

## **Submission to Cabinet meeting 9 May 2012**

### **Opposition to BaNES proposal to develop the Old Colliery Site, Stanton Wick as a Gypsy, Traveller site.**

#### **Speaker Judith Chubb-Whittle, Chair of Stanton Drew Parish Council.**

In support of the overwhelming opposition voiced by the residents of Stanton Wick hamlet and Stanton Drew village, at our Parish Public meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2012, the parish council vehemently opposes the proposal on the following grounds;

1. The scoring matrix defies logic.  
How can a site that was scored 17<sup>th</sup> out of 23 sites becomes one of the preferred top 7 sites, when alternative sites demonstrated superior access to amenities against the scoring matrix?
2. The proposed 15 permanent pitches & 5 transient pitches will totally dominate the hamlet of 26 dwellings i.e. approx. 60 people, contravening *Planning Policy For Traveller Site* document, March 2012.

Based on *Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites document*, a pitch comprises of an average 1.7 caravans but the DPD recommends using an average of 3 caravans. This could mean an influx of 50 to 100 people into the hamlet putting significant pressure on the local community utilities and services, especially the already faltering mains water supply, with existing properties forced to have independent means of pressure boosting.

3. The DPD states that amenities should be accessible by foot, cycle & public transport within 1500m. The local shop in Pensford is due to close in 5 months' time, financial, retirement reasons. The shop has been on the market for over 2 years. The next shop is over 3 miles away, as is the dentist. The doctors' surgery is 5 miles away. No public transport runs to this site.
4. The scoring matrix does not take into account secondary schools, 4.5 miles away. In consultation with secondary school age travellers, walking to schools & urban areas is important for social integration. So say same age local children in recent Parish plan surveys.
5. Road accessibility – accessing public transport & shop is not ideal to either walk or drive. The lane is narrow, it floods at the bridge, and there are few passing places, no street lighting or pavement.

6. 2011 Filers Coaches[ next door to the proposed site] applied for retrospective parking for **8** coaches, which was refused on the grounds of

- ***' inappropriate use of Green Belt'***  
**It is a Site of Nature Conservation.**
- *'vehicle parked...would detract from the openness & rural character of this area'*
- *'local road system, is unsuitable in width, & alignment at junctions.*
- *'location is remote from services & public transport...*
- *Benefits ...clearly do not outweigh the harm by reason of appropriateness.*

#### **Have Highways been consulted?**

- 2005 BaNES Economic Development Dept turned down an application on the Old Colliery buildings site as
- *'...not in a sustainable location for a significant employment use...particularly unsuitable for HGV traffic.'*
- Contamination report during winter 2009/10 for the landowner, reported **arsenic concentrations exceeding MRLs**, stating that;  
*'certain areas are unsuitable for use in garden & landscape areas...600mm of Made ground would need to be removed & replaced'*

Thus creating many HGV movements during remediation works.

**Asbestos roofs** were also noted as a **significant hazard**.

#### **Is this a healthy place to live in? What about long term health issues?**

The mine workings are known to be unstable, remediation works are taking place now on one of the shafts.

#### **Has a mine survey been done?**

#### **Is this a safe place for people to live?**

We fully understand that BaNES needs to provide authorised sites but location of unauthorised sites over the past 10 yrs in BaNES indicates that travelling communities prefer to be near urban areas.

**Is it fair on the travellers to PUT them in an unhealthy, unsafe remote ghetto, that will put significant pressure on them and existing inhabitants?**