
From: POServices [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 July 2010 15:35
To: 'Denise'
Cc: Eastaugh, Sandra; Charles, Ruth; Baxter, Amy
Subject: RE: JCS for Greater Norwich - GNDP lack of transparency

Denise,

I am copying this response to your emails below to GNDP in the expectation that they could give me something to put before the Inspector.

I am sorry that you do not find much merit in meeting with GNDP. This statutory process relies on two different points of view being discussed openly between parties prior to any hearing sessions. If you still cannot reach agreement, the Inspector could well request that, at the very least, you agree a statement of common ground which could be presented before the hearing sessions. This will help to ensure that expensive examination time is focussed on those issues that remain outstanding.

Through this email I encourage GNDP to meet with you to discuss your ongoing concerns.

Yours

Simon Osborn
Programme Officer

From: Denise [mailto:denise.carlo@btinternet.com]
Sent: 01 July 2010 10:34
To: 'POServices'
Cc: 'Middleton, Robert'
Subject: RE: JCS for Greater Norwich - GNDP lack of transparency

Dear Simon,

Thank you for offering to discuss NNTAG concerns with the Inspectors when they return from holiday.

I'm not sure that there is much merit in NNTAG liaising with GNDP. We have written to them on several occasions asking for GNDP meetings to be held in public and papers published and they have refused. Although we note that the GNDP has started to append minutes of recent board meetings on their web in response to the examination process, their members continue to meet behind closed doors.

Moreover, the situation remains that the submitted JCS has been prepared amidst considerable secrecy. The public has been deliberately excluded from GNDP meetings and activities because their members have wanted to pursue policies challenged on occasions by the public, notably, the NDR and related major housing growth in north-east Norwich, including an eco-town at Rackheath and major expansion of communities to the south-west of the City. As a result, it has been difficult to follow the JCS audit trail and to understand the full reasoning behind the GNDP's selection of options.

Therefore, the issue is surely whether the submitted JCS is legally compliant with legislation and regulations relating to public consultation and engagement rather than whether the GNDP will agree to henceforth open up to public scrutiny? Even if the GNDP was from now on to operate in a transparent manner and release into the public domain all Board and sub-group minutes and papers since 2006, it would not negate the fact that the submitted JCS has been prepared in a distinctly non-transparent way.

The GNDP would no doubt respond that they conducted key public consultation stages within the regulations. NNTAG's counterargument is that the public can only respond to consultation documents in a meaningful way if they have full access to information which has patently not been the case. One example emerged at the Exploratory Meeting on 13 May; the Implementation Plan, preparation of which was unknown about until the GNDP referred to the document in its response to the Inspectors.

I look forward to hearing from you further.

regards, Denise

12/07/2010

Denise Carlo, NNTAG

-----Original Message-----

From: POServices [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 June 2010 12:31
To: 'Denise'
Cc: 'Middleton, Robert'
Subject: RE: JCS for Greater Norwich - GNDP lack of transparency

Dear Denise,

I will discuss your concerns with the Inspectors and reply to you as soon as possible. Please however be aware that it may be a while before I am able to obtain a considered response because of pre planned holidays at this time.

In the meantime, it might well be fruitful to get a response to your concerns from GNDP. This will aid the Inspector in coming to a decision.

Generally, everything sent to the Inspectors via me is automatically put in the public domain to ensure transparency. I will therefore copy them in with our correspondence and ask for a response unless you would prefer to talk to them directly which, in any case, all representors are encouraged to do prior to, and during the Examination process.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours
Simon

From: Middleton, Robert [mailto:robert.middleton@pins.gsi.gov.uk]
Sent: 30 June 2010 09:54
To: Denise
Cc: POServices
Subject: RE: JCS for Greater Norwich - GNDP lack of transparency

Denise

Although I have been forwarding your e-mails to the Inspectors during the temporary absence of the Greater Norwich Programme Officer, I believe that he has now returned to work and, since the matters you raise are being dealt with by the Inspectors conducting the Greater Norwich Joint Core Strategy examination, it would now be more appropriate to pass on your concerns about the examination to the Inspectors via the Programme Officer.

I am copying this e-mail to the Programme Officer, Simon Osborn, so that he is aware of our correspondence and of your concerns.

Regards

Rob

Rob Middleton
Development Plans
The Planning Inspectorate
Room 4/03 Kite Wing, Temple Quay House,

2, The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN.

<http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk>

E-mail: robert.middleton@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Telephone: 0117 372 8566 (GTN 7 1371 8566)

From: Denise [<mailto:denise.carlo@btinternet.com>]
Sent: 28 June 2010 10:54
To: Middleton, Robert
Subject: RE: JCS for Greater Norwich - GNDP lack of transparency

Rob,

Thank you for passing on NNTAG's further comments to the lead Inspector.

Looking at GNDP's Statement of Community Involvement (Nov 2009), the GNDP might argue that they have complied with the statutory stages of the JCS in relation to public consultation as per P and CP Act 2004. However, the Aarhus Convention goes much further and establishes a legal requirement for public participation in decisions (Articles 6 - 8) affecting the environment and quality of life. The Convention states that in drafting rules and regulations governments shall strive to '*promote effective public participation at the appropriate stage, and while options are still open*'. The public can only participate if they have full access to information which the GNDP has denied to residents in Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk by meeting behind closed doors and not publishing papers.

Is this a matter on which PINS can take legal advice at this stage please? It would be a wasted preparation effort of everyone concerned if this important issue was left until the Examination stage, with a possibility that the JCS could be found unsound over lack of compliance with legislation and regulations concerning transparency and public involvement.

regards, Denise

-----Original Message-----

From: Middleton, Robert [<mailto:robert.middleton@pins.gsi.gov.uk>]

Sent: 25 June 2010 16:31

To: Denise

Subject: RE: JCS for Greater Norwich - GNDP lack of transparency

Denise

I have passed on your further comments to the Inspectors and the lead Inspector, Roy Foster, has informed me that he will endeavour to make sure that there is an opportunity to discuss whether Greater Norwich Development Partnership's consultation arrangements have been in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement.

Regards

Rob

Rob Middleton
Development Plans
The Planning Inspectorate
Room 4/03 Kite Wing, Temple Quay House,
2, The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN.

<http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk>
E-mail: robert.middleton@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Telephone: 0117 372 8566 (GTN 7 1371 8566)

From: Denise [<mailto:denise.carlo@btinternet.com>]
Sent: 17 June 2010 12:57
To: Middleton, Robert
Subject: RE: JCS for Greater Norwich - GNDP lack of transparency

Dear Rob

Greater Norwich Joint Core Strategy

Many thanks for our conversation yesterday about the Greater Norwich Joint Core Strategy.

One matter we have raised in our letters to the Inspectors is the secrecy under which the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) has been operating: the lack of access to its numerous meetings or Agenda papers and the inability of the public to hear discussions between the partner bodies and ask questions.

May I confirm that Norfolk & Norwich Transport Action Group first wrote to the Inspectors on 22 April about the GNDP's secret way of working, having raised the matter with the GNDP on several occasions and in representations on the JCS at various stages. However, it was not able to be tackled at the Exploratory Meeting on 13 May because the Agenda was very full and the Inspectors had a great deal of work to do testing and questioning the GNDP representatives on the large range of issues they had identified. This took from 10.00 until 15.30 and by 15.00, I and a number of other group representatives had had to leave. The matter of the GNDP's secrecy could only have been raised formally on 13 May under A.O.B. and I could not stay that long at the meeting.

Hence my raising it formally by letter after the Exploratory Meeting.

Irrespective of whether the JCS is now taken to Examination, delayed, or withdrawn, the full publication of all the GNDP's meetings - minutes and papers since 2006, including those for specialist groups such as Transport - in a publicly accessible, indexed form is surely essential. At present the Inspectors cannot trace what and how decisions were made during the period over which the GNDP has met, or the 'audit trail' leading to the choice of the Option now in the JCS.

The GNDP's lack of transparency may raises issues of legal compliance. PPS12 stresses the need for transparent and accessible community engagement (4.19 - 4.20). As NNTAG stated in its letter to the Inspectors, the public can have no

confidence in a Core Strategy which has been produced behind closed doors in order to deliberately exclude the public.

Regards,

Denise

Denise Carlo
Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group

-----Original Message-----

From: Middleton, Robert [mailto:robert.middleton@pins.gsi.gov.uk]

Sent: 16 June 2010 10:47

To: Denise

Subject: RE: JCS for Greater Norwich - GNDP lack of transparency

Dear Denise

I have forwarded on your letters to Rynd Smith and have also sent them to the Inspectors as, I believe the Programme Officer for the Greater Norwich has been ill recently and I wanted to be sure that they had seen your recent letter.

Regards

Rob

Rob Middleton
Development Plans
The Planning Inspectorate
Room 4/03 Kite Wing, Temple Quay House,
2, The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN.

<http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk>

E-mail: robert.middleton@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Telephone: 0117 372 8566 (GTN 7 1371 8566)

From: Denise [mailto:denise.carlo@btinternet.com]

Sent: 14 June 2010 12:23

To: Middleton, Robert

Subject: JCS for Greater Norwich - GNDP lack of transparency

Dear Rob,

-

Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk

I am putting in the post to you today a copy of NNTAG's letters (dated 6 June and 22 April) to the Planning Inspectors appointed by PINS to examine the submitted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk.

We are extremely concerned about the conduct of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) which refuses to hold its many meetings in public and publish agenda papers and minutes and has taken this position since its inception in 2006. It is impossible for the public to have any trust and confidence in the GNDP and Joint Core Strategy process whilst this situation prevails.

We would be grateful if you could forward our letter to Mr Rynd Smith and ask whether he could write to the GNDP and ask them to adopt a transparent and open approach to their work in future.

With grateful thanks.

Yours sincerely,

Denise Carlo
Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group

_____ Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 5194 (20100614) _____

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

Correspondents should note that all communications to or from the Planning Inspectorate or the Advisory Panel on Standards (APOS), may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for lawful purposes.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept by MIMESweeper for the presence of computer viruses.

www.clearswift.com

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

_____ Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 5200 (20100616) _____

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

_____ Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 5232 (20100627) _____

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 9.0.830 / Virus Database: 271.1.1/2971 - Release Date: 06/29/10 19:35:00

_____ Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database
5239 (20100630) _____

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>