

WHITCHURCH VILLAGE ACTION GROUP

THIS SELECTION PROCESS FOR GYPSY SITES SHOULD BE HALTED AS IT HAS PROVEN TO BE SERIOUSLY FLAWED IN MANY CASES INCLUDING PARCEL 7100 AT WOOLLARD LANE, WHITCHURCH VILLAGE. OFFICERS HAVE FINALLY ADMITTED THEIR ERROR IN DESIGNATING THIS SITE AS BROWNFIELD WHEN IT IS GREENFIELD AND THIS DISADVANTAGED THE SELECTION PROCESS RIGHT FROM THE START. FURTHERMORE THE SITE IS NEAR THE HAZARD OF A HIGH PRESSURE GAS MAIN, A CRITERIA THIS SITE FAILS ON THE COUNCILS SCORING SYSTEM. OFFICERS REFUSE TO REPLY TO OUR LETTERS ADDRESSING THE IMPLICATION OF THIS HAZARD. THE SITES ON THE PREFERRED OPTION LIST CANNOT BE FAIRLY COMPARED TO THE 17 OF THE BEST 23 SITES ORIGINALLY CONSIDERED OR POSSIBLY 20 OF THE BEST 23 SITES ORIGINALLY CONSIDERED IF THREE MORE SITES ARE DROPPED TODAY. IF THE COUNCIL DECIDE TO CREATE A NEW SCORING SYSTEM THAT MAKES FOR FURTHER DISPUTE AS THE ORIGINAL SCORING SYSTEM WAS UNSOUND.

THE HISTORY OF THIS SITE MUST BE REVISITED FOR IT IS DOUBTFUL THAT THE COUNCIL HAS GONE THROUGH THE PROPER PROCEDURES TO REMOVE THE AREA FROM THE GREEN BELT WHEN INVITING THE OCCUPANTS AT THE ILLEGAL SITE IN 2010 TO APPLY FOR RETROSPECTIVE PLANNING DESPITE INSPECTORS TWICE REFUSING PLANNING PERMISSION AT THIS SITE STATING HERE AND AT QUEEN CHARLTON THAT THERE ARE NO VERY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES OUTWEIGHTING PUBLIC INTEREST.

AS YOU SEE THERE ARE CLEAR GROUNDS FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW ON THE PARCEL 7100 SITE AND OTHERS.

I WOULD FURTHER LIKE TO DRAW YOUR ATTENTION TO THE WAY RATE PAYERS MONEY IS BEING SPENT OR SHOULD I SAY MISSPENT WITH REGARD TO THE ILLEGAL GYPSY SITE AT LAND ADJACENT TO THE POPLARS, REDLYNCH LANE, QUEEN CHARLTON. THIS COUNCIL DECIDED TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION AND THE APPLICANT APPEALED AS RECENTLY AS SEPT. 2010 (FOR REF. APPEAL REF: APP/F0114/A/10/2127069). THIS COUNCIL SPENT MUCH TIME AND MONEY UPHOLDING THEIR REFUSAL DECISION AND THE INSPECTOR CONCURRED. THE INSPECTOR MADE DETAILED REFERENCE TO HEALTH ISSUES AND CONCLUDED THAT "MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS IN FAVOUR OF THE PROPOSAL, EVEN WHEN ADDED TOGETHER, WOULD NOT CLEARLY OUTWEIGH THE SUBSTANTIAL HARM WHICH THE PROPOSAL WOULD CAUSE" AND THAT HUMAN RIGHTS WERE NOT VIOLATED AS "THE PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST CANNOT BE ACHIEVED BY MEANS THAT ARE LESS INTERFERING WITH THE APPELLANT'S RIGHTS". THE APPEAL WAS REFUSED. I REPEAT – THE APPEAL WAS REFUSED.

I NOW ASK, AFTER SPENDING RATEPAYERS MONEY TO STOP THIS GYPSY SITE WHY IT IS NOW BEING OFFERED UP ON THE PREFERRED OPTIONS SITES LIST?

I CONCLUDE BY REMINDING COUNCIL THAT BOTH COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS MUST ACT WITHIN THEIR REMIT AND ARE ACCOUNTABLE TO RATEPAYERS.