My name is Clarke Osborne; I am a resident of Stanton Wick and represent the Stanton Wick Action Group

Further to my submission at your last Cabinet meeting on 10th April, I have not received any response to the questions I raised. These were in connection with the report from ORS updating the Needs Assessment of the DPD for Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Show People.

An amended version of the report has now been published on the Council web-site. 1 of the references to the site at Stanton Wick has been removed. The 2 references made by Maggie Smith-Bendell inexplicably remain.

To summarise the questions raised at your last meeting;

- How do the Council justify the brief for the update of the Needs Assessment including a requirement to report on individual site preferences which must seek to mislead the reader and cause concern to specific settled communities?
- Why was the procurement process for the report so rushed and why was the contract awarded in the absence of any competing bid?
- Why was the report, completed in December 2012 not published until Saturday 2nd March – 2 days before the Special Council meeting to debate the Core Strategy on the following Monday?
- Why was a member of the Gypsy and Traveller community who is not resident in the District interviewed?
- Why was the conflict of interest by Maggie Smith-Bendell not disclosed? She was an agent for the Planning Application (recently withdrawn) for the Stanton Wick site.

Following the publication of the Updated report further questions arise;

- What instructions were given to ORS to amend the report?
- What justification does the Council rely on when a comment made by a Showman regarding the Stanton Wick site was removed from the report and the two comments by Maggie Smith-Bendell allowed remaining?
- What action does the Cabinet intend to take to rectify the report and remove all the comments from the report?

We have asked the Cabinet to investigate the commissioning and acceptance of this report by their officers and to report their findings. We remain of the opinion that the Cabinet have been badly served in this instance. We feel that the evidence base is not robust or accurate enough to satisfy the inspector who will review the DPD as part of the Core Strategy.

Given the foregoing, the lack of reported progress with the DPD and a likely further Planning Application on the Stanton Wick site, we ask that the Council reassure us that no weight can or will be placed in respect of the reported preferences for the Stanton Wick site and to confirm that the Council has firmly rejected the Stanton Wick site as a possible site within the DPD and will not under any circumstances review that decision.