

Firstly, the comments and observations contained in this statement only represent the thoughts my husband and I.

I am saddened that as a resident of Stanton Wick, I have not been notified or invited to join any previous discussions regarding the proposed Travelers site, unlike BANES, the landowner and Traveler representatives

Due to the extremely low and dubious score achieved regarding the site suitability exercise, I am very concerned that even at this early stage, there appears to be a desperation on the part of BANES to see this site become there answer to a contentious issue, whilst showing little or no regard to the Travellers true requirements and government planning criteria. BANES appears to have its own agenda

I believe the Call for Land from private owners was a mistake that could lead the Council to become embroiled in a huge number of driving issues regarding the reasons behind such an offer, including neighborly disputes.

Clearly at present, the bulk of this land has a very low value, as after all it is made up of an industrial dumping ground, liable to be heavily contaminated. The planning consent held by the owner covers only around 10 percent of the total proposed travelers site. It also contains a raft of costly conditions including the remediation of arsenic contamination. Others pointing toward fine restoration details clearly suggest that this building has an architectural value. The conversion of this site in my view would run into many hundreds of thousands of pounds, which given the current financial climate would

have a significant effect on the sites true current value as it stands.

The site is advertised at present for £1.25 million, which in my opinion clearly constitutes a paper exercise.

As mentioned the Planning consent referred to by the officer in her appraisal only covers an area of around 10 percent of the total site which is made up of 2 separate land registry titles. The fact that the current planning consent has been linked by BANES to suggest that it covers the whole site is at best a mistake, at worst a totally misleading statement. Indeed, it is debatable to suggest that most of the land could even be called brown field due to its undeveloped state.

The consulted travelers involved obviously have there own view as to why this site seems so attractive but they deserve a sustainable quality of life that must override all other considerations that bare no relationship to the written criteria contained in the West of England Gypsy Travellers Accommodation Assessment and the site scoring matrix. Why else carry out such exercises.

A syndic could easily be forgiven for thinking that BANES, the land owner and the consulted travelers all have motives to propel the sites popularity, most of which will not be found in any written policy or criteria. Fortunately, I have full faith in the central government policies regarding this issue and as a BANES taxpayer insist on their proper interpretation and implementation. If this is not the case, a judicial review will no doubt result.

