

My name is Karen Abolkheir and I am a member of the Stanton Wick Action Group

I am here again in respect of the progress of the Gypsy Traveller DPD and the processing of the major Planning Application on the Shale Tip at the Old Colliery, Stanton Wick, which recently has been withdrawn.

I have had no response to the questions I asked here on the 10th April, which causes further concern.

Despite what appears to be a tactical withdrawal of the Application, there remain unexplained significant errors in the processing of this major application and I ask again for answers to these relevant questions;

- Why was the application accepted and registered when by any reasonable measure it was inadequate, inaccurate and misleading? A minimum of 37 errors have been identified?
- Given the early advice on the errors and given the significance of these errors, why was the Application allowed to proceed for almost 4 months before its withdrawal by the Applicant?
- Why was the requirement waived for the Applicant to consult local residents, despite it being, major, significant and controversial?
- Officers were fully aware that the site was the subject of a special full Council meeting last June and was removed from the DPD last September, Why did they not treat the Application accordingly?
- How did a significant and misleading error relating to the size of the application site occur? (Originally stated as 0.6 hectares, later amended to 2.35 hectares but not made available to the public until after the comments period was closed)
- Why was the scale of the Application not questioned by the Planning Officers given that the measurement of the red line was 6.8 hectares?
- Why was this huge area not advised to the public?
- The Application for 12 pitches with ancillary buildings clearly indicates that each pitch would measure over 3,300 square metres. By BaNES own recommended sizing each proposed pitch would actually accommodate over 6 pitches. Or, put another way, the application site could accommodate a minimum of 72 pitches.

- Why has the Applicant has been advised that he can submit a revised application, free of charge? Where an application has significant and misleading errors and is withdrawn a new application should be made with a new fee. This is because the consultation and cost has to be repeated. But your Planning Office will know this.

The Council have a duty to all its Council tax payers to collect the correct fees, which are set on a national basis. The Council have not given us their calculation for the fees and we ask to see them?

Given the fundamental processing errors surrounding this Application we ask for the Cabinets assurance that any re-application or new application on this site will be rigorously tested before it is registered. Otherwise the perception will be that this application is favoured.

Local communities want to see reported progress on the development of the site at Lower Bristol Road and substantial progress on the Gypsy Traveller DPD. The absence of progress will naturally form assumptions that there are issues regarding either competency, complacency or equally concerning undue influence over the process and possibly a hidden agenda. This is understandable given the issues with the DPD last year and the postponement of the Cabinet debate on the issue, not once but twice. Whilst we acknowledge the pressure of work on officers with the Core Strategy, we point out that the Council have employed an officer specifically to progress the DPD. The delay serves no one except parties who may attempt to circumvent the Core Strategy and the DPD.

Thank you.