

MY NAME IS PHIL TOWNSHEND, I AM A RESIDENT OF STANTON WICK AND I'M A MEMBER OF THE STANTON WICK ACTION GROUP.

8 OF THE GROUP WILL BE SPEAKING THIS EVENING

AND IN THE 24 MINUTES THAT WE HAVE AVAILABLE TO US WE INTEND TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE PROPOSAL TO LOCATE A TRAVELLERS SITE AT THE OLD COLLIERY BUILDINGS IN STANTON WICK IS FLAWED,

UNSUSTAINABLE

AND NEITHER REPRESENTS THE INTERESTS OF THE TRAVELLERS NOR THE LOCAL COMMUNITY.

MY PARTNER AND I PURCHASED OUR HOUSE IN STANTON WICK IN SEPTEMBER 2011. DURING THE LEGAL PROCESS WE IDENTIFIED VARIOUS PLANNING APPLICATIONS, ONE OF WHICH IN PARTICULAR RELATED TO AN INCREASE OF VEHICLES OPERATING OUT OF A LOCAL COACHYARD.

THERE WERE SEVERAL APPLICATIONS AND REJECTIONS OF WHICH THE MOST RECENT IN NOVEMBER 2011 WAS REJECTED AGAIN ON APPEAL.

IT IS WORTH NOTING THAT ALL THESE APPLICATIONS TO EXTEND A COACHYARD USE BY ONLY 8 VEHICLES WAS BASED ON ;

"INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GREENBELT THAT WOULD DETRACT FROM THE OPENESS AND RURAL CHARACTOR OF THE AREA. IN ADDITION INCREASED TRAFFIC FLOW WOULD RESULT IN CONJESTION AND INCONVENIENCE TO OTHER ROAD USERS AND MENTION WAS ALSO MADE AS TO THE UNSUSTAINABILITY OF THE LOCATION.

REMEMBER THE COACH YARD APPLICATION WAS FOR THE USE OF AN ADDITIONAL 8 VEHICLES !!!

AFTER LENGTHY CONSULTATION WITH OUR LAWYER, WE DECIDED TO PROCEED WITH OUR PURCHASE ON THE BASIS OF STANTON WICK BEING SITUATED WITHIN GREENBELT AND WHERE THE LOCAL AUTHORITY HAD SHOWN ITSELF TO RESPECT THE GREENBELT BY CONTINUALLY REJECTING THESE PLANNING APPLICATIONS.

I AM THEREFORE FINDING IT INCREASINGLY DIFFICULT TO RECONCILE THAT AN ADDITIONAL 8 VEHICLES ARE DEEMED TO BE INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT AND THE INCREASED TRAFFIC WOULD CAUSE CONJESTION AND INCONVENIENCE TO OTHER

ROAD USERS, YET A 15 PERMANENT PITCH TRAVELLER SITE WITH AN ADDITIONAL 5 TRANSIT PITCHES IS DEEMED

APPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT....

AND THE INCREASED TRAFFIC THIS WOULD BRING TO STANTON WICK WOULD NOT CAUSE CONGESTION AND INCONVENIENCE.

FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO DON'T KNOW THE GEOGRAPHY, THE 2 LOCATIONS ARE NEXT DOOR TO EACH OTHER, EVEN SHARING THE SAME POSTCODE !

HOW CAN ONE BE APPROPRIATE YET THE OTHER INAPPROPRIATE ? HOW CAN IT BE THAT ONE WILL PUT A STRAIN ON TRAFFIC IN WICK LANE, YET THE OTHER WILL NOT ?

RECENTLY ISSUED NATIONAL GUIDELINES RELATING TO TRAVELLERS IN THE GREENBELT CLEARLY STATE, AND I QUOTE ;

"INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT IS HARMFUL TO THE GREENBELT AND SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED EXCEPT IN VERY EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES"

"TRAVELLER SITES (TEMPORARY OR PERMANENT) IN THE GREEN BELT ARE INAPPROPRIATE"

BANES, YOUR PROPOSAL IS FLAWED,

YOUR INTERPRETATION IS INCONSISTENT

AND IT WOULD APPEAR THAT YOU ARE PREPARED TO FLY IN THE FACE OF NATIONAL GUIDELINES TO FORCE THIS PROPOSAL ONTO STANTON WICK RESIDENTS. WHATEVER HAPPENED TO LOCALISM ?

THERE ARE NO "VERY EXCEPTION CIRCUMSTANCES".