rather than *per ardua ad astra* we could go for *simul ad astra*.

It would be really useful for the **parish** now and in the future if BPC chose to be open, honest and transparent in their decision making, expenditure and communications, including using English rather than nebulous Latin phrases.

Kind regards
Marian Barber FCMI

Clerk to Bleadon Parish Council
Coronation Hall, Coronation Road
Bleadon BS24 0PG
07453 358318
<https://www.bleadonparishcouncil.co.uk/>

Normal working days are Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday.
I aim to respond to emails within five working days.

From: Bleadon BOB Community Website <bleadon@live.co.uk>

Sent: 10 February 2019 23:07

To: parishclerk@bleadonparishcouncil.co.uk

Subject: FW: NDP Questionnaire & Related Fracking Issue

FYI.

Kind regards,

Jo

email: bob@bleadon.org.uk

web: www.bleadon.org.uk

twitter: @bleadon

facebook: BleadonBOB

latest news: <http://www.bleadon.org.uk/news.html>

From: Bleadon BOB Community Website <bleadon@live.co.uk>

Sent: 10 February 2019 22:11

To: info@bleadonneighbourhoodplan.co.uk

Subject: FW: NDP Questionnaire & Related Fracking Issue

Dear NDP Working Group/BPC,

It has been 7 weeks since we sent our email (below) to you via BPC, without acknowledgement or response. Please can you confirm that BPC sent our correspondence to all members of the NDP group?

As far as we/residents can tell the Survey did not go to full council to approve before you printed and distributed it to residents, around 10 Jan 19. You also decided not to include a fracking question(s). BPC informed us this week that "*The [NDP] group decided on the survey questions.*"

BOB was informed yesterday by Frack Free EQS that a landowner on Roman Road, Bleadon, has received a fracking related letter. Frack Free North Somerset has also established that at least two landowners in the parish of Bleadon have been contacted. More information can be found at https://www.bleadon.org.uk/beinvolved.html?post_id=29482

Please tell us why you/NDP group chose not to include a question(s) on this fracking issue in your NDP survey, as requested?

Please reply to our emails answering our/resident queries indicated below. NB: BPC publicly stated last year that any new NDP group would answer the outstanding residents questions raised for the APM before continuing with its project.

Kind regards,

Jo

email: bob@bleadon.org.uk

web: www.bleadon.org.uk

twitter: @bleadon

facebook: BleadonBOB

latest news: <http://www.bleadon.org.uk/news.html>

From: Bleadon BOB Community Website <bleadon@live.co.uk>

Sent: 24 December 2018 11:05

To: Gillian William; Anne Selway; Andy Scarisbrick

Cc: parishclerk@bleadonparishcouncil.co.uk

Subject: NDP Questionnaire & Related Fracking Issue

Dear NDP Working Group,

(please forward to all resident members of this group, as yet unknown/unpublished by BPC)

I note that BPC has not yet discussed or approved the NDP Working Group's final recommendations for its NDP Questionnaire in full council. So, before the questionnaire is finalised, printed and distributed to all residents we ask that you consider the following and include a question(s) on fracking.

As you will be aware via BPC there are Petroleum Exploration & Development Licences (PEDL) affecting Bleadon, signed in Sept 2016. Any potential drilling and/or development fracking requests may be managed by NSC via their Local Plan through its planning Development process (e.g. DM14) but it was reported in the Mercury last month "*Central Government has been carrying out consultation on whether to make non-hydraulic fracking, which is the exploratory drilling process, a permitted development and therefore **not subject** to the normal planning process*". https://www.bleadon.org.uk/beinvolved.html?post_id=28979

In Dec (Min 317.9) "*Cllr Williams confirmed that an approved Neighbourhood Development Plan has the status of a planning document.*" I therefore believe that any approved Bleadon NDP should also state Bleadon residents' public opinion on fracking, in all its aspects, too.

BPC's Dec Min 317.9 also states that the "*... questionnaire is in preparation and will be delivered to every home in the parish in early January*". So, due to the imminent timescale please discuss this at your next NDP Working Group meeting, stated as being on 2 Jan 19. Please let me know whether you have/will be including a fracking question(s) in your Questionnaire to be recommended to BPC full council for its approval, and the rational behind your decision if you have chosen/choose not to include fracking.

As there is no NDP Working Group contact information except through the Clerk/BPC and/or Gill Williams as stated in BPC's newsletter I assume that BPC has forwarded our previous requests, the outstanding NDP questions as per April APM, our Local Plan consultation concerns, and my email to the NDP Joint Working Group & CPRE project, which is included below.

Finally, please can you also send me the all NDP Working Group TOR (x2), minutes, agenda, reports, consultations, resident feedback, etc. as requested via BPC's Clerk since project setup, i.e. since around June/July last year.

Kind regards,

Jo

email: bob@bleadon.org.uk

web: www.bleadon.org.uk

twitter: @bleadon

facebook: BleadonBOB

latest news: <http://www.bleadon.org.uk/news.html>

From: Bleadon BOB Community Website <bleadon@live.co.uk>

Sent: 29 November 2018 20:36

To: lpcclerk@talktalkbusiness.net; huttonparishcoun@btconnect.com

Cc: parishclerk@bleadonparishcouncil.co.uk

Subject: NDP, Fracking & Local Plan Review

Dear Hutton & Locking Parish Councils,

At the Bleadon Parish Council meeting on 23 Nov residents heard from District Cllr Terry Porter that Bleadon Parish Council would be meeting with Hutton and Locking Parish Councils to work on their Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDP), and that information would be available on websites and a questionnaire out early next year.

You may already be aware of the information below and informed your residents, but for reference we have posted some information on our Bleadon BOB community website relating to NDP and fracking, e.g.:

- A map of Petroleum Exploration & Development Licences (PEDL) in the WSM area
 - <https://www.bleadon.org.uk/media/images/user-images/24400/Coast-Map-PEDL.jpeg>
- A copy of PEDL320 that covers Bleadon, Hutton & Locking, signed by the Secretary of State Sept 2016
 - <https://www.bleadon.org.uk/media/other/24400/PEDL320.pdf>
- Link to NSC vote re: fracking and related BOB blogs
 - https://www.bleadon.org.uk/beinvolved.html?post_id=28979
- Information on NSC's 3 month Local Plan Consultation (ending midday 10 Dec), which is reviewing Settlement Boundaries that may, if removed, potentially encourage development, such as fracking, on the Bleadon Levels, affecting all surrounding villages (See Section 3.2 Settlement Boundaries). We hope that all Parish Councils and associated residents respond to this consultation and refer to fracking concerns.
 - https://www.bleadon.org.uk/beinvolved.html?post_id=28573
- We hope that any potential Neighbourhood Development Plan information, questionnaires, and associated published plans will also refer to the fracking issue in the WSM/local area.
- We hope that Bleadon Parish Council has shared the outstanding NDP questions raised at Bleadon's APM Apr 18
 - <https://www.bleadon.org.uk/apmq#APMQNotes>
- On 17 Sep 18 Banwell Parish Council "*Resolved – To agree to a request from CPRE for a £10 donation to fight against the government's proposals to give permitted development rights for exploratory drilling and to give government overall say on local fracking proposals.*" Please can you tell us whether you/all parish councils received this CPRE request, if so, what was your/their response on behalf of residents
 - <http://www.banwellparishcouncil.org.uk/parish-council/meetings-and-minutes/>

If you have any queries please just let me know.

Kind regards,

Jo

email: bob@bleadon.org.uk

web: www.bleadon.org.uk

twitter: @bleadon

facebook: BleadonBOB

latest news: <http://www.bleadon.org.uk/news.html>