

Ref Item 14 – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) – Statement by Sue Osborne

My name is Sue Osborne and I make this statement on behalf of myself and on behalf of the Stanton Wick Action Group.

I refer to the officer's report for this meeting and set out the errors. I refer to the numbering within the report;

2.1. Cabinet are asked to note a "stock take" which has commenced. There is no reference to the Cabinet decision which authorised such action.

A "stock take" is not an appropriate response to the clear demonstration of a deeply flawed process. The Cabinet should stop and re-start.

All sites available within BaNES that can meet public base criteria should be taken forward for evaluation, irrespective of the unlawful Decision 7.

3.4. Contrary to advice given, deliverability on a financial basis is fundamental and should be considered at an early stage not at Draft Plan stage. What is the point of consulting on a site that is not deliverable?

The Detailed Site Assessment Report - April 2012- 2.8 says 'suitability , availability and achievability were assessed to determine whether sites should be identified as preferred options for allocation. 2.12 says ' to assess achievability all known constraints were identified to draw out site delivery costs such as infrastructure and remediation works'

So which is it? The site **has been** assessed for achievability, **or it won't be assessed** until draft plan stage?

4.1. We refer you to these words and ask that you ensure your outcomes meet these criteria, promoting positive lives for everyone, creating neighbourhoods where people are proud to live, improving community cohesion.

5.2. A review of this paragraph will clearly underline why a stop of the process is necessary.

5.3. The Scoring Matrix did not result in confusion; it resulted in questions surrounding its inconsistent application. Or was there predetermination to self select a 'large scale site' and thus ' reduce the need to allocate and develop land elsewhere'. This entirely subjective assessment without effective comparison will again prove to be flawed and disruptive.

5.12. We disagree with your officer's submission that the information received on the certain sites was not a "show stopper". There is clear evidence in respect of the Stanton Wick site that it is undeliverable, which we guess in your officer's parlance, stops this particular show?

5.15, 5.16, 5.17, all display a lack of attention and commitment to attend to basic investigation and reporting. After over 4 months, this cannot be acceptable as a reasoned consideration of site restraints.

5.19. The domination of the nearest settled community is entirely contrary to Government Policy. It appears this policy was ignored.

Ref Item 14 – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development
Plan Document (DPD) – Statement by Sue Osborne

5.20. Your own Detailed Site Assessment Report claims that the achievability exercise was completed to bring forward SW as a Preferred Option.

Why have the following third party comments been omitted from the officers report?

- English Heritage –consider historic and social significance
- Environment Agency – Salters Brook identified as potential site constraint
- Wessex Water – All sites can be connected to water and foul sewerage but at what cost?
- Avon Wildlife Trust – recommendations which are significant and detrimental to the proposals.
- The Gypsy Council – The recommendation for smaller sites (the Stanton Wick site is very large) is not mentioned in the officers report.

These omissions from the officers report which go further to underline the hopeless mess of a process and the complete nonsense of a proposal to consider SW for development.

We hope you will take steps to ensure that this deeply flawed process stops before further damage is done to your settled communities and your reputation.