

FAO Mr John Slater
Inspector

Frisby Neighbourhood Plan

Statement for the Public Meeting – Mr Peter Rogers

For the purposes of the meeting you have called to gain answers to the questions you have on the suitability of the Frisby Neighbourhood plan, I am providing this document to give you a summary of my concerns which I submitted at Regulation 14 and Regulation 16. I hope that you have had a chance to read this information and that you can provide an impartial opinion on whether the NP should go forward as an approved document. Generally, my issues relate to Q1, Q3 & Policy H1 and whether due process was followed in accordance with the NP guidelines.

As background I want to confirm, I joined the Neighbourhood Planning sub-committee at the beginning of the process. My interest was to represent the Great lane neighbourhood to ensure a fair and unbiased approach was conducted as one of the sites offered backed onto our homes. From the onset of the process it became clear that the NP document was going to be a plan to block development within our village. The focus was always to fulfil only the minimum development. Whilst I was on the committee there were many times that it became obvious that certain members of the group were driving the decisions to ensure that no development would occur in their backyard. The committee are just a collection of NIMBY's with a common agenda to keep "it" away from them. There was one plot already in the system and quickly it was decided this would fulfil the obligations of development for the village and they wanted only one site to be effected. This was the Great Lane site. The focus went on to force an extension to this site when it became clear that the village needed to provide more houses. At no point were any other sites given a fair chance to compete.

Evidence

The village questionnaire – A survey document of detail which tried to be fair, it didn't present a full picture of each option but did get a very high percentage of responses. The end result was the favoured site Cooks Land to the South. This document was buried and never referred to again as it did not suit.

A sustainability report requested by the Parish Council, written by a professional from a company "Yourlocal". At the beginning of this process this was the first document to be "Doctored". Whilst I was on the committee I saw 3 versions of this document as the members tried to suggest mistakes and distort the evidence. This was because the outcomes did not suit certain members of the NPAC's agenda. The favoured site was Water Lane, by a substantial amount of points.

The Limits to Development – The conduct of the committee was appalling from the beginning. At no point were the merits of each site ever to be presented within the survey. The information used was specifically selected from all different, never consistent sources, in order to sway the voter in the direction they wanted. Numbers of houses were suggested, beyond the capability of the sites to scare villagers. Not all combinations of sites were available to vote on and no site could be selected on its own. I created and presented an alternative and fair document to send out but without agreement from the committee because the bias version had already been printed. With this in mind, I can confirm I have submitted evidence to you in the form of emails that prove that paragraphs of the NP were written before the results of the survey came in. The committee were very confident they had ensured the result they wanted by grossly influencing the public vote. The survey was personally delivered and people were led through its criteria to answer as the committee member delivering wanted them to. The follow up survey when the NPAC and FPC said that the Rotherby lane development had become unavailable, was no fairer and villagers were given only 5 days to respond, during the holiday season.

Voicing my concerns at this LTD meeting on these issues led to me being made to leave the committee and to my continued anger and frustration as clear objective points being totally discounted. The NP document should not provide the basis of my village's future. I feel that if the information I have presented to you is not taken into account and the conduct of this committee is considered acceptable with the validation of this document it will make a mockery of the Localism Act and give the green light to future Neighbourhood Planners to abuse this system. I would like justice for my village, fair, open and honest choices should have been disclosed and offered to them from the beginning. When the Local Plan allocated various sites, these allocations were totalling ignored. The focus became a race to beat the local plan so it had no bearing at any planning committee. This means it has been rushed, not thought thorough or fair and not suitable to carry forward to determine the planning future of this village.

Mr Peter Rogers, Resident, Frisby on the Wreake