

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Members may recall that I addressed the Committee last month and raised a number of issues of concern to many residents - not to mention both Congresbury and Yatton Parish Councils - such as breaching the Strategic Gap and access.

I said that if... and it's a big if... if members are minded to approve, we needed an upfront commitment to fund the minimum basic infrastructure needed to support a new medical facility in this location and that it was vital that the wording of conditions was robust and unequivocal.

I spent my morning continually refreshing my web browser in search of the elusive [update sheet](#). This eventually appeared online at 12 o'clock leaving little time for scrutiny. But having now done so, it is very disappointing to see that a revised Condition 10 mentions provision for only *an uncontrolled pedestrian refuge island and tactile paving* at one point on Smallway.

As Yatton Parish Council has commented: a continuous pavement should be provided from both villages and controlled crossings to link up places where this may be difficult to achieve.

I'm aware that we're talking about a condition and usually such things can be delegated to officers to sort out after you give your consent... but this Condition is integral to this application as it stands... and without such a commitment the proposals are unsustainable and therefore unacceptable.

So in a nutshell, many residents consider the minimum requirements to be...

- **a light-controlled pedestrian crossing. This is absolutely essential for safe access to the surgery for vulnerable people using public transport.**
- **a speed limit reduction to 30 mph along Smallway.**
- **improvements to the pavements from both Yatton and Congresbury - and a commitment to their ongoing maintenance - not the one-off clearance of vegetation as suggested in the Update sheet.**

A pedestrian refuge in the middle of a busy road is not acceptable on its own.

The applicants suggest that some councils have utilised funding from new housing schemes to help support their local practices... but that to date the Mendip Vale Group has not been offered any support. Now my understanding is that there are statutory limitations on what the Council can ask of developers during Section 106 negotiations. As I alluded to last month... it would've perhaps helped if the proposed site was closer to the new housing developments!

After I addressed Members last week, Dr Sam Partridge made a perfectly sound case for a new surgery and no doubt he will do the same today. But we can all agree on that; that is not in dispute.

We need residents to be listened too... **really** listened too... not just tick-box consultancy exercises... but in ways that take people's concerns and aspirations seriously... and let me say this: the more you involve people... the more you have people **engaged** in decision-making... the more you have a platform to build trust, even if we don't get the outcomes we necessarily want or thought we wanted.

Now on balance I think I would normally prefer to have questions that can't yet be answered to answers that can't be questioned, but given consideration of this application was deferred for one cycle *to nail these issues*... not being able to pin people down in time for Committee today leaves me with little confidence they will be sorted if Members approve this application **as it stands**. So again... **I urge you to give all parties more time... or refuse.**

Thank you for listening.

Steve Bridger

10th October 2018