

Speaking on behalf of Stanton Wick Action Group. Statement by Chris Ree

Re Staton Wick Colliery Proposed Site: Implications for Local Amenities and Infrastructure

I wish to consider the implications the Stanton Wick proposal on local amenities and infrastructure.

We have consulted the document 'Govt Planning Policy for Travellers March 2012' and note that it states that local planning authorities should:

- ❖ **enable access to health, education and welfare and employment infrastructure and to have due regard to protection of local amenity.**
- ❖ **ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest community**
- ❖ **ensure that policies promote integrated coexistence between site and community, and importantly avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services**

It is plain that the Stanton Wick Colliery proposal satisfies none of these criteria:

- Access to Schools
The matrix used in assessment scores the Colliery site as 1. i.e 1.5km to local school via a safe walking route. This is incorrect. There is no safe walking route as described. Access to Pensford requires the use of a minor lane which has a gradient of 1:5, has no lights, no pavement, is mostly single track, has 2 blind 90 degree bends and floods frequently. When icy you take your chances.
- Access to shops
With regard to proximity to a food shop similar considerations apply as the shop and school are very close and for the same reasoning above access via safe walking route is nonexistent and should score 0 and not 1 on the matrix. Furthermore, the above food shop is not capable of providing for a weekly shop. All supermarkets are more than 2.4 miles away and none are on a direct bus route.
- Access to Health : In the matter of access to health facilities the situation is even worse. All surgeries are at least 5 miles away.
- Domination of nearest community: The nearest settled community is Stanton Wick, a hamlet of 26 dwellings and 60 people and so the proposal clearly contravenes this instruction. The proposal for 20 pitches exceeds guidance (Circular JAN 2006), restated in local DPD, which recommends a maximum of 15 pitches and the DPD stated preference for sites of no more than 5 pitches.
- Infrastructure: The sheer size of this proposal will place huge strain on local infrastructure.
 - For schools, it is obvious that a large influx of students would cause disruption to the functioning and character of any local small school.
 - Stanton Wick has a marginal water supply. Doubling the population would take it beyond breaking point.
 - The site may well accommodate individuals of high health need and sited as it is on the periphery of all local practices areas would constitute a major challenge for the provision Primary Health Care.

- The site has no mains sewage. Septic tanks for a site of this size may cause significant contamination of Salters Brook and footpath to the north east. It may be necessary to use tankers with consequences for traffic.
- It is inconceivable that the net effect of all this on local infrastructure will assist 'achieve sustainable development'.

BANES Site Allocation and Development Plan Document states that is essential that sites provide a healthy and safe environment. Sites should therefore not be located on contaminated land.

- The site is contaminated with arsenic. A survey in 2010 revealed levels 'indicating a potentially significant risk to health'. The stated remediation strategy involved removal 60cm of surface soil to be replaced by 15cm of 'clean' topsoil with a geomembrane underneath. It is likely that much of the removed soil will require offsite disposal. It is important to note that the survey was limited to those areas previously built upon and contamination could exist in a wider area.
- In addition above normal levels of Carbon Dioxide in ground gas assessments require protective measures applied to some aspects of residential development. I acknowledge that all of these issues are solvable but the cost of doing so is bound to be very large and some of the recommendations extremely problematic.
- The site is possibly hazardous with respect to soil instability and subsidence.

In summary for this site, walking access to shops and schools is extremely poor, access to drs is worse, there no employment, the site is contaminated and potentially hazardous, the site will dominate and overwhelm the local community and swamp its infrastructure. It is not sustainable, it is extremely poor choice of site and should be removed from consideration.

Chris Ree 8 5 12