

Respondent: 13 / 1 Name: Ms Annabel Jackson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Further to my acknowledgement dated 27 August, I am now in a position to let you have a reply to your letter of 20 August.

Pensford Colliery site is currently designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) in the deposit Wansdyke Local Plan and has been recognised as having significant wildlife interest for many years.

The site does have a complicated planning history, being identified as a site for limited regrading and landscape improvements within the Minerals Local Plan. In the past the owners have applied for planning permission to remove shale and restore the site for wildlife and agricultural benefit. This was refused.

The designation of the site as an SNCI in the Wansdyke Local Plan is currently subject to an objection at the Local Plan Inquiry. The Council will be defending the SNCI designation.

In terms of a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) declaration, the site does appear to meet the declaration criteria, and this approach would fit well with out- objectives for declaring LNRs in Bath & North East Somerset. However English Nature would need to be consulted to confirm this potential

The proposal would secure the long term future of the wildlife interests of the site, and would enable public access to the site to be formalised. Clearly, compulsory purchase would incur costs to the Council if pursued, but the principle of the approach would seem to be the right one. We are seeking to protect the site through the Local Plan Inquiry and it would be most appropriate to follow this through with a commitment to fulfil all the powers we have to secure the site in perpetuity.

Clearly the Council will need to consider the potential liabilities it might inherit through designation of the site as a Local Nature Reserve and indeed any opportunities for external funding through lottery, landfill tax which might be available to purchase and manage the site. I have asked Cherril Copperwheat, Environmental Practice Manager, to give this matter further consideration and to contact you for a more detailed discussion.

Respondent: 23 / 1 Name: Ms Sian Parry Organisation: Avon Wildlife Trust

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The modified application for Pensford Colliery has failed to take into consideration the main environmental concerns

stressed by the Wildlife Trust and others when commenting on the original proposal. Hence the Trust once again wishes to object to what it considers to be an in-appropriate development for a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.

To summarise, the site comprises a rich variety of plant communities that have developed on what has proven to be an unusual combination of rock material, acidity and drainage. The site supports over 100 species of plants, of which 13 are County scarce and 3 County rare. Other notable species observed include purple hairstreak butterfly, hobby, turtle dove and green woodpecker. Additionally, adders and slow-worms were observed, both of which are protected under the 1981 (Amended) Wildlife and Countryside Act. The proposed operations would inevitably involve the clearance of this rich plant life and, at the very least, sever disturbance to the animal species.

The Trust: feels that such a scheme would be wholly incompatible with Avon County Council's current environment.1.1 standards and hopes that you feel you can agree with this position. If you have any further queries or require a more detailed response please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respondent: 106 / 1 Name: Mrs Kathy Curling Organisation: Pro Planning

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The accompanying representations on behalf of SWAG (Stanton Wick Action Group) set out the details why it is considered the Old Colliery Site, Stanton Wick is not suitable as defined in paragraph 2.9 of the Detailed Site Assessment Report, is not available as defined in paragraph 2.11 and is not achievable as defined in paragraph 2.12.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The Council's assessment, and particularly the assessment matrix, is considered to be flawed with incorrect weightings for the constraints in terms of proximity, nature conservation value, contamination, brownfield land and highways accessibility and safety. The explanation and justification are given in the Representations Report.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Given that the process is deemed to be flawed, it has been shown that the Old Colliery, Stanton Wick site certainly should not be taken forward as a preferred allocation, but moreover, the whole process should be halted and a re-assessment carried out of all potential alternative sites.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. These representations are submitted by Kathy Curling MA(Cantab) DipTP MRTPI, of Pro Planning, on behalf of Stanton Wick Action Group (SWAG) in response to Bath & North East Somerset Council's publication of their Preferred Options Development Plan Document on Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations. SWAG has instructed Pro Planning in relation to all matters concerning this DPD. The representations are to be submitted by 18 July 2012. Kathy Curling has lived and worked as a Planning Consultant in the Bath/Bristol area for some 25 years.

1.2. Although the representations are primarily on behalf of SWAG, there has been close cooperation with the Keynsham Action Group (KAG) and Bath Old Road Action Group (BORAG) in relation to the sites at Ellsbridge House, Keynsham and the former Radstock Infants School Canteen site respectively. The site specific comments clearly relate solely to the former colliery site at Stanton Wick, whereas most of the comments on procedural matters are also relevant to the sites in Keynsham and Radstock. The communities primarily affected by the proposed designation at the Old Colliery site, Stanton Wick are Stanton Wick, Pensford and Stanton Drew. The site lies within the Parish of Stanton Drew.

1.3. The Council's Response Form gives a prescribed format of questions. The issues raised in these representations are however, more wide-ranging and do not fall neatly under the headings of the four questions posed. The approach is therefore to set out in this report the full scope of the issues of concern to SWAG and then, by way of summary, tailor that into the format in the response form.

1.4. The matters covered in these representations are as follows:

- Policies relevant to the former colliery site at Stanton Wick as a preferred gypsy and travellers site and the issues arising.
- Procedural requirements for preparing DPDs, including the Council's evidence base and consultation procedures with reference to statutory regulations and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).
- Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for this DPD.

2. POLICY

2.1.Two aspects of statutory regulations and policy are relevant to these representations. The first relates to preparation of DPDs, and the second to determination of planning applications.

1.Regulations require DPD policy to follow from and be consistent with the higher order policy contained in the Council's Core Strategy. These representations will show that the Council's emerging DPD on Gypsies and Travellers Site Allocations is not consistent with Core Strategy Policy CP11 as it was submitted for examination.

DPD preparation is also obliged to comply with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) adopted in 2007 which, the representations will show, it does not.

In relation to national policy as contained within Government Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012, it will be shown that, although the Core Strategy Policy CP11 is consistent, the emerging DPD is not.

2. Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that any planning application must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. These representations will demonstrate that, any planning application for a gypsy and travellers site at Stanton Wick colliery, could not comply with either current or emerging Development Plan Policy and would have to be refused. Development Plan policy currently comprises the Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan, adopted in October 2007. Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012

2.2.As with Development Plan policies, this Government document:

"must be taken into account in the preparation of Development Plans, and is a material consideration in planning decisions." (Para. 2)

These representations will show that the preferred allocation at Stanton Wick colliery is not consistent with this national policy and should be removed from the DPD allocations.

2.3. Paragraph 4 includes Green Belt as the only policy designation expressly referred to in the Government's aims for travellers sites:

"Plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development."

Paragraph 14 elaborates that:

"Travellers sites in Green Belt are inappropriate development."

"Inappropriate development is harmful to Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances."

BANES have offered no grounds to demonstrate why they might consider there to be very special circumstances to justify shortlisting Stanton Wick colliery as a preferred DPD allocation. The preferred site allocation does not therefore comply with Policy E.

2.4.Under Policy B Councils are obliged to prepare their DPDs in accordance with policies in the National Planning Policy Framework, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The site at Stanton Wick colliery is not sustainably located in that it is remote, the nearest villages are Stanton Wick and Pensford, remote from any services including education, shop, health or other community facilities, and the route linking the site to the principal service centre at Pensford cannot viably be upgraded. More detailed information on each of these aspects is provided throughout the representations.

2.5. In paragraph 9, Councils are required to:

"a. Identify and update annually, a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against their locally set target."

To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now and the development should be viable. As the representations will elaborate upon, the Stanton Wick site is not viable in view of the infrastructure costs to upgrade the highway network to a satisfactory and safe standard, and to remediate the contaminated site.

2.6. The Council in this DPD is relying on an assessment of need carried out in 2007. It is not therefore an up to date basis

upon which to fix the level of provision sought through the emerging DPD.

2.7. Paragraph 11 requires Councils to ensure that travellers sites are sustainable, economically, socially and environmentally. Eight criteria are given, the Stanton Wick colliery site fails to comply with four of them.

“(a) Promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community.”
 The Council’s consultations procedures to date have done little to deliver this objective.

“(b) Promote, in collaboration with commissioners of health services, access to appropriate health services.”

The site is wholly remote to any health services and, given the difficult highways access to the site, this could only be achieved in situ, creating an isolated traveller community rather than an integrated social fabric with the existing community.

“(c) Ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis.”

The nearest schools are at Pensford and Stanton Wick; neither can be accessed safely by bike or on foot or by any other sustainable means. Capacity is understood to be an issue at both schools, and their current respective sizes, compared with the potential number of the gypsy and traveller children, would result in a disproportionate representation of gypsies and travellers children at the schools.

“(e) Provide for proper consideration of the effect of local environmental quality on the health and well-being of any travellers that may locate there or on others as a result of new development.”

There has been no proper consideration of the existing contamination on the site and, in the event that the specifically allocated site is remediated but the surrounding tip areas remain untreated, the consequential impact on gypsy children’s health as they play in these surrounding areas.

2.8. All of these parameters fall within Policy B: Planning for Travellers Sites, again confirming the extent to which the preferred designation fails to comply with Government policy.

2.9. Policy C: Sites in Rural Areas and the Countryside requires in paragraph 12 that:

“When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, the Local Planning Authority should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community.”

Since the only justification for retaining Stanton Wick colliery given to date has been its “size”, it is clear that the local community at Stanton Wick would be unacceptably dominated by the proposed establishment of a large gypsy and traveller community on the former colliery site.

2.10. The criteria relied upon to assess highways capacity, domination of the nearest settlement, the number of school places and, in part, noise and nuisance potential requires the consideration of the projected number of people and children, yet there is no reference in BANES information to the likely numbers. Further there is a discrepancy between BANES estimated number of vans per pitch (1.7) and the government’s estimates (3.2).

2.11. Paragraph 23 of Policy H states:

“Local Planning Authorities should strictly limit new travellers site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the Development Plan.”

Stanton Wick colliery can only be described as a site in the open countryside remote to the nearest settlements; therefore its designation is inconsistent with Policy H.

2.12. In summary, the most recent and relevant Government policy guidance for designating gypsy and travellers sites gives a range of plan-making and decision-taking policy criteria. The Stanton Wick colliery site fails to comply with most of these policies, so that it remains inconceivable that it could continue as a preferred site designation as the DPD progresses.

BANES Core Strategy: Policy CP11

2.13 This emerging Core Strategy Policy on Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople gives seven criteria against which such proposals are to be assessed. Stanton Wick colliery site fails to comply with five of them.

“(a) Local community services and facilities including shops, schools and health facilities should be accessible by foot, cycle and public transport.”

There is a Post Office and school at Pensford, but it is not accessible by foot or cycle and there is no public transport. The proposed site is some 1600 metres from the village, beyond the recommended walking distance to school. The road is single track, unlit and has no footpath. Onward visibility is poor and there is a steep hill to negotiate. It is not suitable for walking or children cycling. The suggestion to use the existing public footpath down to the A37 would only be acceptable if this were to be upgraded, and presumably lit, to make it safe as a route to school during the winter.

The limitations of the range and scale of facilities at Pensford, and the difficult access between the proposed site and the village, together put the proposed designation in conflict with criteria (a).

“(b) Satisfactory means of access can be provided and an existing highway network is adequate to service the site.”

This has been shown not to be the case and upgrading the highway network to make it suitable, including upgrading the bridge over the disused railway line, would likely make development of the site unviable.

“(e) Adequate services including utilities, foul and surface water and waste disposal can be provided as well as any necessary pollution control measures.”

No information is available on the level of services available to serve the proposed large gypsy and travellers site, but they are known to be limited and anticipated to be inadequate. Specifically, there is no mains drainage. No account has been taken of the costs or feasibility of upgrading these services.

More particularly the site is known to be contaminated and, it is anticipated, remediation would have to be carried out prior to its development as a gypsy and travellers site. To date no indication can be ascertained as to who would assume responsibility, the existing land owner, the Council or the site developer. Furthermore, no full site investigation has been carried out, other than for the limited area occupied by the buildings for a previous application, so there is no evidence base on which to support the proposal as a viable and deliverable allocation.

“(f) Use of this site must have no harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.”

There are two adjacent residential occupiers whose amenity would undoubtedly be compromised by the proposed scale of development.

“(g) The site should avoid areas at high risk of flooding and have no adverse on protected habitats and species, nationally recognised designations and natural resources.”

The site is in part designated for nature conservation. There are thought to be European protected species. No ecological survey has been carried out without which it is anticipated that the Council could be in breach of the Habitats Directive and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. They are also in breach of policy if they can carry the site forward to the next round of consultation without having carried out an ecological survey.

2.14. Whilst it is acknowledged that Policy CP11 could be amended by the Inspector following its examination, it is nevertheless a material consideration for the assessment of sites to be promoted through the DPD. Against the foregoing evaluation it is incomprehensible and inconceivable to SWAG that Stanton Wick colliery could be carried forward into the draft DPD. If however, the Council are minded to do so, then it is imperative that a site investigation be carried out to establish the nature and extent of the contamination, that an ecological study be carried out over the summer months to establish the species present and, a transport assessment to detail the engineering works required to deliver a safe and satisfactory highway network both to Pensford and Stanton Wick.

BANES Local Plan: October 2007

2.15. Whilst this remains the only statutory Development Plan for BANES it is relevant to consider how a planning application for a gypsy and travellers site at Stanton Wick colliery would be evaluated. There is some overlap with the issues already evaluated such as Green Belt, policies specifically relating to gypsies and travellers site proposals, sustainability and technical matters of highways and access, nature conservation and contamination. There are also further issues to be addressed including protected employment sites.

Settlement Classification

2.16. Both Pensford and Stanton Wick are classified as R.3 Rural Settlements in the Local Plan. Paragraph B1.13 described these settlements as:

“There is limited provision of and accessibility to local facilities, services and employment. Some also have environmental constraints and therefore development should be more restricted than envisaged within R1 Settlements. This approach will avoid exacerbating unsustainable travel patterns and protect the countryside. Many of these settlements are also covered by Green Belt designation which further restricts development infilling and these are categorised as R.3 Rural Settlements.”

Bearing in mind that this is referring to restricted development within the Development Boundaries to avoid exacerbating unsustainable travel patterns and protect the countryside, how much more then should it apply to an isolated rural location as proposed at Stanton Wick colliery.

Gypsies and Other Travelling People, Policy HG.16

2.17. Policy HG.16 is a criteria based policy. The proposal at Stanton Wick colliery does not comply with:

1. access to local services, facilities to public transport,
2. safe and convenient access to the road network,
3. capable of being landscaped to ensure that it blends in with its surroundings,
4. adequate services, and
5. harmful impact on the amenities of local residents.

2.18. In addition paragraph B7.108 confirms that these proposals would normally be inappropriate in Green Belt locations and that, if sites are proposed outside existing settlements, they need to be within reasonable distances of local services and facilities.

2.19. Although Policy HG.16 is carried forward as a saved Local Plan policy, insofar as it is not consistent with more recent national policy, legislation requires that the more recent policy should prevail. This principle applies to the word ‘normally’ in the Local Plan Green Belt policy which is excluded in the 2012 national policy. The gypsy and travellers site proposal at Stanton Wick colliery would in any event fail against the tests of Policy HG.16.

Green Belt Policies GB.1 and GB.2

2.20. Green Belt Policy GB.1 gives the accepted categories of development which do not constitute inappropriate development in Green Belt. Any other form of development would have to demonstrate “very special circumstances” to justify the harm to the Green Belt which would arise. Government policy is clear that gypsy and travellers sites constitute inappropriate Green Belt development. The Council have not put forward any very special circumstances to justify their proposed DPD allocation at Stanton Wick colliery.

Policy GB.2

2.21. This policy precludes:

“development within or visible from the Green Belt which would be visually detrimental to the Green Belt by reason of its siting, design or materials used for its construction.”

By their nature gypsy and travellers sites tend to be visually more detrimental than built structures so that, although the existing site is not visually attractive, refurbishment of the existing buildings would be likely to present a more attractive end result than the development of a gypsy and travellers site.

Landscape Policy NE.1

2.22. This policy precludes development which:

“Does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.”

For the same reasons as given in relation to the visual amenity of the Green Belt, the proposed DPD designation of Stanton Wick colliery would be unlikely to be consistent with Policy NE.1.

Trees and Woodlands, Policy NE.4

2.23. The trees and woodlands within and surrounding the former Stanton Wick colliery are understood to be a valuable mixed woodland resource. It therefore falls within the scope of Policy NE.4 where development is only to be permitted if:

“1. It does not have an adverse impact on trees and woodlands, wildlife, landscape, historic, amenity, production or cultural value and

2. It includes the appropriate retention and new planting of trees and woodland; and

3. It does not have an adverse impact on the veteran trees;”

It is thought that neither the landowner nor Council have carried out any arboricultural assessment of these woodland areas or the potential threat to their wellbeing from the proposed DPD designation. This work would need to be carried out before the Council could proceed to carry forward the Stanton Wick colliery site as a draft DPD designation.

2.24 This policy is perhaps all the more significant given the note in paragraph C2.26 that the District’s woodland cover is less than half the national average. Where there is valuable woodland therefore it merits protection in accordance with this Development Plan policy.

Nature Conservation

2.25. Local Plan Policy NE.9 protects designated sites and Policy NE.11 protects species and their habitats, of importance to BANES. In both cases development is not to be permitted unless:

“1. Material factors are sufficient to override the local biological value of the site; and

2. Any harm to the nature conservation value of the site is minimised; and

3. Compensatory reversion of at least equal nature conservation value is made.”

It is considered that the Council should have, at the very least, established the evidence base of what the nature conservation value is at Stanton Wick colliery, before progressing to the preferred option stage. The reality is that the site is being designated even though there is virtually no evidence base to demonstrate that the serious constraints are capable of being addressed, consistently with national and local statutory policy, without which the site should not be being brought forward.

Transport Requirements Policy T.24

2.26. Policy T.24 has eight provisos, all of which have to be satisfied for development to be permitted. The proposed gypsy and travellers site at Stanton Wick colliery would fail to meet seven of these, for reasons which have already been explained. These are:

“1. A high standard of highway safety;

2. Safe and convenient access for pedestrians including those with a mobility impairment;

3. Safe access for cyclists and cycle parking;

4. Facilities for public transport including measures which would facilitate the early introduction or enhancement of services;

5. Adequate vehicular access having regard to environmental considerations and in addition;

6. It avoids the introduction of traffic of excessive volume, size or weight on to an unsuitable road system or into an environmentally sensitive area; and

8. Provision is made for any improvements to the transport system which are required to render the development proposal acceptable having regard to the safe and efficient functioning of the transport system and the traffic targets and related initiatives set out in the Local Transport Plan.”

As stated, the proposed DPD allocation does not meet any of these and should automatically fail as a designation against this policy alone.

Contaminated Land Policy ES.15

2.27. The policy sets out the requirement for any development which might be proposed at Stanton Wick colliery.

“On land known to be or strongly suspected of being contaminated, or where development may result in the release of contaminants from adjoining land, development would only be permitted where:

1. It would give rise to significant harm or significant risk of significant harm to health or the environment or cause pollution of any water course, water body or aquifer; and
2. Any remedial action required:
 - (a) Safeguards users or occupiers of the site or neighbouring land and
 - (b) Protects the environment and any buildings or services from contamination during its implementation and in the future.”

Stanton Wick quarry is known to be contaminated, but a site investigation has only been carried out for the front, developed part of the site. Again, before the Council proceed to allocate this already shortlisted site as a confirmed development site for gypsies and travellers, it is essential that a full site investigation be carried out to establish the extent of contamination and, more particularly, whether it will be practicable to remediate the whole of the site to which the gypsies and travellers will have access, to a suitable standard for their mode of lifestyle.

2.28. It seems incomprehensible that this site has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal with the complete absence of an evidence base on three of the key sustainable development criteria:

- Nature conservation’
- Contamination remediation, and
- Safe, suitable and sustainable site accessibility to facilities and services by foot, cycle and public transport.

2.29. This absence of any evidence base and the cursory way in which they are dealt with in the policy and assessment documents raises serious questions as to process and procedures carried out to date.

Conversion of Rural Buildings Policy ET.9

2.30. This policy sets priorities for the conversion of rural buildings to new uses. There is a general presumption in favour provided the existing buildings are in keeping with the surroundings and the appearance of the buildings would not be adversely affected. The existing building must also be sound and capable of conversion without substantial or complete reconstruction, or require major extension. In addition it must, individually or cumulatively, not result in dispersal of activity which prejudices town or village vitality.

2.31. Where however, the change is a proposed residential conversion, the criteria are more stringent, in that the applicant is obliged to make every reasonable attempt to secure suitable business re-use. Furthermore, it must not be in a position isolated from public services and community facilities and unrelated to an established group of buildings. Gypsies and Travellers sites are, in planning terms, a residential use. The existing buildings at Stanton Wick colliery were last used for employment purposes. Although there is consent for conversion to residential use, this has not been implemented. Before therefore an application for a gypsy and travellers site can be brought forward, the existing buildings would have to be placed on the market for a reasonable period, to establish whether there might be interest in re-use for business purposes. The need to address this issue introduces a significant time delay before the DPD allocation could be brought forward to planning application stage, as well as undermining its designation as an available and deliverable site. At present it is not.

2.32. Further, given that all of the criteria of Policy ET.9 apply, clearly any development, in addition to conversion of the existing buildings, would fall foul of Green Belt policies for new build development in Green Belt.

Local Plan Policy Summary

2.33. In summary therefore there is a wide range of statutory development policies carried forward in the BANES Local Plan against which any proposed development for a gypsy and travellers site at Stanton Wick colliery would have to be assessed and would fail. It is unlikely that the assessment would be any different as and when these policies are replaced by adopted Core Strategy policies, given that each of these factors is more than likely to remain as a valid and significant consideration to development of the site.

Summary

2.34. This section has set out the national and Development Plan policies against which any gypsy and travellers site proposed allocation or planning application must be assessed. It has demonstrated that there is virtually no policy support

for the proposed DPD gypsy and travellers site designation at Stanton Wick colliery. Conversely, at every level of planning policy, there are a range of reasons why the proposed designation should proceed no further, at least at this stage, until a proper evidence base has been prepared.

2.35. It is incomprehensible to SWAG and their advisers how or why the Council are continuing to retain this site in their shortlist when these points are being brought to their attention, having been so demonstrably justified and substantiated.

3. PROCEDURES

3.1 The fact that the shortlist of sites in the Council's Preferred Options DPD on gypsy and travellers site allocations is so flawed, particularly with regard to Stanton Wick colliery is, in many respects, an inevitable outcome of the actual or perceived flaws in the process to date.

3.2 There are discrepancies between what the Council claim they will do, and what they actually do, in their Statement of Community Involvement, the Sustainability Assessment for this DPD and in the matrix for evaluating the long list of sites. Many of these flaws have been drawn to the Council's attention, particularly in preparation for the extraordinary Full Council meeting on 18 June 2012. Given the outcome of that meeting, these representations are obliged to re-state at least some of those flaws. The list below however, is not intended to be comprehensive.

3.3. It is considered by SWAG and their advisers that these mistakes need not have occurred, had consultation been carried out as, it is considered, it should have been, to comply with regulations for the preparation of DPDs and the Council's own policy documents on these matters, including the SCI approved in 2007. The following section examines these in more detail.

Issues and Options Paper November 2011

3.4. The following comments are not on the content or approach proposed in the Issues and Options Paper; it is acknowledged that the period for making such comments expired in January 2012. It is however, relevant to highlight how the approach promoted in that document has subsequently been carried through.

DPD Programme

3.5. The Issues and Options Report gives a project commencement date of March 2010, some two years before there was any direct consultation with any representative body on the inclusion of Stanton Wick colliery site. This was even though the evidence suggests that the site was known to the Council some time before the 'call for sites' and publication of the Issues and Options Report in November 2011, not least because a photograph of the site is included in the document.

3.6. As reference will be made in the next section, and as stated throughout all the Council's policy documents, early consultation with the local community, particularly with regard to proposals relating to gypsy and travellers sites, is accepted as being essential to ensure constructive community involvement and to deliver integration of the new with the established communities. The Council's failure to engage with the local community at Stanton Wick, Stanton Drew and Pensford has seriously adversely affected the outcome of the DPD process to date.

Preferred Size of Site

3.7. Paragraph 4.6 of the Issues and Options Report refers to:

"The need for smaller sites in Bath & North East Somerset district is supported by the West of England GTAA which found that most surveyed respondents expressed a preference to live in smaller family-sized sites of no more than five pitches."

It is difficult to reconcile this stated preference with the only justification given for the retention of the Stanton Wick colliery site in the six shortlisted sites as being its "large size". Furthermore, it is inconceivable that this factor alone can then be relied upon to justify very special circumstances to allow the development in Green Belt when the base line need is for "smaller sites".

Matrix Assessment

3.8. Paragraph 4.12 of the Issues and Options Report gives the context for the site selection scoring matrix which is subsequently used in the identification of preferred sites.

3.9. In relation to the sustainability of the location the document refers to Building Research Establishment guidance on sustainable residential development, giving an optimum distance of no more than 1,000 metres from key amenities by a safe walking route. The Council have extended this to 1,500 metres relying on guidance in Circular 01/2006, but this has been withdrawn since the publication of the new guidance in March 2012. It in turn, is silent on the issue of distances. There is therefore no substantial justification for the Council to deviate from the 1,000 metre distance.

3.10. Overridingly however, the criteria is that it is to be "safe" walking, and it is acknowledged that the route from Stanton Wick colliery to Pensford is not a safe route given that it is unlit, a single track road and with no footpath, as well as having difficult highway geometry.

3.11. For these reasons the Stanton Wick site should go to zero against all the proximity criteria, thus reducing the score by three.

3.12. In Appendix B the scoring matrix shows that, where the site is subject to a local landscape or wildlife designation, the score should be -5. Stanton Wick colliery has been given a score of zero whereas it should be minus 5, hence a further five points should be deducted.

3.13. Unless the whole of the former colliery including all of the slag heaps are remediated, the site will be within 1,000m of a hazardous place. Hence the score against this criteria should be zero, removing a further five points from the colliery site score.

3.14. It is unclear from the planning history on the Council's website as to whether Class B2 consent has ever been given by the Council for the site or, if it has, for which parts of the site. In this connection, it would appear that any mining consents may well have been abandoned as a result of a failure to register for an IDO. This would be relevant in considering any prospective change of use of the site and should have been considered before designating as a Preferred site.

3.15. It is further unclear whether the Council has considered if the NPPF Annex 2 exclusions relating to previously-developed land (brownfield) apply to the whole or significant portions of the site as shown in the Plan contained within the Consultation document. For example:

'Previously-developed land is that which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure.'

It therefore could only refer to the front part of the site occupied by buildings.

3.16. The NPPF definition also precludes mineral workings, specifically, where provision has been made at any time for restoration.

Land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill purposes where provision for restoration has been made through development control procedures.'

3.17. In addition, a considerable area, including the slag heaps appears to have regenerated and would not qualify as previously developed land by any of the NPPF exclusion definitions either.

'Land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time.'

3.18. Any infill development, which could only be permitted on the site of the existing buildings, would still be subject to the stringent Green Belt obligation to protect openness. The old colliery is not a Major Developed Site in Green Belt. Gypsies and travellers are subject to these same development restrictions.

3.19. Finally, the NPPF definition states that it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed.

3.20. PPG3 is the only clear explanation in past and recent policy. Whilst the NPPF is less detailed and specific on matters relating to previously-developed land, it certainly gives no indication that the definitions in PPG3 are to be relaxed compared with previous policy criteria.

3.21. There is potential for noise to affect neighbouring residents and hence the score against potential noise issues should be minus 5 rather than zero, deducting a further five points from the score.

3.22. Allowing for these corrections the old colliery buildings at Stanton Wick would not have a sum of scores of 10 as concluded in the Preferred Options Report, but a score of minus 7.

3.23. There are therefore not just policy reasons why Stanton Wick colliery should not have been designated as a preferred site, but the evaluation matrix, if properly scored, confirms the inappropriateness of so doing.

3.24. It is pointed out that these scoring inaccuracies are not considered to be the only flaws with the matrix process, but they are given by way of example to highlight one of the flaws.

Preferred Options Stage: Detailed Site Assessment Report

3.25. In addition to the problems with the matrix, a number of flaws in the qualitative assessment explained in the Detailed Site Assessment Report need to be highlighted.

3.26. Paragraph 2.9 assesses site suitability against the criteria in the Issues and Options paper. It states that:
“This removed a number of sites from consideration due to the incompatibility with national planning guidance.”

The previous section of this report demonstrated non-compliance of the Stanton Wick colliery site against both national and local planning policy and, had the Council followed their own procedures, should have been eliminated prior to reaching the preferred option stage.

3.27. Paragraph 2.12 refers to achievability in terms of:
“All known constraints were identified to draw out site delivery costs such as infrastructure and remediation works.”

There has been no attempt to quantify the infrastructure costs highlighted in this report and acknowledged to exist by the Council. These include highways infrastructure, drainage and remediation works. Without the appropriate evidence base on these issues it is inappropriate to retain Stanton Wick Colliery as a preferred site.

3.28. Under the heading Methodology paragraph 3.3 describes the process for Rejecting Sites. It refers to:
“The weightings applied to the four main constraints – Green Belt, landscape or wildlife designation, flood risk and contaminated land, highlight those sites with the most important physical or policy-led constraints to development.”

3.29. Paragraph 3.5 continues:
“Of particular importance is the need to identify sites outside the Green Belt due to national and local policy restrictions on developments on land covered by that designation. This includes the most recent policy included in Planning for Travellers Sites which states that travellers sites in Green Belt are inappropriate development.”

Given that Stanton Wick colliery lies within Green Belt and is subject to three of the four main constraints, it is difficult to understand how the Council were then able to shortlist it as a Preferred Site, when it failed so badly against their own explicit criteria.

Detailed Site Assessment Tables

3.30. In the detailed site assessment for Stanton Wick colliery, under the heading of Availability and Achievability, it refers to the site currently being marketed and:

“The site may be suitable for the Council or a Registered Provider to deliver...”

This cross-refers to paragraph 5.6 which states that there are £60m of funds allocated for the delivery of traveller pitches of which £13m remains unallocated following the 2011 bidding round. Elsewhere in the document however, it is stated

that none of these funds should be used to acquire sites for gypsies and travellers.

NPPF 182: Development Plans

3.31. When a DPD is examined, the principal test will be its Soundness. To be sound the DPD has to be Justified, Effective and Consistent with national policy. The analysis given in these representations to date has demonstrated that this DPD is not consistent with national policy.

NPPF 182 explains that to be Justified means that the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.

These representations have highlighted the lack of evidence base to support the continued allocation of Stanton Wick colliery. It is also considered that the Council has not considered all the reasonable alternatives within the District which they have known about throughout this DPD process, eg the tolerated gypsy and traveller sites and the MOD sites in Bath. The latter are not in Green Belt and should be considered as a higher priority than sites which are in Green Belt. The tolerated sites at 19 January 2012 were given as:

Sites Authorised

Whitchurch: 2 static caravans, 1 tourer 3

Sites Unauthorised

Lower Bristol Road: 9 box vans 27 tourers 2 transit vans 38
 Stoney Lane, Newbridge: 5 box vans 5 tourers 1 transit van 1 coach 12
 Farmborough: 4 box vans 4 tourers 2 transit vans 10
 Queen Charlton 1 mobile home 5 tourers 6
 Total 69

Other Procedural Matters

3.32. Two other aspects of procedure are addressed in these representations in the following sections.

- Consultation, and,
- Sustainability Appraisal Report, April 2012.

4. CONSULTATIONS ON DPDs

4.1. The consultation requirements for the preparation of a Development Plan Document were set out in the 2008 regulations at regulation 25 (and from April regulation 18 of 2012 Regulations). The expectation in terms of good practice following the regulations is explained in DCLG's Development Plan Document Manual.

4.2. Regulation 25 of the 2008 regulations requires Local Planning Authorities to notify specified bodies of the subject of a DPD which they propose to prepare and to advise those bodies to make representations to them about what that DPD ought to contain. The bodies are those the Local Planning Authority considers may have an interest in the subject of the proposed DPD. This can include persons who are resident or carrying on a business in their area.

4.3. Given that there was no proactive involvement of any representative body in Pensford, Stanton Wick or Stanton Drew until April 2012, whereas the DPD process started in March 2010, it is considered that neither the spirit nor obligations of regulation 25 have been fulfilled. This is more particularly the case given that the Council clearly were considering Stanton Wick colliery site at the time they issued the Issues and Options Report in November 2011, given that that document contained a photograph of the site.

4.4. The Manual elaborates the expectations as follows:

"You do not have to regard this as an isolated stage of consultation that takes a set period of time. Instead, the Local Planning Authority may choose to encompass a variety of activities which happen more than once and at different times.

However, since the regulation refers to the preparation of the development plan document, it would be of little purpose for it to be done at the end of the process."

This highlights the principal concerns of the local community in that they were not specifically approached in November 2011 and more particularly were not involved in the Site Evaluation Matrix. There was no approach from the Council between November 2011 and when the Preferred Options Report was produced in April 2012. This does not meet the requirements of “a variety of activities” which “happen more than once and at different times”. The reality is that the consultation is being done “at the end of the process”. Furthermore, the experience of the public exhibitions, and particularly that at Pensford, was of closed minds, decisions made, and inflexibility, set against an inability or lack of willingness to give constructive answers to questions which were acknowledged to be of merit and relevance.

4.5. The fact that a decision was made at the Council’s Cabinet meeting on 9 May 2012 to eliminate sites before the consultation had been carried out and before SWAG could meaningfully raise their concerns about the matrix evaluation process, undermines the value and purpose of the consultation to a serious extent.

4.6. For these reasons it is considered that the public consultation carried in relation to the preparation of the Gypsies and Travellers Site Allocations Development Plan Document does not meet the regulatory requirements and constitutes a flawed process.

BANES Statement of Community Involvement adopted 2007

4.7. The Council’s own stated requirements for consultation on DPDs contained in their SCI, is similar to the section 25 regulations, although its adoption pre-dates publication of the regulations.

4.8. At the Stage 1 Pre-production Consultation to Establish Issues and Options, the SCI refers to “evidence gathering consultation” and “early community involvement using a wide range of methods”. There is to be “more than one specific consultation carried out at this stage” and “consultations will be targeted at a range of consultees”.

4.9 This has all to be carried out before the Council reaches Stage 2 Preferred Options Consultation.

4.10. As with the S25 regulations it is considered that the Council have failed to meet their own SCI requirements at any stage during the preparation of this DPD thus far.

5. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

5.1. The Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocation DPD was published in April 2012. It is also out for consultation alongside the Preferred Options during the same period 23 May to 18 July. This section of the report constitutes, in part, representations to that document.

Main Sustainability Issues

5.2. The Sustainability Issues and Key Considerations were set out in table 3.2 and include issues, most of which have been highlighted elsewhere in these representations, but specifically:

- Areas of nature conservation importance.
- General environmental considerations.
- Access to services and facilities.
- Health.
- Education.
- Relations with settled communities.

All of these have already been demonstrated not to be fulfilled by the proposed siting of gypsies and travellers at Stanton Wick colliery.

5.3. Reference has also been made to the lack of evidence base on which the matrix was formulated. This is confirmed in paragraph 3.6 under the heading ‘Difficulties Encountered in Compiling Information on Carrying Out the Appraisal’. These difficulties related to Baseline Data and assumptions which are set out in paragraph 3.6.1-3.6.3. It is considered that these gaps in Baseline Data and the evidence base have undermined the value of the matrix subsequently carried out. It is confirmed at paragraphs 4.2.1-4.2.2 that the Baseline Data, such as was available, was fed into the matrix. If the input information is inadequate the results from the matrix are unlikely to be correct.

5.4. It is from this flawed process that table 4.1 presents a summary of the significant and secondary effects of the issues identified within the SA for the old colliery buildings at Stanton Wick as:

“The site performs very well against a number of SA objectives, including protecting and enhancing the District’s

environment.”

It is not understood how the SA could have reached this conclusion, except of course, that it was based on the flawed matrix. The site is subject to the principal environmental constraints of highways, nature conservation and contamination. The Preferred Options Report highlights these as the principal constraints, leading to the unsuitability of the site for allocation for this use.

5.5. The only positive site attribute in the SA is the reference to the site’s “large size” but, as mentioned earlier, this contravenes the findings of the GTAA reported in the Issues and Options Report that the gypsy and travelling community themselves would prefer to be located on smaller sites. Furthermore, it is the size of the proposed site which gives rise to the issues of domination of the nearest settled community at Stanton Wick.

5.6. It is acknowledged that the summary includes the references to the “significant negative impacts”, but relies on “on-site services such as providing space for healthcare visitors and education” and “the potential for business space”.

5.7 The site’s suitability therefore seems to be predicated on creating a “self-contained community”, wholly isolating the gypsies and travellers from the remainder of the community by virtue of inadequate highways access and remote location. These concepts also further contravene Green Belt policies on inappropriate development, as well as adding to the already high infrastructure costs in terms of highways and remediation, to develop this site for gypsy and traveller use.

5.8 In summary, it is considered that the Sustainability Appraisal, based as it is on the flawed matrix process, reaches wholly invalid conclusions in relation to the suitability of the Stanton Wick colliery site for its proposed designation in this DPD.

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1. These representations on behalf of Stanton Wick Action Group (SWAG) have covered the following matters.

- The unsuitability of the former colliery site at Stanton Wick for the DPD proposed gypsy and travellers site on the grounds that it contravenes a wide range of national and local planning policies and because of the site’s technical constraints, giving rise to high infrastructure costs, which are likely to render it non-viable, impracticable and unsafe for gypsy and travellers occupation.
- The procedure by which the Stanton Wick old colliery site has been designated as a Preferred Option in the DPD, focusing on the inadequate evidence base, inadequate consultation with the local communities throughout the process and a flawed site evaluation, which has led to inappropriate conclusions in the Sustainability Appraisal.

6.2. In the light of these policy, technical and procedural limitations which, SWAG has been advised, would justify judicial review of the process thus far, the Council is urged to halt the DPD preparation process, engage effectively with the local community, carry out a wider review of alternative sites, and ensure that the re-evaluation is done with the benefit of a proper evidence base.

Respondent: 106 / 2 Name: Mrs Kathy Curling Organisation: Pro Planning

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. I attended the exhibition on the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople site allocations development plan document (DPD) preferred options consultation paper held at Pensford Memorial Hall on 11 June 2012.

Exhibition Experience

1.2. At the exhibition, the seconded consultant Meghan Rossiter was kind enough to give me a considerable amount of her time and we were joined for a short period by an Officer from the Planning Policy section of the Council whose name I did

not record. I also had the opportunity to speak to Cllr Paul Crossley Leader of BANES Council. Whilst I appreciate the time which Meghan Rossiter gave, I am sorry to say that I was not impressed by the quality of the information given in response to my questions. I believe that this will be a relevant consideration for the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) to be prepared in due course on the preparation of this DPD. For that reason I give a fuller commentary on her specific answers at Appendix 1 to this report.

1.3. I acknowledge that one purpose of the exhibition was to receive local residents' and other interested parties' views on what the Council may have omitted to take into account in their evaluation of the shortlisted proposed travellers' sites. Given however, that no notes were taken by the Officers at the exhibition of the inaccuracies and omissions as they were being pointed out, it appears to be wholly dependent on the local residents to identify any weaknesses not just in content, but procedure as well. This does not lend confidence that local residents' views are "to be taken seriously", when the Officers immediate response is to "block" rather than to "note".

1.4. My expectation of attending the exhibition had been to seek answers to a considerable number of questions which I had prepared before attending. I think that I can justifiably say I did not receive meaningful responses to any of my questions, with the sole response being "it's all in the reports". Given that I had read the reports prior to the meeting and did not find the answers I sought, clearly this was not particularly helpful. In fact it begs the question as to why the Council were paying for Officers to be in attendance if the only response which visitors to the exhibition were to be given was to be told to go and read the documents. I am sorry to say that this applies equally to the Officer from the Council's Planning Policy section who declined to offer any response on procedural matters relating to the preparation of the DPD, as it did to the seconded Officer with responsibility for preparing and progressing the DPD.

Concerns Regarding the Site Designation

1.5. It appears that there are a range of fundamental flaws in the process by which the selected sites have been chosen. These representations do not purport to cover all the issues which are known to have been raised to date, but seek to focus on the principal flaws and omissions of which I am currently aware. These include:

- Allocation of sites within the Green Belt.
- Contamination.
- Sites of nature conservation interest.
- Accessibility, sustainability of the location and highway safety.

1.6. As a local resident of Pensford, my comments are directed principally to the former colliery site at Stanton Wick, but some of the points will be relevant to the general assessment of other sites as well.

1.7. The representations draw principally from the following documents:

- Planning Policy for Travellers Sites: Department of C&LG, March 2012.
- BANES Core Strategy Submission Policy CP11.
- Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations: DPD Preferred Options, undated.
- BANES DPD, Preferred Options Stage: Detailed Site Assessment Report.

Designation of the Gypsies and Travellers Sites.

1.8. Before progressing to the detail of the representations I would emphasise that I support the Council in their endeavour to identify and provide permanent sites for gypsies and travellers within the district. The absence of an identified site creates difficulties for all concerned, the Council, the travelling community and permanent residents. The need to address the matter does not however, justify any actual or perceived shortcircuiting of proper planning procedures or making inappropriate site allocations in terms of national policy or statutory and emerging development plan policy. In the context of equality, my interpretation of Government policy is that this section of the community are not to be treated any differently from any other, in terms of more or less favourable treatment in providing for their accommodation on a suitable designated residential site.

2. SITE ALLOCATION AND ASSESSMENT

2.1. The previous section highlighted that these representations would focus on four key areas, Green Belt, contamination, nature conservation and highway safety and accessibility, because at this stage these are understood to be the principal constraints to any redevelopment of the colliery site.

2.2. It surely becomes all the more difficult for a local resident to understand therefore how this site has made it through the long list of 23 to the short list of 6, when the Council in their Detailed Site Assessment Report at paragraph 3.3 give the principal constraints and reasons for rejecting sites from the long list as:

- Green Belt,
- Landscape or wild life designation, flood risk and,
- Contaminated land.

The remarkable coincidence of these two lists highlights why we are baffled as to how the colliery site made it though to the short list when it suffers from four of the five identified constraints, with the added disadvantage of very poor highway access and accessibility.

2.3. At this stage I refer you to the response given by Meghan Rossiter. She accepted the colliery site suffers from all of these constraints but she was not prepared to offer any reason as to why it remained in the allocation.

2.4. At least in speaking to the Leader of the Council afterwards the explanation was given that it was retained solely because of its large size. Assuming this to be the case, the local residents await the Council's decision as to whether this single factor of size outweighs all the fundamental policy objections such that the site not only can and should be allocated, but provides a sufficiently robust case to resist a legal challenge if any party be minded to disagree with the Council's procedure and assessment.

3. CONTAMINATION

3.1. My understanding is it is accepted that the Stanton Wick colliery site is contaminated. I am only aware of a site investigation having been carried out for the area of the buildings which was subject to a change of use application for residential use (Local Planning Authority Reference 05/02227/FUL). Whilst there may or may not have been other investigations for the areas of the mines and the tips, it would be reasonable to assume that, particularly the tipped area, would be contaminated.

3.2. At the exhibition information was sought on the nature, implications and procedure for addressing this issue in relation to the proposed gypsy and travellers' site allocation. The Officer was unable to help in any regard explaining that she had not read the report because she was not an expert in the field. She knew that there was arsenic present, but was not aware of methane gas. The Officer is relying upon the Environmental Health Officer's advice that this matter can be addressed by condition at the planning application stage. She did not consider she needed to acquaint herself with whether, in principle, the site could be appropriately remediated to render it suitable for occupation by gypsies and travellers.

3.3. Presumably this means that the Council could proceed to allocate the site without any further knowledge on this fundamental issue, that they could proceed to spend a significant amount of money acquiring the site from the landowner, that they would then assume the responsibility for an unknown level of remediation costs, or, alternatively find that the site is not capable of being remediated to an acceptable level for gypsies and travellers. It is assumed these residents will require areas to be left as gardens for cultivation, as opposed to capping off the whole site as the remediation strategy. Their children will also tend to spend more time outside than they do in permanent fixed dwellings, making them more vulnerable to the effects of any residual contamination, or through playing on untreated areas of the colliery.

3.3. This surely cannot be a satisfactory programme for the Council to commit to such a level of expenditure or indeed require any other social landlord to do so, with such a serious constraint left unaddressed in terms of cost and its effect on viability, achievability and health of future occupiers.

3.4. Furthermore from the point of view of DPD process, where site allocations are to be made on a clear evidence base, it is surely procedurally incorrect to proceed with any site allocation until the site investigation for the whole area potentially to be allocated has been carried out and the necessary remediation strategy agreed and costed, and financial provision made available for the work to be done.

4. NATURE CONSERVATION DESIGNATION

4.1. A significant part of the Stanton Wick colliery site designation lies within an area protected for its scientific interest and development under Local Plan policy. Because much of the area lies out the Pensford Proposals Map inset, relying upon the wider area of the Proposals Map makes it impossible to correlate site boundaries with the version on the Council's web site. On asking the Officer for clarification of how much of the proposed allocation lay within the designated area, the Officer said that she did not know, nor did she have a copy of the Local Plan at the exhibition. Her advice was that I should go to the Planning office in Bath to find out. Again, I was disappointed that the only statutory development plan for the local area was not available at the public exhibition.

4.2. As with contamination, to meet the evidence based requirements for DPD allocations, surely before the Council re-consult at the next stage of this process, an ecological study needs to be carried out for the whole of the area being considered for allocation. Further, given that an ecological survey can only meaningfully be carried out during the summer months, surely this is all the more reason that this be done before the next round of consultation on this DPD.

4.3. A bats study carried out for the 2005 application cannot be relied upon, being more than five years old it is out of date, although there may have been an update for the renewal application.

4.4. More particularly the current red line is significantly more extensive and includes an area which had been previously

developed land, but has now been reclaimed as a natural area where ecological diversity might be expected to have flourished during the decades since the mining activity ceased.

4.5.The SN designation tends to confirm the proposition that the major part of the former colliery no longer constitutes 'previously developed land'.

5.HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS, SUSTAINABILITY OF LOCATION AND SAFETY

5.1.The Highways comments on the renewal of the 2005 single dwelling application (10/01429/FUL) were:

"Given that the site is outside any development boundary the proposals are contrary to both National and Local Policy. Further increase in traffic in the context of the wider highway network, blind bends and single carriageway is problematic, however this may be difficult to sustain given the previous use of the site. Recommend that the application be refused."

This acceptance that the site is unsustainably located, where development would not comply with development plan policy, was accepted in relation to a single dwelling. Furthermore, if the local highway network is deemed to be unacceptable even for a single dwelling how can it then be acceptable against the same policies for 20 or more gypsy and traveller families?

5.2.I consider it disingenuous that the comments recorded in the Detailed Site Assessment Report for the colliery are:

"Previous planning permission 05/0227/FUL accepted that "the reduction in traffic generation from the former industrial use of the site would be of benefit, whilst recognising the site is not a sustainable location." Highways not did object to that application due to an earlier permission."

I have difficulty in reconciling how the Detailed Assessment Report reached that conclusion from the contents of the Officers' Delegated Report on the application.

5.3.The detailed site assessment refers to the need for:

"additional safeguards to be put in place to ensure highway safety as the existing poor nature of the highways leading to and from the site (single track in parts and tight bends) may lead to conflicting movements with other road users."

Since the road is single track in both directions to Stanton Wick and Pensford, and has no footpaths at all, it is assumed that these improvements would be required along the whole length between the villages. Compulsory purchase would presumably have to be invoked to acquire the necessary space for road widening and there would be the difficulty of widening or building a new bridge over the railway on the route into Pensford. This will add very significantly to the cost of delivering this site as a suitable gypsy and travellers site. These need to be quantified before the site can be allowed to progress, and the information made publicly available, before a further round of consultation is carried out.

5.4.It is understood that one proposal has been to use the existing public footpath from the colliery into Pensford. This may be acceptable, but again the costs of upgrading it need to be quantified, the question of land acquisition for any necessary widening and improvement established. The ecological impact of lighting, which presumably would be required to provide safe access to the school during winter months, would need to be assessed given the area is a protected nature conservation site.

5.5.Seeking information and clarification of these issues at the exhibition attracted the response that all the information was in the detailed site assessment. The Officer had only driven from the site to Pensford or Stanton Wick. Again I have to question the purpose of holding the exhibition, other than for the Council to be able to report it has been held, if local residents are simply to be directed to what is already available online and nothing further could be added.

5.6.My understanding is that there is no policy provision for the need to allocate a gypsy and travellers site to override issues of satisfactory highways access and occupier safety. Nor is there any provision for Development Plan policies on sustainability of location, in relation to both accessibility and designated areas for growth, to be circumvented. There are therefore many Development Plan policies both existing and emerging, with which this potential allocation does not comply and, in accordance with National Planning Policy, should not be considered for allocation for this use.

6.GREEN BELT

6.1.Paragraph 4 of the Government's Planning Policy for Travellers Sites states that:

"Plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development."

Paragraph 14 elaborates that:

"Travellers sites in Green Belt are inappropriate development."

"Inappropriate development is harmful to Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances."

At the exhibition the Officer offered no grounds to demonstrate why she considered there to be very special circumstances to justify shortlisting Stanton Wick colliery out of the 23 sites originally considered.

6.2.Further discussions with the Leader of the Council, Cllr Paul Crossley revealed that the only reason is the site's large size. Presumably it will be a matter of legal argument as to whether 'large size' constitutes 'very special circumstances' to

justify the retention of the colliery site as a potential allocation, whilst also setting aside all the other constraints discussed in previous sections of these representations.

6.3.The alternative is to create a Green Belt inset, but the guidance says this is to be done through the plan-making process and not in response to a planning application. Presumably, therefore it should be commenced through the Core Strategy as a matter of principle, and then in detail through this DPD. I do not think that the Core Strategy examination has considered the possibility of a Green Belt inset to accommodate a large travellers site.

6.4.In addition to a number of other relevant policy guidance matters in this document, paragraph 23 requires:

“Local Planning Authority should strictly limit new travellers site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the Development Plan.”

In my view this summarises all the reasons why the colliery is unsuitable and should not have been retained amongst the six shortlisted sites as part of this DPD preparation process.

6.5.At the exhibition the Officer said that legal opinion was being sought on the ability to continue to promote the colliery site within Green Belt. At this stage she had no further information, but hopefully the Council will have it available if this site progresses to the next round of DPD consultation.

7.POLICY AND PROCEDURE

7.1.It is known that many comments have already been made to the Council on the procedure to date in terms of consultation and the matrix used for evaluating sites. These aspects are not therefore addressed in these representations.

7.2.There are however other aspects of policy, in addition to those already raised, from which I have difficulty in understanding how the Council can consider this to be a suitable gypsy and travellers site. There are also aspects of procedure and timescale on which clarification is sought.

Government Policy

7.2.The Government’s Planning Policy for Travellers Sites provides relevant guidance on matters, in addition to Green Belt, which appear not to have been followed thus far.

7.3.Paragraph 4 gives as a Government aim:

“To enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure.”

Prospective travellers at Stanton Wick colliery have at best very limited access to education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure. In reality they will be an isolated community with only a dangerous road link to the nearest service village at Pensford. This will continue to be the case unless there is significant investment in upgrading the full length of the road between the site and the village. The current proposal is therefore prejudicial to giving gypsies and travellers equality in respect of these criteria, in comparison with other residents in BANES.

7.4.Paragraph 6(c) requires:

“Use a robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to inform the preparation of Local Plan to make planning decisions.”

It is understood that the current level of need is based on a survey carried out in 2007. It is questionable whether a seven year old survey can be considered to be robust.

7.5.Paragraph 9(b) requires Councils to:

“Identify a supply of specific, developable sites...”

To be developable sites should be:

“In a suitable location for travellers site development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.”

7.6.Previous sections have questioned the viability of the development of this site given the level of investment required into remediation of the contamination and providing highway infrastructure.

Local Plan Protected Employment Sites.

7.7.Should the Council be minded to retain the colliery site as a gypsy and travellers site allocation, as a residential use, presumably they will need to market the site for its current employment use before they can confirm the designation, as Local Plan Policies ET3 and ET9 require.

Emerging Core Strategy Policy CP11: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

7.8.The policy gives seven criteria against which sites being considered should be assessed. These representations should not need to set them out, they are presumably well known to Officers. None of the following criteria are met by the proposed site at Stanton Wick colliery: A, B, D and F. It is understood that criteria E on services is also currently not met.

7.9.Once again it begs the unanswered question as to how the Council can have shortlisted the colliery site when it is so demonstrably unsuitable against the Council’s own criteria for assessment.

Detailed Site Assessment Report: Preferred Option Stage

7.10. Section 2 on the Background to Site Selection describes the detailed site assessment as being carried out against suitability, availability, achievability and capacity. Whilst Stanton Wick colliery might be considered to have capacity and to be available in ownership terms, it would seem to fail completely against both suitability and achievability.

7.11. Focusing on achievability paragraph 2.12 states:

“To assess achievability all known constraints were identified to draw out site delivery costs such as infrastructure remediation works.”

According to the Officer at the exhibition this has not been done in the case of Stanton Wick colliery since no information was available on the costs of highway infrastructure works, remediation works or utilities and servicing. Against this information vacuum and absence of evidence base, it remains unclear how the site progressed to the shortlisted six from the original twenty-three, or indeed how the Council can consider they have followed their own protocol for assessment.

7.12. Paragraph 2.12 claims that the final site recommendations were assessed against the “Draft Core Strategy Spatial Strategy”. Given that the Core Strategy seeks to focus development at sustainable locations in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and within the principal urban areas or at other sustainable locations, it is wholly unclear as to how the colliery site made it through to the shortlist.

8. QUESTIONS RAISED

8.1. At the exhibition the Officer confirmed that she was not there to answer questions but only to invite visitors to the exhibition to put their questions in writing in response to the consultation. In summary therefore my questions, set out in these representations, are as follows:

1. What is the site area considered appropriate for a gypsy and travellers site allocation since the Officer has confirmed that it is not the whole area shown on the Preferred Options report.
2. Please can we be provided with information on the level, nature and proposed remediation strategy for the contamination across the site being proposed for designation.
3. Please can we be provided with a summer ecological assessment for the whole of the site being proposed for designation.
4. Please can the nature and extent of highway improvements between the site and the nearest settlements be specified at least to the stage of a description e.g. carriageway widening to 5.5 metres and provision of continuous footpath of 2.0 metres.
5. Please can we be provided with a programme for how the works, in particular the remediation works, will tie in with the potential progress of the site through the DPD to adoption and a subsequent planning application.
6. At what stage will the Council test the market for continuing employment use in accordance with Local Plan Policy ET9?
7. Please can we be provided with the case that the Council intend to use if they retain this site as a designated gypsy and travellers site, for promoting this inappropriate development within Green Belt contrary to National and Statutory Development Plan Policy.
8. Please can the Council advise how the retention of this isolated development site to accommodate gypsies and travellers, complies with equality requirements to provide the potential occupants with access to education, health and employment opportunities.
9. Please can the Council advise how this currently unsustainably located site which will be wholly dependent on private cars and, it appears several cars per family, can be deemed to be sustainable or be made sustainable to bring it in line with all policy requirements.
10. Please can the Council advise how occupants of the site are to be protected from remaining areas of the colliery mine and tip areas which may not be remediated as part of the development site, but remain contaminated, and to which the occupiers’ children will either continue to have access, or will need to be fenced in and protected from, precluding access to the wider countryside.

8.2 In view of the perceived unsatisfactory experience at the exhibition in Pensford your attention to the points raised herein would be appreciated, and I look forward to receiving further information in response to the above questions.

APPENDIX 1

Notes of Exhibition Conversion 11 June 2012

Notes on conversation Kathy Curling/ Meghan Rossiter

Recorded by Sue Osborne

Pensford Roadshow 11/6/12

Kathy Curling (KC) had been having a conversation with Meghan Rossiter (MR) which was progressing with difficulty around the issue of Greenbelt. I joined to observe KC observed that the SW proposal could not be brought through DPD . As greenbelt it would have to progress through statutory amendment to development plan.

MR agreed that SW had been brought through to consultation and shortlist without testing. KC pressed on who was to clarify this and whether legal advice was being taken. MR said that advice was being sort.

KC observed that if it hadn't been investigated how could SW have got through to this point. No clear response.

KC asked about SN area. MR wasn't sure of the extent of the SN area. KC asked her to retrieve the Local Plan, but MR didn't have one with her. KC observed this was the only statutory document she required but she didn't have it.

KC wanted to know how SW had gone through the sift of 23 to 6 sites without any investigation around SN site. MR advised that status of SN site was discussed with Environment Dept.

KC observed that it was not possible to get to DPD or any policy document without evidence base.

MR advised that this was all that had been done so far. KC advised there are 4 key issues - the evidence base should have been completed.

MR said she had asked relevant colleagues. KC argued that this is not evidence base. Ecology evidence can only be collected during the summer

MR said that consultees are to tell us what is missed.

KC asked MR about planning history on the site. MR did not answer. KC said there is no evidence on this site.

KC moved to contamination

MR accepts there is contamination. KC pressed MR and revealed that MR doesn't know where or what it is. She knew there was arsenic present but hasn't looked at the report, colleagues have told her about report, and this isn't her field of expertise.

KC asked if she were to write for the information she needed would it be available?

MR said it was in the assessment report.

As the report only makes reference, KC pressed MR that the info was not available.

MR said KC would have to contact the contamination land team to see if anything else was available.

KC again pressed that there was no evidence base. Asked what exactly the contamination land team said about the site . No clear response.

MR confirmed she had written the reports.

KC asked at which stage is the contamination to be considered. KC asked if MR was happy to proceed with 1 of very few sites, yet it may not be deliverable at planning application stage if no meaningful prior assessment.

MR gave no clear response. KC pressed again on whether she was happy to proceed.

MR again suggested KC speak to the contamination team.

KC advised MR that this is supposed to be the opportunity for the public to understand what is proposed and she should be able to answer. KC said MR's job was to ensure that the site was acceptable, but that she did not have any information.

KC suggested to MR that she didn't seem minded about this.

KC asked about safe walking. MR referred KC to report . KC asked her to show her where exactly.

KC asked her if MR had walked any of the road. She had not. KC asked if MR considered it safe . MR referred to comments in report.

KC asked whether MR considered it safe. MR again referred to the background comments on highways.

KC asked what highways had said. MR confirmed they had said they would find it difficult to support at this level.

KC asked if MR could see that this proposal is illogical.

KC observed that MR was not helping residents to understand.

MR said she could not give information she did not have.

KC asked whether she could not see how frightening this is for people. You are admitting there are issues around greenbelt, SN, contamination and highways, but you have no information to support why you have made your decision MR was asked to offer one key issue in support of SW. MR said she couldn't just name 1. She was asked to name 2. She would not respond, but said it was all in the document.

KC referred to the site plan and asked who drew the boundary line. MR said she had. She confirmed it was only a boundary line . MR said that 2.5 hectares required for development. KC asked why there were 10 hectares if you only want a portion. MR had no clear answer.

KC asked MR when she had walked the site. MR confirmed Jan/Feb. Walked with Smart/ Bendall.

KC asked when the Call for Sites had been issued. MR confirmed in the Issues and Options doc in Nov.

MR confirmed it went to all statutory consultees, all on database and requests for PC's to come forward. Maggie Smith-Bendall brought the site forward.

Shortlist of sites wasn't notified until 17/4/12 after all the sifts were complete.

KC asked if the sift had been done without consultation. MR confirmed this.

KC asked if MR thought that it would have been prudent to consult. MR did not agree.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 243 / 1 Name: Mrs Donna McClelland Organisation: Chew Magna Parish Council

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

In response to this document Chew Magna Parish Council wishes to oppose, most strongly, the proposals for the above-mentioned site on the following grounds:-

1. The site is in the Green Belt and therefore inappropriate under National Policy Guidance. No justification for "very special circumstances" has been put forward.
2. Poor access and infrastructure.
3. Detrimental and overbearing impact on services; schools; social provisions; local amenities and policing.
4. Very adverse impact upon the local community in terms of increased population in a predominately rural area which will dominate the nearest settlement (ie the hamlet of Stanton Wick) contrary to national policy for travellers sites.
5. Environmental issues pertaining to the proposed site including contamination and hazardous waste and the potential for longer term environmental damage.
6. The potential detrimental impact upon the local landscape. B&NES emerging Core Strategy requires that development should not harm the character and appearance of an area.
7. The site history and previous development precedent

The current paper and process seems to be flawed due to its lack of detail and poor consideration of potential impacts that the proposal will have on this small community and also the wider area.

Respondent: 245 / 1 Name: Mr Andy Reading Organisation: Environment Agency

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

We are pleased to see that the majority of the sites put forward in the Preferred Options Consultation are located in Flood Zone 1 (low risk). This is consistent with the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which is clear that caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use should not be allowed in principle in Flood Zone 3 (high risk). This approach is also supported by Policy CP11 of the draft Core Strategy.

GT.2 – Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

This site lies adjacent the Salter’s Brook, which runs along the Eastern boundary of the site. This Brook should therefore be identified as a potential site constraint. Through the redevelopment of the site the pitches should be set back from the watercourse. The watercourse should be protected and enhanced where possible.

Respondent: 263 / 2 Name: Ms Gillian Sanders Organisation: Wessex Water

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Bristol Water for water supply.
The site is some distance away from the public foul sewerage system

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 279 / 1 Name: Mr Rohan Torkildsen Organisation: English Heritage

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

We hope the following comments will help shape a plan which provides a more robust case for appropriate sites in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

At present English Heritage is concerned by the assessment process employed to determine site suitability. The approach fails to apply an even handed consideration of the key planning issues particularly the affect of proposed site allocations on the historic environment.

The Plan fails to demonstrate that evidence about the historic environment has been used to assess the significance of all heritage assets affected and how they contribute to the local area.

Site assessments process

An initial sift of 23 sites discarded certain options that were contrary to "national planning policy" including sites located within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

"Those sites identified as being within and thus impacting adversely on the national landscape designation, the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty were rejected"

There is no reason or explanation why sites in the AONB were rejected as a matter of course whilst those in the Green Belt, World Heritage Site (WHS) or adversely affecting a designated heritage asset were not.

You have allowed the consideration of sites in the Green Belt due to 'exceptional circumstances' but have not considered sites in the AONB for the same reason.

I refer to Policy E pg 5, National Policy for Traveller Sites March 2012. "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

There is no justification for the AONB being given greater weight in the plan making process than Greenbelt, the World Heritage Site, Conservation Areas or indeed in the curtilage of a Grade II listed Building. You should note that Paragraph 14 of the NPPF attaches the same weight to designated heritage assets as Green Belt and AONB.

As such if you choose to reject sites in the AONB as a matter of course you should also reject sites within the WHS, Conservation Areas or within the grounds of a listed building. We are not suggesting you do this as a matter of course but we are anxious to ensure a thorough consideration of the historic environment and all heritage assets, as defined in the NPPF, is undertaken and that greater weight is not applied as a matter of principle to the AONB or that those sites within the AONB are omitted for that reason.

A 2 stage sift process was used to exclude certain sites. The scoring matrix was used to assess the relative sustainability of each site based on whether they were in the Green Belt, landscape, wildlife designation, flood risk or land contamination. This fails to give an appropriate weight to the consideration of heritage assets. You should note that heritage conservation is at the heart of the definition of sustainable development in the NPPF. Inadequate weight has been applied to heritage conservation in the assessment process.

Likewise the assessment process appears to have given greater weight to matters such as noise and overlooking.

Page 14 of the Site Assessment Report refers to the emerging Core Strategy Policy CP11 and the need to ensure sites should have no adverse impact on nationally recognised designations (criteria g) and do not harm the character and appearance of the surroundings (criteria d).

For a variety of reasons various sites have been rejected. But none appear to have been abandoned due to the adverse impact on heritage assets e.g. school building, Radstock; Ellsbridge House, Keynsham.

Unequal weight appears to have been applied to various relevant significant criteria without proper regard to the strategic NPPF principles for the conservation of heritage assets.

The Site Scoring Matrix at Appendix B of the Assessment Report makes no reference to the impact on heritage assets other than the World Heritage Site or Conservation Areas. There is no consideration, for example of the impact on listed buildings such as Ellsbridge House, Keynsham.

Unless there is clear evidence to demonstrate otherwise your site search sift should clearly have resulted in the omission of the Ellsbridge House as development in the curtilage of a listed building would presumably harm its historic significance and would therefore be contrary to NPPF and emerging Core Strategy policy?

I refer to Appendix E of the Site assessment report

"Development at this location would likely not assist the promotion of peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the locality due to the level of visual exposure".

Has this same assessment been undertaken for all other sites?

Pensford Colliery, Stanton Wick (GT.2)

Opened in 1909, this was one of the few Somerset collieries from the 20th century, and became the second largest colliery in Somerset. For many years the colliery was the only Somerset colliery with any form of coal-washing plant, there being both dry cleaning and contrast washing types at the pithead. Unusually for this area, the associated buildings were built entirely of red brick, and since closure, most have been adapted for reuse. The colliery closed in 1957-8. The weigh bridge, an horizontal engine house, workshops, and other unspecified mine buildings survive, although the pithead baths have been demolished.

The historic and social significance of the colliery should be carefully considered to ensure any future use of the site is sensitive to its cultural heritage value. Policy relating to the conservation of non designated heritage assets such as this colliery is contained in the emerging BANES Core Strategy and NPPF.

Specific preferred options.

Without prejudice to the above I have the following specific comments on the preferred options.

Planning across boundaries

If BANES Council are struggling to find suitable sites might there be alternative opportunities in adjoining local authority areas? Local planning authorities are required to work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities such as adequate provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople across local boundaries are properly co-ordinated and clearly reflected in local plans

Conclusion

We strongly recommend a more consistent and objective process of evaluation to ensure this Plan accords with the NPPF and its principles for sustainable development in relation to protecting and enhancing the historic environment, and national policy for the provision of suitable traveller sites.

As it stands the Plan fails to demonstrate that adequate evidence and subsequent informed assessment has been undertaken contrary to the NPPF. As such English Heritage considers the plan is unsound.

Respondent: 281 / 2 Name: Ms Alison Howell Organisation: Natural England

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Preferred Options

The Council has selected six preferred sites for development. The site selection process identified four main constraints: Green Belt, landscape and/or wildlife designations, flood risk and contaminated land. Natural England is satisfied the assessment criteria and scoring matrix applied to the site selection appears robust and consistent with government policy for the planning of traveller sites.

We consider the approach taken also broadly accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), including with respect to paragraph 110 which states "In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to minimise

pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment. Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework”.

Site Constraints

Notwithstanding the above, the Sustainability Appraisal has identified a number of issues with the development of the preferred sites, including likely impacts on landscape, ecology and public access.

- The assessment of Site GT.2 at Stanton Wick suggests development would harm the openness of the Green Belt due to the introduction of caravans, amenity blocks, vehicles and domestic paraphernalia. We are therefore pleased to note the requirement that any development proposals would have to be accompanied by a significant scheme of planting and be based on a detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

Natural England considers the constraints and suggested mitigation and enhancement measures outlined in the Sustainability Appraisal appear reasonable, however we would like to make the following comments:-

Sustainable Development - the Natural Environment and Biodiversity

Natural England would welcome a commitment in the Plan to moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature, as required in the NPPF paragraph 9.

Use of Brownfield land of low environmental value

The preferred options reflect the NPPF paragraph 111 in terms of the need for planning policies and decisions to encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed, however the Plan should also recognise that some brownfield land can be of high environmental value and ensure suitable avoidance or mitigation measures are in place.

Enhancing landscape and biodiversity in Green Belts

Natural England would welcome a greater emphasis on enhancement of the Green Belt in line with the NPPF Paragraph 81 in terms of seeking opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land”.

Light Pollution – Landscape and Wildlife

Natural England would welcome a requirement to minimise light pollution in accord with NPPF paragraph 125 “By encouraging good design, planning policies and decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation”.

Ecological networks and Green Infrastructure

Making Space for Nature (A review of England’s Wildlife Sites and Ecological Network) highlighted action to support ecological networks as an effective response to conserve wildlife in environments that have become fragmented by human activities. It stated: “An ecological network comprises a suite of high quality sites which collectively contain the diversity and area of habitat that are needed to support species and which have ecological connections between them...” with this in mind, Natural England would welcome a commitment in the Plan to ensuring the development of all preferred sites incorporate multifunctional green infrastructure in accordance with the emerging Bath & North East Somerset Core Strategy policy, draft Green Infrastructure Strategy and local biodiversity action plan.

Respondent: 296 / 2 Name: Ms Gill Stirling Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am writing regarding the preferred sites for travellers and showmen. I can only comment on your list although I believe some of these were not even thought suitable by your own consultants. It seems to me that both the travellers and local residents should be considered when making a decision. I do not live near any sites and believe that those who do should have the greater influence.

GT2: Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

This would seem to be a good site if no objection for local landowners.

Respondent: 406 / 2 Name: Mrs Janet Sweet Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We would like to register our objection to these proposals. Our main concern at the present time are that the two sites, ie Stanton Wick and Whitchurch Wollard Lane parcel 7100 are both in the Green Belt area.

Stanton Wick Old Colliery buildings are totally inappropriate and the council has already set a precedence by refusing planning permission on numerous occasions for other developments.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 462 / 1 Name: Mr Dennis Baber Organisation:
William

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The scale of the proposal would dominate the adjacent community and is contrary C12.

The proposal is an inappropriate development in the Greenbelt, contrary to Policy E.

There are no exceptional circumstances to be taken into account.

The proposal has poor access to local facilities and is contrary to Policy B, paragraph 11.

The site was ranked 16th out of 23 sites, but was one of only 6 selected as preferred sites. This requires clarification and a full re-assessment.

Respondent: 498 / 1 Name: Mr David Lewis Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I feel compelled to write to you regarding the proposed site in Stanton Wick for the Travellers.

It would appear that the site is totally unsuitable for both residents and travellers for the following reasons.

1. The site is and has been declared unsafe owing to its previous use.
2. The road leading to the site from either direction cannot handle any more traffic.
3. There is no transport method other than to drive to access the area.
4. There are no pavement footpaths to the site.
5. Water and drainage supplies would cost huge amounts to install.
6. There are none of the following within a sensible walking distance.
A) A shop b) A Doctor c) A hospital
7. The schools in the area are already at a maximum capacity with Chew Valley being over capacity.
8. The proposed site would be larger than the present residency of Stanton Wick.
9. The site is not on an already recognised traveller's route.
10. The site is in the Green Belt and has many types of wildlife including bats, newts, adders, slow worms.

It seems that even though this site is unacceptable it is still being considered as it will solve the BANES problem, almost in one go, for finding sites for these travellers.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 499 / 1 Name: Mrs Tracey Lewis Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I feel compelled to write to you regarding the proposed site in Stanton Wick for the Travellers.

It would appear that the site is totally unsuitable for both residents and travellers for the following reasons.

1. The site is and has been declared unsafe owing to its previous use.
2. The road leading to the site from either direction cannot handle any more traffic.
3. There is no transport method other than to drive to access the area.
4. There are no pavement footpaths to the site.
5. Water and drainage supplies would cost huge amounts to install.
6. There are none of the following within a sensible walking distance.
A) A shop b) A Doctor c) A hospital
7. The schools in the area are already at a maximum capacity with Chew Valley being over capacity.
8. The proposed site would be larger than the present residency of Stanton Wick.

9. The site is not on an already recognised traveller's route.
 10. The site is in the Green Belt and has many types of wildlife including bats, newts, adders, slow worms.

It seems that even though this site is unacceptable it is still being considered as it will solve the BANES problem, almost in one go, for finding sites for these travellers

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 505 / 1 Name: Mr Hilary Cox Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I will not list my concerns fully in this letter, but as bullet points as I feel this will make them clearer, and I am sure you are up to date with the details of the situation.

- Suitability of the land (contamination)
- Access (single track country lanes)
- Wildlife (rare bats and rare orchids)
- Scale of development (particular in relation to the size of Stanton Wick, as well as the village of Pensford.)

I am asking you, as my Councillor, to take my concerns and objects forward to the Council, about this proposed Gypsy and Traveller site. I feel it is quite inappropriate and not thought through.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 505 / 1 Name: Mr Hilary Cox Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

- NO
- * Size - far too many pitches for local community setting
 - * Suitability - old mine shafts, contaminated land
 - * Nature conservation - bats, wild orchids, conservation area
 - * Access - narrow country lanes, no passing places or footpaths
 - * Planning laws - seem to be thoroughly ignored
 - * Green Belt area - doesn't seem to be respected

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO
See above

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I would like to know why B&NES have decided to introduce Gypsy and Travellers sites within the Authority? I understand the Authority is still exempt for providing sites.

Respondent: 548 / 1 Name: Cllr Peter Edwards Organisation: Bath & North East Somerset Council

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I think it most important that policy e.14 issued by the department for communities and Local government in march 2012 be taken into account i.e. traveller sites (temporary or Permanent) in the green belt are inappropriate development

I would therefore request that the Stanton Wick site be withdrawn from the list of sites considered as appropriate for public consultation since the site does not conform with the above mentioned current policies

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Equally so policy c12 must be adhered to as the scale of such sites in rural or semi rural settings should not dominate the nearest settled community.

In the case of Stanton wick 15 permanent and 5 transit sites would treble the population

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 554 / 1 Name: Jonathon Payne Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Listed below is the objections I have to the proposal for Stanton Wick. I hope that on my behalf the parish council will strongly oppose this gypsy/traveller site.

I would like to register my strong objections for the use of the site of the old colliery buildings at Stanton Wick as a gypsy/traveller site for 15 permanent and 5 transit pitches. My main objection is that the increase in population would completely change the dynamics of this small hamlet of Stanton Wick, it would be over development. I understand that there is already less than 25 dwellings in this area. Lets not forget this is not a village but a hamlet. The access to this site is served by a single track road, can you imagine the impact an increase of 80 or more vehicles using this road on a daily basis would have on the inhabitants. There would not be sufficient capacity for walking or access. I understand that you have already refused permission for Filers Coach Company request to increase the amount of coaches they keep in their depot which is adjacent to the proposed gypsy/traveller site. The reason why it was refused was because there were concerns and issues with the access and increase in traffic on such a narrow lane these extra vehicles would have caused. Has the

Highways Agency under taken a risk assessment regarding the impact an increase in traffic would have. I would also question why this site is 'being considered as there is no existing water supply or power (electric). Is there sufficient drainage and sewerage facilities to cope with this many people living on this site. There is no shops or doctors within the recommended distance. There is no public transport direct from Stanton Wick. The local schools would not have the capacity to cope with the increase in pupils wishing to attend these schools. The site is in the greenbelt and my understanding regarding planning permission is that the current government is opposed to any development whatsoever on this type of land. Mining has taken place in this area and some shafts are uncharted. Has the site actually been assessed as being safe for human occupation. I also object to this proposal for this site especially as it is not on a recognised gypsy/traveller route.

I am very concerned on how you came to even short list this site when using you own matrix scoring system. This site came in at 17th place. How on earth has it now been short listed as one of seven possible sites for your consideration. I urge you to seriously re consider this proposal.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 554 / 1 Name: Jonathon Payne Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The assessment states that this site is in the Green Belt and that it is heavily constrained by its access. It does not take into consideration the access to amenities such as schools and doctors surgery. Plus which schools are all the children going to.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

I do not agree as the scale of this site should not dominate the nearest settled community.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

As stated in your assessment, this is a greenbelt site. National guidelines catagorically state that gypsy and traveller sites in green belt "are inappropriate" development.

Respondent: 555 / 1 Name: Kim Payne Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do NOT agree with the Council's assessment because I do not think this site is suitable as it is in the greenbelt. Policy E14 issued by the department for communities and local government in March 2012 stated that Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the green belt are inappropriate. Equally so policy C12 must be adhered to as the scale of such sites in rural or semi rural settings should not dominate the nearest settled community. In the case of Stanton Wick 15 permanent and 5 transit sites would treble the population. I am also concered in the increase in traffic this would cause to this single track road. Has the Highways Dept done a risk assessment to ascertain the impact on pedestrians using the lane. What about their safety. This is a small hamlet and this site would dwarf the local community.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

As mentioned above re policy E14 & C12. National guidelines state that the site should not overwhelm the nearest settlement. Even at 20 pitches the travellers would outnumber the Stanton Wick residents 2 or 3:1

How will social cohesion be achieved under these circumstances. The site has nothing in common with the type of site preferred by travellers as shown in the West of England Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Travellers prefer close proximity to amenities and small family sites of up to 5 pitches. Has anyone done an indepth survey of the land for contamination. Is it safe for human occupation. I believe the site is contaminated with arsenic.

Respondent: 555 / 1 Name: Kim Payne Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Listed below is the objections I have to the proposal for Stanton Wick. I hope that on my behalf the parish council will strongly oppose this gypsy/traveller site.

I would like to register my strong objections for the use of the site of the old colliery buildings at Stanton Wick as a gypsy/travellers site for 15 permanent and 5 transit pitches. My main objection is that the increase in population would completely change the dynamics of this small hamlet of Stanton Wick, it would be over development. I understand that there is already less than 25 dwellings in this area. Lets not forget this is not a village but a hamlet. The access to this site is served by a single track road, can you imagine the impact an increase of 80 or more vehicles using this road on a daily basis would have on the inhabitants. There would not be sufficient capacity for walking or access. I understand that you have already refused permission for Filers Coach Company request to increase the amount of coaches they keep in their depot which is adjacent to the proposed gypsy/traveller site. The reason why it was refused was because there were concerns and issues with the access and increase in traffic on such a narrow lane these extra vehicles would have caused. Has the Highways Agency under taken a risk assessment regarding the impact an increase in traffic would have. I would also question why this site is 'being considered as there is no existing water supply or power (electric). Is there sufficient drainage and sewerage facilities to cope with this many people living on this site. There is no shops or doctors within the recommended distance. There is no public transport direct from Stanton Wick. The local schools would not have the capacity to cope with the increase in pupils wishing to attend these schools. The site is in the greenbelt and my understanding regarding planning permission is that the current government is opposed to any development whatsoever on this type of land. Mining has taken place in this area and some shafts are uncharted. Has the site actually been assessed as being safe for human occupation. I also object to this proposal for this site especially as it is not on a recognised gypsy/traveller route.

I am very concerned on how you came to even short list this site when using you own matrix scoring system. This site came in at 17th place. How on earth has it now been short listed as one of seven possible sites for your consideration. I urge you to seriously re consider this proposal.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 558 / 1 Name: Mr S J E Thomas Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I totally agree with the comments made by The Action Group

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No! The site is totally inappropriate both practically and socially

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Certainly not!

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am not impressed with the council's attitude and presentation of their proposal. There is no logic in the approach, physically or socially. The financial implications for rate and tax payers would be considerable

Respondent: 559 / 1 Name: Ms Mary Thomas Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The statements made by Action Group cover all aspects. A totally unsuitable site.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree. Quite out of question!

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, No, No !!!

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

What an illogical problem!

No water, no drainage, not even a road. Just a lane to approach, more mud!

Respondent: 612 / 1 Name: Mr A E F Quinn Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I have been alerted to the above proposal and have to say I was surprised that no-one in any of the Parish Councils was aware that B&NES were even thinking about this. Not quite my idea of democracy to be honest.

I want you to know that I have a number of reservations about this proposition. I understand that there has been an application for dwellings on this property before and that it was rejected on grounds of safety - mines and toxic soil. So can you explain to me how it is has now become a prime site for caravans. Surely dwellings and caravans are the same when it comes to the safety of individuals.

The location of the site does not seem to fit normal criteria for such sites, i.e. easy access to shops and schools. In fact both the schools in Pensford and Stanton Drew are close to capacity and everyone knows that Chew Valley School is already overfull. So the burden of transport of children to other schools will fall on the taxpayer.

Presumably there will be significant costs to bring the site up to standard - services and surface -another burden for the taxpayer. The sheer size of what is proposed will significantly dwarf the existing hamlet of Stanton Wick.

The lane is very narrow and has no pavements making an already hazardous road even more so with the significant additional movement of traffic that will be inevitable given the numbers proposed.

From what I gather the site does not score well on any of the criteria laid down for such facilities and I think the Council should reconsider its strategy and seek a wider range of sites from which to choose. Even more importantly to those of us who choose to live in the country with its additional costs, this is clearly Green Belt and I am keen to make sure we value that space that successive generations have secured for us

A couple of questions for you [Cllr Peter Edwards]:-

1. Are you, as the representative of the people of Pensford, supporting or opposing this idea?
2. What approaches have the gypsy community made to B&NES for such a facility given that they very rarely travel in this area.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 632 / 1 Name: Mr Roy and Ena Miles Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We are writing to register our objections to the above proposal.

1. The land in question is Green Belt land and previous applications to develop the same have been rejected. It cannot be right to have one rule for one party and not the same rule for another.
2. The site is possibly unsafe with mine shafts, it being a former coal mine.
3. There is no main drainage in the area and a question mark must arise over the provision of a suitable electricity supply . Also there is no natural gas laid on to Pensford or Stanton Wick.
4. There is only one access road, which is a very narrow country lane (possibly unclassified) and certainly not suitable for the type of vehicle used by Gypsies or Travellers, with or without caravans.
5. The local primary school (s) would not be able to cope with a substantial influx of pupils and locally, generally, there is very little in the way of facilities.
6. The proposed size of the site, would completely swamp its nearest neighbour of Stanton Wick, which is a very small hamlet.
7. Finally, it is understood, even the Gypsies Travellers have not expressed any interest in the site.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 632 / 1 Name: Mr Roy and Ena Miles Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site is in a very isolated position with little prospects of its permanent inhabitants being able to integrate into the Chew Valley neighbourhood. I understand there are redundant ministry sites in Bath which could provide admirable sites for these people, where they would be able to integrate with bath's citizens and yet still keep their own identity, a midway alternative would be part of the Old Cadbury site at Somerdale, equipped as it is with full infrastructure and access to shops, schools, Doctors surgery and sports pitches, all within a half a mile radius, already in places and essential to reduce anti social behaviour from people of all ages and backgrounds.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

There are no appreciable public services. The class c road only allows reasonable access from a Southerly direction. Attempting to use it in a Northerly direction via Pensford will cause accidents/incidents, Z bends either end of one track railway bridge, a very steep (again one track) gradient over hung with trees leading into Church Street, just part of the problem, prohibitive and unsuitable for heavy trucks as associated with tarmac laying and the collection of scrap metal occupations.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

There is a complete lack of amenities at this site, maybe if this site is to become a home for Gypsies/Travellers BANES be made to erect facilities such as football/tennis/general athletic pitches together with toilet and shower rooms, which could be shared with the local communities. The nearest school and only shop, both situated in Pensford, some 5 miles away (on a northerly direction) with the school being sited on the opposite side of the busy A37 from where these children would arrive, The Doctors Surgery is situated some four to five miles from the proposed site. All the above are complete no starters, as there are no main drainage etc. The lane will need widening and upgrading.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

On the face of it, in general it seems councillors have been given little if any thought to planning issues and Gypsy/Traveller wellbeing and instead have followed a course which would inflict the best amount of damage to their chances of being re-elected at the forthcoming elections.

Respondent: 643 / 1 Name: Ms Janet Ogilvie Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

YES. I object to the inclusion of the site at Stanton Wick.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. This assessment is incorrect and the entrie process is flawed.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. The Stanton Wick site should not be taken forward.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Stanton Wick site is unsuitable because:

- a) it is not appropriate in the greenbelt
- b) there is no public transport within safe walking distance
- c) Wick Lane is very narrow and cannot support an increase in traffic. I understand that this has been cited in previous refusals of planning permission.
- d) this large development would overwhelm the existing settled community (potentially by 2:3)
- e) there is no transport to shop in Pensford, doctors surgery (5 miles) or schools.

Respondent: 644 / 1 Name: Mr Simon Rawlings Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site is located in the Green belt If allowed to go ahead this site will dominate the nearest local settlement – something the government has made clear should not take place! The land is contaminated and riddled with disused mine shafts. Road access is inadequate for vehicles and unsafe for pedestrians I understand that planning permission has been refused on this site for smaller developments in the past so don't see how this could be allowed to go ahead. Amenities are overstretched and hard to access without a vehicle

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I do not agree. The council seems to have overlooked the fact that the site will hugely dominate the nearest settlement of Stanton Wick in size. The site is in a greenbelt area bordering residential properties and countryside footpaths so talk of being sheltered from sight is not correct – this site will have significant impact on the area. The remedial works mentioned briefly in the assessment will be extremely costly to make the site safe. As it is contaminated land I feel it is an unsafe place to house families – arsenic contamination is not an easy problem to overcome and contamination will remain on the site. Road access is extremely inadequate and it would be very costly and difficult to improve this. The local schools and GP surgery are in my opinion already overstretched or near capacity. These and other amenities are not within walking distance and there are no suitable nearby shops which can be accessed without use of a vehicle. The size of the proposed site is in excess of what is recommended by the government and I do not see that 'special circumstances' apply here.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I completely disagree

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 645 / 1 Name: Mrs Lizz Rawlings Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I feel that this proposed development is inappropriate for the following reasons, mentioned in no particular order:

1. The site offers insufficient road access and capacity – The proposed site is situated at the top of a single track country lane with very few passing places. This road is just about sufficient for the amount of traffic that currently uses it but would struggle to cope with the needs to 20 additional dwellings on top of this. It is also worth noting that the road users will then need to drive through Church Street in Pensford which is already congested and has no safe walkway for pedestrians.
2. The site offers insufficient walking access and capacity – there is no footpath on Stanton Lane leading up to the site and the only alternative walking route to Pensford involves a cross country 'hike' where one is required to clamber through mud and through hedges etc. Due to the steep sides on Stanton Lane it would not be possible to create a footpath here and it is already quite uncomfortable if a car has to pass you whilst you are walking as the road is so narrow. Surly no-one in there right mind would be happy to have their children walking down such a road without supervision and if this is the case then it means residents of the site will be forced to make more regular use of their vehicles for trips to the local corner shop or school (both over a mile away from the site) – this will cause more problems as out lined above!
3. There is no public transport access to the site. Therefore children and the elderly will have to be ferried about even to get to the nearest bus stop. Due to the nature of Stanton Lane it is extremely unlikely that this situation would ever change in the future. Therefore residents of the site would be cut off and forced to walk a dangerous route (especially if taken

after dusk) or have to use their cars.

The Governments Planning Policy for Traveller Sites stipulates that ‘Local planning authorities should ensure their policies provide a settled base that reduces the need for long-distance travelling’ and ‘avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services’. It seems that this site does not meet either of these criteria amongst many others.

4. There are no water or electricity supplies in the area. Bringing these in will be extremely costly and additional difficulties could arise due to the unstable and potentially hazardous nature of the site.

5. There is no shopping available in the recommended distance from the site. The nearest supermarket is a 15-20 minute car drive away.

6. The ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ stipulates that the ‘Governments aims in respect of traveller sites are...to enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure.’

- There is no healthcare available within the recommended distance from the site.
- There are no employment opportunities available in the immediate area.
- Local schools are already near full or oversubscribed. I believe there are a few places available in the local primary school however Chew Valley school is already full to the brim and local children are currently having to be bussed out as local schools can’t meet the needs of the existing residents in the area.

7. The site is situated in the Green Belt. The Governments ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ states that ‘plan making and decision taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development’. I can’t think of any reasons why this development could be termed ‘appropriate’! In fact Policy E of the Planning Policy states that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.’

8. The site will dwarf the local established community. Stanton Wick is the nearest village and is only made up of 25 houses. According to Government guidance this site could house up to 45 caravans and over 200 people. The Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states under policy C that ‘When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such site does not dominate the nearest settled community.’ This must have been a great concern as the point is made again in Policy H point 23.

9. The site is not on a recognised traveller route. When gypsies and travellers have been questioned about their requirements for a site they have expressed a desire that sites should ideally be near to motorways as this fits in with their lifestyle. This site is at least half an hours drive to the nearest motorway. Policy H of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that ‘Local planning authorities should consider the existing level of local provision and need for sites’. It seems that the only people who would benefit from a site in the area are the council as this will fulfil 70% of their required quota. This site will not benefit gypsies, travellers or locals!

10. Gypsies and travellers have stated in accommodation assessments that they prefer small sites which are within walking distance from shops and other amenities. Permission for this site has not been requested or suggested by any traveller.

11. The site is unstable and potentially hazardous. Recently work was undertaken here to fill in a collapsed mine shaft and I understand there is evidence that arsenic has been discovered here in a previous survey – surely this is not a safe place to house families and bring up children!

In conclusion and bearing in mind all the points made above I cannot see how it could possibly be justified to grant permission for this site as it flouts so many of the recommended guidelines on planning policy for traveller sites.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 645 / 1 Name: Mrs Lizz Rawlings Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site is located in the Green belt

If allowed to go ahead this site will dominate the nearest local settlement – something the government has made clear should not take place!

The land is contaminated and riddled with disused mine shafts.

Road access is inadequate for vehicles and unsafe for pedestrians
 I understand that planning permission has been refused on this site for smaller developments in the past so don't see how this could be allowed to go ahead.
 Amenities are overstretched and hard to access without a vehicle

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I do not agree. The council seems to have overlooked the fact that the site will hugely dominate the nearest settlement of Stanton Wick in size. The site is in a greenbelt area bordering residential properties and countryside footpaths so talk of being sheltered from sight is not correct – this site will have significant impact on the area. The remedial works mentioned briefly in the assessment will be extremely costly to make the site safe. As it is contaminated land I feel it is an unsafe place to house families – arsenic contamination is not an easy problem to overcome and contamination will remain on the site. Road access is extremely inadequate and it would be very costly and difficult to improve this. The local schools and GP surgery are in my opinion already overstretched or near capacity. These and other amenities are not within walking distance and there are no suitable nearby shops which can be accessed without use of a vehicle. The size of the proposed site is in excess of what is recommended by the government and I do not see that 'special circumstances' apply here.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I completely disagree

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 691 / 1 Name: Mrs Bernice Parsons Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Inappropriate development in the green belt

Respondent: 692 / 1 Name: Mr Keith Parsons Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Inappropriate development in the green belt

Respondent: 732 / 1 Name: Mrs M J Thomas Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

- 1) THE STANTON WICK SITE is in the Green Belt. This would be inappropriate development in the green belt.
- 2) There is a history of planning refusals
- 3) The proposed large development is too big and would overwhelm the existing community

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The site is dangerous, with old mine shafts. The local schools are miles away, with no foot path and no bus route to the site. There is limited employment in the area.

Respondent: 733 / 1 Name: S W Thomas Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Inappropriate development in the Green Belt
 Dangerous and contaminated site - mine shafts

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

No public transport and remote from schools and shops or GP's.
 Narrow and dangerous lane for traffic and walking.
 No sewerage or room for septic tank.
 No local employment opportunities.

Respondent: 738 / 1 Name: Ms T J Allward Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Stanton Wick Old Colliery site is wholly unsuitable as a 'Preferred site' and fails on a number of key areas of consideration. The site is in the Green Belt and would constitute 'inappropriate development in the Green Belt'. It is close to Pensford Conservation Area and a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. There is a long history of planning application refusals at this site and adjacent with inappropriate development on the Green Belt cited as reason for refusal. The proposed development would overwhelm the existing community by up to a factor of 3 to 1. The road network cannot

support an increase in traffic without substantial widening and alterations with traffic volume also cited in previous refusals. The water supply infrastructure is at capacity and there is no mains sewerage. The site is contaminated and remediation would be uneconomic and involve significant contribution from the Council and all these issues would involve a high volume of heavy vehicle movements along the lanes. There are no safe walking routes to the local schools, local shop or surgery and there is no public transport within safe walking distance. The site is potentially dangerous and the old mineshafts could be liable to subsidence.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 739 / 1 Name: C Allward Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Stanton Wick Old Colliery site is wholly unsuitable as a 'Preferred site' and fails on a number of key areas of consideration. The site is in the Green Belt and would constitute 'inappropriate development in the Green Belt'. It is close to Pensford Conservation Area and a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. There is a long history of planning application refusals at this site and adjacent with inappropriate development on the Green Belt cited as reason for refusal. The proposed development would overwhelm the existing community by up to a factor of 3 to 1. The road network cannot support an increase in traffic without substantial widening and alterations with traffic volume also cited in previous refusals. The water supply infrastructure is at capacity and there is no mains sewerage. The site is contaminated and remediation would be uneconomic and involve significant contribution from the Council and all these issues would involve a high volume of heavy vehicle movements along the lanes. There are no safe walking routes to the local schools, local shop or surgery and there is no public transport within safe walking distance. The site is potentially dangerous and the old mineshafts could be liable to subsidence.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 778 / 1 Name: Mr Bernard Coombs Organisation:
Glover

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Use ex M.O.D. sites outside Green Belt.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Several mineshafts are within the site and these could subside at any time. There is also the high risk of fire and explosion.

Respondent: 779 / 1 Name: Ms Beryl Audrey Coombs Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Ex M.O.D. site - also outside Green Belt

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The site is dangerous, has several old mine shafts within it, and these could be liable to subsidence at any time - also these factors create a much greater and dangerous fire risk which would soon spread with devastating results.

Respondent: 795 / 1 Name: Ms Ruth Alison Wear Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I have facts and "information" regarding the site at the Old Colliery, Stanton Wick, Near Pensford and I submit that Bath and North East Somerset Council have designated this as one of their "Preferred Sites" based on poorly researched and dubious "evidence" and "information" and that it is unsuitable and unachievable

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree and submit that the Council have failed to carry out a full and proper "assessment of opportunities and constraints" on this site. I submit that this site is unfit for human habitation for the following reasons:

1) The land is known to be contaminated with arsenic, asbestos and other noxious substances. I have been informed by a planning officer that this would be "cleared". My questions are: How would this be achieved? How much would it cost to achieve it?

2) Even more worrying than what is visible and tangible on the surface of the site is what is not visible. My questions are: What lies underground? Does anyone (eg. The National Coal Board) have documents showing the layout of this old coalmine? Where are the mineshafts? Are they known to be "safe" or could they subside at any time?

I submit that no full and proper Health and Safety Assessment has been carried out on this site and that it has been "chosen" as a "Preferred" site for Travellers by a group of Bath and North East Somerset Councillors who would balk at the idea of living there themselves.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, I do not and respectfully suggest that the site be left alone for what it is, ie: An old colliery of historic interest and a conservation area providing an undisturbed habitat for protected species.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I recommend that Bath and North East Somerset Councillors focus their strategies on proposed sites for travellers based purely on planning issues, national and local policies, government guidance and best practice for Gypsy and Traveller sites.

Respondent: 796 / 1 Name: Mr John Wear Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Old Colliery - Stanton Wick

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I disagree with the Council's assessment of this site.

The Council's assessment is shallow and deeply flawed. Little or no research into the site's viability seems to have been carried out. What the Council is presenting as facts are proving inaccurate on almost all fronts.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

I totally disagree that the pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation. I believe that the Council will be putting gypsy and travellers health and wellbeing at risk by siting them on what could be a very dangerous and hazardous location.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

When Bath and North East Somerset Councillors are considering the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan, the health, safety and wellbeing of all BANES residents should be uppermost in their minds.

Respondent: 803 / 1 Name: Mr Alan York Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Could you please explain how the proposed site at Stanton wick could possibly have been put through, by the members of Banes council at the meeting on may the 9th Ignoring strong arguments against this proposed site even from the nearest liberal councillor Jeremy sparks.

This site falls foul of every planing rule that Banes council is supposed to adhere too, It does not need money wasted on consultation. May i suggest a far cheaper solution, a day trip for the whole council taken to this contaminated site full of lots of health and safety issues, transport provided by the coach firm that use the site [by the way this coach firm had they, re plans to expand putting more coaches on this site turned down because of the increase in vehicular traffic on the narrow single track road, that is the only way to reach this site !!!] You will all be able to see for yourselves how narrow this lane is, and as you pass by the small hamlet of Stanton wick [about to be swamped by this proposal] through lovely green belt , you will arrive at your destination no main drainage, no footpath , no facilities , nowhere near a motorway junction [which i understand travellers prefer] and if common sense is still in use [or have the EU banned this because it dose not conform to the metric rule] it may dawn on the council that this site is totally unsuitable

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 803 / 2 Name: Mr Alan York Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

i would most strongly like to register my protest at the news that BANES COUNCIL are strongly considering putting a travellers camp at the old pit site at Stanton Wick.

Having lived in the village of Pensford all of my life [55 years] i have seen very many changes [new houses extensions etc], not all of which i,ve approved of but realise that life moves on .

However, this latest plan from this council makes me wonder just what lunatics are in charge of making these decisions . A camp that defies all known logic , Its proposed size would swamp the nearest hamlet [Stanton wick] by more than three to one, Access to it from either direction necessitates negotiating a very narrow single track road. [hardly ideal,and as i remember a local coach firm ,s application to park two more coaches on this very same plot was rejected amongst other things ,because of the road access!!!! and they would have been as nothing compared to the vehicle movements involved in with this insanely thought out travellers camp.

Further more as this was a working pit , with various shafts and workings, there is every chance of subsidence ,not to mention all manner of contamination all over this site ,Destruction of wildlife habitat , On green belt land, No main drainage etc etc etc !!!!!!!!!!!!! the list is endless

I really do believe that Banes Council think they can dump this site on us , [thinking that we are only country yokels, Too thick to understand whats going on. They want to rush this through, without consulting the local councils , or the affected community .

Banes Council would very much like to get this site passed , as it would go a very long way to meeting their requirements [traveler sites] With 15 pitches proposed and by their very own admission [capable of being expanded to up to 50 pitches] from going from a very large proposed site to something on an enormous scale.

We have all seen what happens to these camps, how they expand overnight .[Does Dale Farm ring any bells]

Who pays for all of this ? As a taxpayer having worked all my life from the age of 15 . I hope you are not suggesting that as a proportion of the various taxes i have to pay goes towards the very MPs and Councillors wages and very generous pensions , who are proposing to wreak havoc on my life and community, i will also be paying towards the building of this camp , its upkeep and everything else associated with running such a WONDERFUL village enhancing project. AFTER ALL IF I AM PAYING TOWARDS YOURE JOB SURELY THAT MAKES ME YOURE EMPLOYER [NOT THE OTHER WAY ROUND] Perhaps you could tell me where the travellers will get the money to pay for the site pitches, as we all know these are difficult times, and work is short even for those resident in the surrounding villages.

Sometimes when i travel to bath [to seek work to pay my taxes] i pass by a travellers camp near Newgate, may i say how wonderful this looks, no mess or rubbish, a real credit to the city of BATH [I DONT THINK!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!] Perhaps the thinking from the council is to encourage these travellers out to us [oik,s] Out of site ,out of mind, so to speak [SURELY NOT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!]

If the council would like any suggestions as to possible pitches for a travellers camp i have noticed a few whilst traveling through Bath that would far better meet the travellers needs

Just one other small point, Lifestyle choices are fine, As long as you fund them yourselves , NOT EXPECT SOMEONE ELSE TO FUND THEM FOR YOU . But if you can get money from the council to fund the lifestyle you would like , please tell me , where do i apply as i want a bigger house, a new car , very little work and lots of holidays. [Or do you have to be a councillor to get these!!!!!!!!!!!!!!]

I would very much like a reply to my email with some explanations!!!!!!

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 807 / 1 Name: Ms Janet Blackwell Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing to register my very grave concern that the Colliery land at Stanton Wick has been shortlisted by Bath and N E Somerset Council as a Gypsy and Travellers site. This land is totally unsuitable for the following reasons:

- 1) The site is Green Belt land, and, according to the Planning for Travellers Sites document, sites should not be located within the Green Belt except "in very special circumstances". The fact that the land is conveniently large, and that BANES has a lot of Green Belt land in its area do not constitute "very special circumstances".
- 2) Planning permission in the area was recently refused for Filers Coaches for minor development as unsuitable for Green Belt so how is it suddenly acceptable to have an enormous development of homes for over 100 people?
- 3) The Gypsy /Traveller community would totally overwhelm the local community of Stanton Wick.
- 4) The road accessing the site is very narrow and single track for most of its length. It emerges into Pensford in an equally narrow and restricted area. The huge increase in traffic that will result from this development means that serious accidents are inevitable.
- 5) There is no pavement for walking from the site to either Stanton Wick or Pensford. How are the Travellers' children going to make their way to school presumably in Pensford? Walking would be too far and too dangerous, driving would be dangerous and in any case there is absolutely nowhere in Pensford to park.
- 6) There are no amenities in the area- no shops, no public transport and the nearest doctors' surgery is nearly five miles away in Chew Stoke.
- 7) There would be problems with water supply, power supply and drains.
- 8) The site itself is utterly unsuitable and dangerous. The ground is unsafe because of mineshafts and the land is contaminated by, among other things, arsenic. It would reflect very badly on BANES Council if it were discovered that Councillors were happy to put Gypsy and Traveller families in such a dangerous environment just because the area concerned was large. Cleaning up the land and making it safe would cost a huge amount of money.
- 9) The wildlife in the area would suffer from the development, including adders and bats, which as you know are protected.
- 10) I gather that the selection process has been going on for over a year, yet there has been absolutely NO consultation with local residents and Parish Councils in the affected area, the community only discovering what was afoot ten days ago.
- 11) Eric Pickles and the new Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, has stated that traveller sites built in the green belt, whether temporary or permanent, should always be considered inappropriate development.

The selection process involving the matrix is seriously flawed, and looks like an attempt to force onto the shortlist a piece of land which is clearly unsuitable being contaminated and unstable with no amenities and accessed by a dangerous single track road, just because the site happens to be large.

I would be immensely grateful if you could lend your support to ensure BANES Council urgently rethinks the shortlist of Gypsy and Traveller sites.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 807 / 2 Name: Ms Janet Blackwell Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Several planning applications have been rejected by BANES to extend the usage of Filers coach yard to 20 vehicles, the land being immediately next door to the south of the proposed site. The rejections were for inappropriate use of the Green Belt which would detract from the openness and rural character of the area.

This too is a Brown Field site within Green Belt.

I think most rational people would consider that a sprawling development of approximately 40 caravans and 80 vehicles to say nothing of 100+ inhabitants would detract from the openness and rural character of the area rather more than the few extra coaches which the Council considered so undesirable.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 1075 / 1 Name: Mrs Carolyn Beecroft Organisation: Chelwood Parish Council

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do not agree with Council's assessment.

The proposal is contrary to policy HG.16, specifically i), ii), iv), and v).

The proposal is contrary to policy CP11, specifically a), b), d), e), f) and possibly g).

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do not agree.

Chelwood Parish Council notes that the extant residential permission only covers an area of approx 6750 square metres. Planning ref 05/02227/FUL..

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Based on our own experience and local knowledge of BANES Council's previous decisions we do not support the contention that very special circumstances exist to allow the normal Green Belt constraints to be ignored.

The case against the proposal is overwhelmingly supported by HG.16 and CP.11.

The requirement to provide a travellers site is not mandatory and cannot therefore constitute very special circumstances.

The existing highway network is clearly totally inadequate CP11 (b), as evidenced by the refusal of previous applications on Wick Lane.

Respondent: 1323 / 2 Name: Mr Christopher Thomas Organisation: Marksbury Parish Council
J.

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

1. The site is in the greenbelt and is therefore inappropriate for a traveller site.
2. The road access is unsuitable for the likely increase in traffic a proposal site of the size indicated would be generated.
- 3, Is there a possible radon hazard from the old workings?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No it is inappropriate as above.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 1549 / 1 Name: J.A. J A Harvey Organisation: Stanton Drew Parish Council

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Parish Council found no appropriate sites because:

The Parish is washed over Green Belt and development of traveller sites is 'INAPPROPRIATE IN THE GREEN BELT'
 There is no easy access to public transport.
 We have no shop in the Parish.
 Doctor & dentist surgeries are 3- 4 miles away, not within 1500 m
 There are no sites in safe walking distance from Stanton Drew Primary School.

The Parish Council first became aware the site was listed as 'preferred' for 15 permanent & 5 transit pitches i.e. 60 caravans on 18th April 2012 via email. If the Parish Council had known about the potential allocation of the above site prior to its public announcement we could have provided necessary evidence to help BaNES officers in the pre-consultation process, preventing the site from being erroneously placed on the list. If gypsy representatives were allowed to see the site in November and asked to make comment then why was the parish council kept out of the loop?

This proposal would totally overwhelm Stanton Wick by 3:1, contravening Planning Policy For Traveller Sites [March 2012].

An independent contamination report 2009/10, states arsenic levels exceed the Residential SGVs and there is much asbestos on site.

The hypocrisy of considering a development of some 60 caravans & associated buildings on site after the refusal of previous private planning applications on highways, sustainability & Green Belt grounds, [however latterly the permission for the building of 1 house & ancillary building, approved in March 2011, with stringent stipulations] is flabbergasting.

The Parish Council organised a public meeting on 2nd May to inform residents of the facts, prior to the Parish Council

meeting on 3rd May 2012. Over 250 residents attended, overflowing into the car park. Almost 100% of parishioners have signed a petition registering their incredulity that the site scored 17th lowest out of 23, yet becoming top 6th preferred site. This gave the Parish Council the mandate to speak on behalf of its residents.

The site is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest with European protected species. This should have been scored in the matrix.

The Parish Council made statements at:

1. 9th May Cabinet Meeting [Appendix 1]
2. Scrutiny Panel on 15th May.
3. 11th June Cabinet meeting [Appendix 2]. Submissions from the Parish Council & parishioners have all received the same answer, that they would be answered at the end of consultation. This reply has created feelings of mistrust that the questions would remain inadequately answered.
4. Two further Parish Council Public meetings on 23rd & 25th May were held.
5. The Parish Council held a surgery on 17th June to help residents complete the consultation response forms.
6. The Parish Council made a statement on behalf of the parishioners at the Special Council meeting on 18th June [Appendix 3]

The PC has attended MP surgeries. In association with Stanton Wick Action Group we asked for contact to be made with Andrew Robathan (PUSS) to consider vacated MOD sites for allocation. This has been done.

The Parish Council attended the consultation roadshows across the district, the public meeting at Chew Magna on 11th July and the Cabinet meeting was attended by the Chair of the Parish Council.

The Parish Council is very concerned about the lack of useful feedback from BaNES received by the many parishioners who have engaged to ask questions, give evidence and express opinions.

Since the Parish Council was given the mandate of its Parishioners to speak on their behalf, we will continue to work to this end in a hope that the Cabinet will listen and understand that the Stanton Wick site is neither suitable, achievable nor available as a Gypsy and traveller site.

Whilst we understand the need for authorised sites in BaNES, the Parish Council is very concerned that this whole process has been ill-thought through, and rushed, creating much anguish and frustration in the Parish. The deeply-flawed scoring matrix produced the deeply flawed list of preferred sites. The whole process needs to be commenced again so that Gypsy and traveller communities are provided with safe, healthy, small sites located close to urban areas (being their preference in the GTAA).

If BANES look at the location of unauthorised sites and we understand 69 tolerated sites throughout the district the Cabinet will see that the major sites centre in or around major road networks and close to urban areas for ease of movement and accessing of services. In the past 10 years the major unauthorised sites have been at;

Former Herman Miller site, Lower Bristol Road, Bath
 Lower Bristol Road, Bath
 Newbridge Park & Ride, Bath
 Odd Down Park & Ride, Bath
 Odd Down Playing Fields, Bath
 Twerton, A4, Bath
 Quen Charlton, Keynsham
 Charmy Down, Bath
 K2, Keynsham [at least twice]
 Hampton Row, Bath [at least twice]
 Entry Hill, Bath
 Play area, Whitchurch
 Freshford Mill, Bath
 Clandown, Radstock

Rush Hill, Bath
 Swan Lane, Combe Hay, Bath

In other words, NOT in the remote parts of Stanton Drew Parish

Any sites in the Green Belt should not have passed 'Go' at the outset. Valuable time & money has been wasted and a great deal of stress has been placed on communities across the district. Not forgetting the stress placed on the permanent BaNES officers unnecessarily. Respect & trust in BaNES Council has been seriously damaged and admiration for local democracy is at an all-time low. This is deeply troubling for society as a whole.

AVAILABILITY, SUITABILITY & ACHIEVABILITY.

The Old Colliery Buildings site at Stanton Wick is NOT AVAILABLE as development of gypsy, travellers sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt. [Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Dept. for Communities and local Government, March 2012].

This site is NOT SUITABLE as development of gypsy, travellers sites are inappropriate in the Green Belt.

This site is NOT ACHIEVABLE as development of gypsy, traveller sites are inappropriate in the Green Belt.

No very special circumstances exist to counter the above policy because achievable, suitable & achievable sites have been indicated to BaNES during the May to July consultation period. The site proposed at Stanton Wick may be available for sale by the landowner, Tom Smart, but it is not available in terms of the proposal for a gypsy, travellers site for numerous reasons of suitability & achievability, these being on the grounds of;•

PAST PLANNING DECISIONS. Allocation would contradict all previous planning applications permitted & refused. Reasons from BaNES Planning Dept. have stated;

1. 'The site is not in a sustainable location for a significant employment use and it is particularly unsuitable for HGV traffic'. Mr Solder, BaNES Economic Development Dept., site meeting 17/06/2005.
2. Aug 2005- Permitted, Change of use from B2 site to provide one residential dwelling, ancillary residential accommodation, B1 floorspace & garaging for 5 vehicles. Certain conditions were placed - 'in the interests of appearance of the development & the surrounding area.' Remedial work was necessary, 'To safeguard the living conditions of future & neighbouring occupiers and to protect the water environment.' Permission granted for 1 dwelling and 1 ancillary building plus the parking of 5 vehicles is very different from permitting 15 permanent and 5 transient pitches equating to some 60 caravans (using Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document DPD 2012 recommended usage figure). August 2005- Imposition of condition 7- 'To prevent an over intensive use of the site', based on the unadopted Wansdyke Local Plan & policies of BaNES Local Plan, Revised Deposit Draft 2003.
3. 30 December 2010 - Refuse 05/0227/FUL Change of use & conversion of ancillary accommodation [building 1] to a self-contained dwelling & variation of condition 7 of planning permission 05/0227/FUL. WORKS SITE ONLY.

So potentially if this had been permitted it would have allowed maximum 2 dwellings on site, one from the previously permitted building 1 dwelling. At present only 1 family has permission to take up residence subject to remediation works. With the present proposal for 15 permanent pitches and 5 transient pitches that would mean 15 permanent families plus close relatives and 5 transient families, an estimated number of people to be between 100 - 150 plus people which would totally overwhelm the settled community of 60 people [thus contravening Planning Policy For Traveller Sites, March 2012. The BaNES requested contamination report done by Sanctus [GL10 3UT] 01/04/2010. This report is available on the BaNES website. Sanctus drilled 14 trial pits to the max depth of 3.2 metres below ground level on 11 Nov 2009, monitoring wells assessing gassing & hydraulic regimes on 81h December 2009.

Arsenic concentration levels exceeding Residential SGV were stated as potentially significant. Being harmful;

- Via ingestion of contaminated soils
- Dermal contact with soils
- Consumption of home grown fruit & veg
- Via migration of soil gas via permeable/ fracture strata, [associated with the repair, commercial vehicle storage & maintenance facility & also from historic mine workings.
- Page 22, 'due to the maximum % of carbon dioxide being >5%, characteristic situation for ground gas protection will be considered, in order for residential development to incorporate adequate protection measures for the gassing regimes present'.

- The Sanctus report identified asbestos in shed roofs as hazardous & non-hazardous waste.

- Re: ARSENIC [p 23] - 'certain areas are unsuitable for use in garden & landscape areas of the new development'.

The analyses were done in & around the buildings areas only. The present BaNES proposal does not take into account likely contamination on the mine workings & old tip sites that would be accessible to site residents and may be subject to potential expansion in Appendix 5: Detailed Site Assessment Tables, Site Capacity].

Further contamination reports should be undertaken on the mine working & old tip areas now to assess likely harm to human and animal health [the latter in terms of grazing horses].

- P 24, Sanctus recommends '600 mm of made ground to be removed from proposed garden & landscaping areas & replaced'

- P 24, 'Gas protection measures are required to prevent build-up of gas within confined spaces'. It is known by older parishioners that the site has been subject to spontaneous combustion in the past. Again further investigation should be carried out on the mine & tip areas to ensure that future residents are not put at fire risk.

- Lead contamination results varied across the site, the majority of the test point had results between 30 - 60 mg/kg, however;

Test point 02 - 100 mg/kg at 1.2 m depth,
 TP 04-410 mg/kg at 1.5 m,
 TP 08-100 mg/kg at 0.3 m,
 TP13 -110 mg/kg at 1.5 m.

Again lead is a known contaminant relating coal mining practices, analysis of mine & tip working would need to be carried out to assess health risks. • 18/03/11 PERMIT 1 0/03029/REN, the Works site only. Renewal of application 05/02227/FUL Change of use from 82 site to provide 1 residential dwelling, ancillary residential accommodation, 81 floor space & garaging for 5 vehicles.

- Various stipulations as to finishes were placed 'in the interests of the appearance of the development & surrounding area'. It is very difficult to see how mobile homes & amenity blocks are going to be able to satisfy the above stipulation and be in keeping with the heritage nature of the site brick buildings. 'To ensure the provision of an appropriate landscape setting to the development', stipulations were made for

1. Archaeological work
2. Bat scheme
3. Contamination

'To safeguard the living conditions of future & neighbouring occupiers & to protect the water environment' - with respects to the water environment. Concerning the bat scheme, bats are known to fly & feed in the area in and around the adjacent Winding House and the Old Colliery site. A copy of the bats' flight path is attached [appendix 4], this was drawn up by the occupants of the Winding house in June 2012 prior to a visit by Dr Nancy Vaughan [doctorate in bats & hares, Bristol University] to identify the bat calls. The hibernarium is located within the boundary of the Winding House property close to the boundary of the Old Colliery building site. The evening of Dr Vaughan's visit she identified piperstrelles and noctules by call. Greater horseshoe bats have been seen in the area but not identified that evening. Dr Vaughan placed a record at the BRERC.

Past planning applications on the adjacent Filer's Coaches site provide pertinent evidence to further illustrate why the Old Colliery building should not be available or suitable for the proposed development. Past applications to park an additional 8 coaches in addition to the 12 permitted coaches have been turned down on the following grounds;

'The proposed expansion ... would be inappropriate use of the Green Belt' [Policy G 8 1] ' .. .increase in the number of vehicles parked at the site would detract from the openness & rural character of this area ... ' [Policy GB 2].

'likely to increase vehicle movements, including those of large vehicles, on the local road system, which are unsuitable to accept additional traffic by reason of its inadequate width, alignment and junctions ... result in congestion & inconvenience to other road users'. [Policy T 1]

'Location remote from services & public transport facilities to enable staff to access the site ... likely to increase the vehicle journeys to and from the site ... 1Policy T1]

'Benefits of the proposal ... do not clearly outweigh the harm by reason of appropriateness.

On 4th June 2012 at the Planning Control Committee meeting, planning officers once more recommended Refusal but the decision was deferred pending more evidence from the applicant.

ACHIEVABILITY - In terms of achievability it is very unlikely that this site is economically achievable. A necessary thorough Environmental Impact Assessment should be done across all areas of the site i.e. the old buildings, the mine & the tip, even if the latter are not intended for use, as a matter of duty of care BaNES needs to insist all areas are covered in case of egress on to the land by residents recreationally or otherwise. The Parish Council has alerted Cabinet members & officers to the potential cost of decontamination of the buildings area alone, in the region of £1.8 Million [see appendix 2] based on consultation with local expertise in the area. Since contamination examination has not been carried out on the rest of the site yet this figure is likely to be substantially increased. A full contamination survey across all areas needs to be done. The Parish Council has also alerted BaNES to the fact that the mains water supply is potentially inadequate. Many residents in the hamlet of Stanton Wick experience very low pressure and are unable to run more than 1 water using appliance at a time. Due to lack of water pressure the previous business collected & used water from the roofs, this will not be an option for domestic use thus a new water main should be laid at huge expense. A full highways report needs to be done and looking at the evidence from planning applications in the area there would be substantial work to be done to make the roads adequate to carry the anticipated extra vehicles. A mine safety assessment needs to be carried out to ensure that no resident comes to any harm and that work is done correctly. Ensuring that the heritage brick built buildings are renovated appropriately will be costly and ensuring any bat roost remains undisturbed will also have knock on costs. A full year round bat assessment would need to be carried out to ascertain the exact movements of the bats.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Site & Surrounding areas information -

1. 'The site comprises a former pit and brick buildings, including workshops and barn.' We partially agree but the site considerations also included a tip and old mine workings which are known to be potentially unstable.
2. 'The site is outside the housing settlement boundary of Stanton Wick'. No it isn't. Next door to the north, is the Winding House and directly opposite to the west, is the Bath House, both residences. 0.28 km to the north again are two more properties.
3. 'The site benefits from existing on-site services and utilities' We disagree. There is a tap and low power 3 phase electricity. There is no foul water drainage, no mains gas. As previously stated the mains water supply is inadequate [page 4, paragraph 5].
4. 'The development of this site would not directly assist the aim of social integration'. We agree, creating a large 'ghetto' such as proposed would adversely affect any aim of social integration. This remote site could potentially be very isolating for young gypsy/traveller mums with young children as experienced by young mums in Stanton Wick. The lane is too narrow, gloomy and very hilly to be pushing buggies down to the shop in Pensford and particularly uphill back to the site. Elderly residents could also experience isolation, not being able to walk a short distance to a shop for a chat. It must be noted that the owner of the shop in Pensford has been trying to sell the shop for a couple of years as he needs to retire. He stated to the Parish Council in April that he intended to close the shop in 6 months. The shop may no longer exist very soon.
5. 'However, the site's location outside the main settlement would also limit the impact on neighbouring residents ... We disagree. As indicated in 2, this is a complete fallacy. The impact on neighbouring residents needs to be assessed in an Equality Impact Assessment. It is not acceptable to make assessments on behalf of one type of community and to discriminate against the needs of the settled community. Residents may be able to demonstrate under the Human Rights Act 1998, that their 'respect for privacy when one has a reasonable expectation of privacy', may be compromised by this proposal.
6. '... ability to obtain primary school place is more likely to be easier than other locations. This is a long term benefit of the allocation of this land for development. ' It would be interesting to note that Councillor Hartley in his assessments wrongly identified the school as Stanton Drew Primary School to which the site children would go to. That school is way outside the distance criterion of 1500 metres.

The Parish Council will discuss the Pensford School location as it is nearest to the proposed site.

Has the number of potential primary school children been assessed properly? Prior to June 2012 we are aware through discussions with Cllr Hartley this had not been done. So, as a ballpark figure 20 families with an average of 3 children for gypsy families and 5 for Irish travelling families based on Planning for Gypsy and Travellers; The impact of Localism, June 2011 i.e. 60 - 100 children could be walking up & down a narrow, unlit, gloomy, hilly lane or alternatively a public footpath which at its entrance & exit looks feasible but if Councillors walked the whole thing would soon find out that it is incredibly boggy for about 2/3rds of the walk even in the summer! The novelty of such a walk would soon wear off.

BaNES are not being duly diligent in considering their Duty of Care to the children & their parents.

Driving to school along the lane would create huge amount of vehicle movements and chaos as passing places are infrequent. Allocation of sites must reduce reliance on motor vehicles.

Why is secondary school location not even mentioned in the scoring matrix? As Cllr Ball pointed out in our meeting on June 25th 2012, very commendably gypsy & travellers attaining professional qualification & degrees, something that they can only do if they are able to access secondary education. Teenage gypsy & traveller children prefer being able to walk to school & be in contact with the wider community of their own age.

7. 'National guidance indicates that the re-use of previously developed land can positively enhance the environment with the establishment of a well-planned or soft-landscaped site. We agree that National guidance [note guidance not law] would be a good 'indication' as a general guidance but not at Stanton Wick based on past private planning applications. How can arguments used in the past by BaNES Planning officers magically disappear to allow a totally inappropriate development in the Green Belt?

How can light industry, the movement of large mobile homes, vehicles associated with light industrial activities, movements of between 100 - 160 plus new inhabitants into a hamlet of 60 people possibly enhance the environment even with screening? No amount of screening will enhance the environment and right to privacy for the residents of the Winding House nor will it give privacy to proposed new residents as the Winding House totally overlooks the site.

8. '... well bounded by its topography, would prevent the allocation of this land being used as a precedent for development elsewhere.' We disagree because this statement makes absolutely no sense. However, considering the 'well bounded by its topography', the Parish Council is concerned that BaNES this implies or is aware that the site could suffer from 'creep' or overspill onto the potentially dangerous areas of the mine workings & the tip. This is not acceptable. What action plan has BaNES in place to prevent harm to the SNCI, the wildlife, the landscape but most importantly the new residents?

9. 'The landscape to the immediate north of Wick Lane is not particularly sensitive and could possibly accommodate such a development'.

We strongly disagree. To start the land is part of the SNCI and it is designated Green Belt land. BaNES officers need to rigorously investigate whether or not disused mine working revert to greenfield description, once mining activities cease, has this been done? If so, this area cannot and should not be used in any case on contamination & safety grounds. Noise and light pollution would disturb the bats and this is illegal.

10. 'it may be appropriate to restrict or avoid development at the perimeter of the site to avoid impact on neighbouring properties' We agree, but this will require the reduction in pitch allocations as there are residences to the north and west and the coach park to the south meaning less space available. It may be pertinent to point out that due to the problems with spontaneous combustion of land in the past from the build-up of ground gases, the Fire service require full access running along the west-east boundary to get onto the mine & tip workings. There is concern from the local retained fire-fighters that the water supply would be wholly inadequate in the event of a major fire.

11. Has a detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment been done?

12. Highways 'the reduction in traffic generation from the former industrial use of the site would be of benefit, whilst recognising that the site is not in a sustainable location' We agree that the site is not in a sustainable location. The quote relates to the planning application for 1 dwelling & 1 ancillary building & parking of 5 vehicles, which would have constituted reduction in traffic. The present proposal for the site would not reduce traffic generation in fact it will constitute a marked increase in vehicle movements, noise & emission pollution and road safety problems. We also agree with the second paragraph that a full highways assessment needs to be conducted. We are aware that residents have commissioned a full highways report and that this is being submitted to BaNES. The conclusions of the report recognise and uphold all previous BaNES Highways concerns that this is not a suitable or sustainable location due to highways constraints.

13. Site Constraints - we agree with paragraphs 1 and 2, however the nearest doctor's surgery is not Chew Magna but nearly 5 miles away in Chew Stoke, not directly accessible by public transport although a surgery coach does operate once

a week, not convenient if one has sick children prone to illness regularly.

14. Concerning PPG2

We agree that the site location is unsuitable as it would not 'safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Furthermore 'development of gypsy & traveller sites is inappropriate in the Green Belt'.

15. We agree that 'the development would harm the openness of the Green Belt'

16. We agree that 'the impact on the openness of the Green Belt would be materially greater than that caused by the permitted change of use to a single dwelling'.

17. The Green Belt is not weighted it is Green Belt not 'slightly Green Belt' or 'slightly' non Green Belt'. Once again such development is 'inappropriate in the Green Belt and there are NO exceptional circumstances here.

18. Potential for Development and Suitability- 'The site benefits from existing on-site services and utilities. ' We disagree because as already argued the services are partial and inadequate.

19. 'Existing buildings could be converted to form day/utility rooms and a site manager's office'. We agree but at what cost? The costs will deem the whole site undeliverable.

20. 'and the very special circumstances identified above, the site is considered suitable subject to appropriate contaminated land and highways assessments being conducted'. We disagree, legal advice from Richard Harwood will be able to demonstrate that there are no very special circumstances to take this site forward. We agree that extensive and rigorous assessments should be carried out.

21. 'the need to provide a safe living environment' We wholeheartedly agree that BaNES has a duty of care to provide a safe living environment and should not choose this site just because it is 'large' [as quoted by councillors at the Pensford consultation] and a convenient place to create an out-of - Bath ghetto in a remote, isolating and unsafe place.

The Sustainability Appraisal of the Stanton Wick Site.

Objective 1 -'improve accessibility to community facilities and local services' There is poor access to local retail services - nearest shop is 1.5 km away- very small & its future existence is uncertain. The nearest supermarket ASDA in Whitchurch or TESCO Brislington - several miles away. No direct public transport to either.

Access to Pensford Primary School- 1.5 km nearest. It is suggested that there could be mitigation by developing existing buildings on site for the purposes of education. Also that there could be teaching supplied by ACTES.

The cost of converting the buildings for this purpose would be very considerable as would the cost of supplying education - presumably paid for by BaNES and therefore through the council tax of everyone?

It would not promote social cohesion.

It would be discriminatory against the settled community who do not enjoy the benefits of education at their place of residence or the potential benefits of a low student to teacher ratio.

Objective 2 'Improve the health and well being of the community

Again, this would be discriminatory against the local settled community who would not enjoy such a 'special case' access and have to put up with the existing situation that is cited as a problem for this proposed site allocation.

Objective 4 'Promote safer, stronger, more vibrant and cohesive communities'.

Given that this is not a sustainable location due to lack of local facilities and its location from local communities it follows that there would be problems with social cohesion – little opportunity to mix socially with the resident population - and resulting lack of understanding - and the potential for increased tension and fear. The transient nature of travellers using transit pitches would lead to a perceived problem with crime.

Objective 5 'Access to Business Employment and Skills opportunities'.

There is very limited employment opportunity due to the location. This is true for any of the local communities. In the past, agriculture & horticulture would have provided local opportunities but this is no longer the case. Most local people have to travel towards the cities for employment .If conversion of existing buildings is carried out to provide business opportunities for the travelling community this would again be discriminatory against the local settled community [especially young people). Again, this would work against social cohesion and promote a 'ghetto' community. It would also cost a very considerable amount to convert the existing buildings.

Objective 7 'Promoting access to sustainable transport'

This site is not sustainable in this respect due to its location. There is little opportunity for safe cycling due to the surrounding major road networks. Walking opportunities could only be for leisure purposes, not to access services - other

than the bus route to Bristol. Reliance on fossil fuels would not be reduced by the site.

Objective 8 'Protect and Enhance the district's distinct historic, environmental and cultural assets'. If, as suggested, it were a condition of allocation to sensitively redevelop the buildings of historic value, the cost would be very considerable.

Objective 9 'Encourage and protect habitats and biodiversity'.

The site is an SNCI [Site of Nature Conservation Interest]. There are significant records of European Protected species on site.

Human habitation would compromise the safety of protected species whose existence in this location will be partly due to lack of human presence.

Objective 10 'reduce land, water, air, light and noise pollution' Although remediation of the contaminated land [suggested as a m1n1mum requirement of allocation] would have a positive impact on land pollution, the costs involved would be huge.

Figures of 600 lorry loads out of the site with contaminated soils, 600 lorry loads into the site with new soils and a cost £1.8 million -just for the dumping of the contaminated soils have all been suggested. As well as the cost, there will of course be highways issues to be considered. Light and noise pollution would not be reduced by the use of this site; rather it would be worse than the current situation.

'The site performs very well against a number of SA objectives, including protecting and enhancing the district's environment. The allocation of this site would assist in the achievement of this objective partly due to the scope to provide a large-scale site on previously developed land with little landscape impact. The allocation of this large scale site would also reduce the need to allocate and develop land elsewhere in the district to meet the identified need; this is a significant positive secondary impact of the allocation of this site. '

Bingo! BaNES creates its out-of-Bath ghetto contravening all the planning policies and guidelines, paying scant attention to the detailed feedback in its own assessment reports. Creating a large site where gypsies and travellers prefer small sites, disregarding their preference not to mix permanent and transit pitches for fear of crime and lack of community cohesion. We, the Parish Council vehemently disagree with the Paragraph 1 of the Summary.

In paragraph 2 of the summary the states 'the site's designation as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest is also likely to be negatively impacted .. '. Either the landscape & SNCI will be impacted or it will not be. The Parish Council fears the former and is minded to think that paragraph 1 should not have been included or should have more accurately portrayed the situation knowing full well busy councillors would read the first paragraph and consider 'job done'. The job is far from done. The Parish Council feels that it has more than adequately pinpointed areas of concern in question A to promote the need for this site to be dropped from the allocation.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

The Parish Council disagrees strongly with any potential pitch provision at this site for all the reasons outlined in A. The Parish council wishes to demonstrate that the scoring matrix flawed and therefore the site should not have been placed on the preferred list to begin with and should not have got to this stage of the consultation process, therefore further reason why the potential pitch provision should not be taken forward to formal allocation.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Putting this site forward to allocation would contravene;

- Paragraph 4 'plan making & decision making should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development'
- Paragraph 14 'Travellers sites in Green Belt are inappropriate development'
- Policy B, para 11 a 'Promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community'
- Policy B, 11 b, 'Promote, in collaboration with commissioners of health services access to appropriate health services'.
- Policy B 11 e.' Provide for proper consideration of the effect of local environmental quality on the health and well-being of any travellers ... '
- Policy C para 12 ' ... scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community'
- Policy H para 23 ... 'strictly limit new travellers site development in open countryside ... '

BANES Core Strategy

Putting the site forward to allocation would contravene;

- Policy CP11 a 'Local community services & facilities including shops, schools and health facilities should be accessible by foot, cycle and public transport'
- Policy CP11 b 'Satisfactory means of access can be provided and an existing highway network is adequate to service the site'
- Policy CP11 e 'Adequate services including utilities, foul and surface water and waste disposal can be provided as well as any necessary pollution control measures'
- Policy CP11 f 'use of the site must have no harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers' Gypsies and Other Travelling People, Policy HG.16 Putting the site forward to allocation would contravene;
- Criterion 1 'access to local services, facilities to public transport'
- Criterion 2 'safe & convenient access to the road network'
- Criterion 3 'capable of being landscaped to ensure that it blends in with its surroundings'
- Criterion 4 'adequate services'
- Criterion 5 'harmful impact on the amenities of local residents'. Other Policies this allocation would contravene include;
- Green Belt Policy GB1 & GB2.
- Landscape Policy NE1
- Trees & Woodlands, Policy NE4
- Policy NE9
- Policy NE.11
- Transport requirement Policy T.24
- Contaminated Land Policy ES.15

Conclusion

The site at Stanton Wick is totally inappropriate as a gypsy and traveller site as illustrated comprehensively in this document. It should never have been on the preferred list. The Parish Council requests that it is removed immediately.

Appendix 1

1. The scoring matrix defies logic.

How can a site that was scored 17th out of 23 sites becomes one of the preferred top 7 sites, when alternative sites demonstrated superior access to amenities against the scoring matrix?

2. The proposed 15 permanent pitches & 5 transient pitches will totally dominate the hamlet of 26 dwellings i.e. approx. 60 people, contravening Planning Policy For Traveller Site document, March 2012. Based on Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites document, a pitch comprises of an average 1.7 caravans but the DPD recommends using an average of 3 caravans. This could mean an influx of 50 to 100 people into the hamlet putting significant pressure on the local community utilities and services, especially the already faltering mains water supply, with existing properties forced to have independent means of pressure boosting.

3. The DPD states that amenities should be accessible by foot, cycle & public transport within 1500 m. The local shop in Pensford is due to close in 5 months' time, financial, retirement reasons. The shop has been on the market for over 2 years. The next shop is over 3 miles away, as is the dentist. The doctors' surgery is 5 miles away. No public transport runs to this site.

4. The scoring matrix does not take into account secondary schools, 4.5 miles away. In consultation with secondary school age travellers, walking to schools & urban areas is important for social integration. So say same age local children in recent Parish plan surveys.

5. Road accessibility - accessing public transport & shop is not ideal to either walk or drive. The lane is narrow, it floods at the bridge, and there are few passing places, no street lighting or pavement.

6. 2011 Filers Coaches [next door to the proposed site] applied for retrospective parking for 8 coaches, which was refused on the grounds of • 'vehicle parked ... would detract from the openness & rural character of this area'

'local road system, is unsuitable in width, & alignment at junctions.

• 'location is remote from services & public transport ... Benefits ... clearly do not outweigh the harm by reason of appropriateness. Have Highways been consulted? 2005 BaNES Economic Development Dept. turned down an application on the Old Colliery buildings site as ' ... not in a sustainable location for a significant employment use ... Particularly unsuitable for HGV traffic.'

• Contamination report during winter 2009/10 for the landowner, reported arsenic concentrations exceeding Residential SGV, stating that; 'certain areas are unsuitable for use in garden & landscape areas ... 600 mm of Made ground would need to be removed & replaced' Thus creating many HGV movements during remediation works. Asbestos roofs were also noted

as a significant hazard. Is this a healthy place to live in? What about long term health issues? The mine workings are known to be unstable, remediation works are taking place now on one of the shafts. Has a mine survey been done? Is this a safe place for people to live? We fully understand that BaNES needs to provide authorised sites but location of unauthorised sites over the past 10 yrs in BaNES indicates that travelling communities prefer to be near urban areas. Is it fair on the travellers to PUT them in an unhealthy, unsafe remote ghetto, that will put significant pressure on them and existing inhabitants?

Appendix 2

Firstly thank you to Councillors who attended the consultation roadshows to answer my parishioners' questions. However, there are many answers still awaited. You & we agree that the matrix is deeply flawed. Even a secondary unspecified screening process delivered a flawed result. Yet with demonstrable negligence some sites were still put forward on the preferred list.

According to PPT 2012, you are required

1. To reduce tensions This has clearly not happened so far.
2. To enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health ... How can they do at GT 2, an unhealthy, unsafe, remote site?
3. Identify and update annually, a supply of deliverable sites ... At Cabinet meeting 9 May 2012 it was suggested that you reassess the need for sites and investigate suitable land i.e. outside the GREEN BELT far south of the district. Have you done this? Has the Cabinet understood the consequences of not taking into account the Scrutiny Panel's recommendation?
4. Protect local amenity and environment, Please explain how development of light industrial employment will safeguard the SNCI & protected wildlife species from light & noise pollution and further hazardous contamination?
5. No very special circumstances will be demonstrable especially where MOD sites are available. [You would lose some 106 levy of course if you replaced some social housing with a couple of pitches]. Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. GT2 is DESIGNATED Green Belt, the description 'brownfield' for the buildings. They are still Washed over GB
6. Strictly limit new traveller sites ... away from existing settlements ... do not dominate the nearest settled community ... avoid placing undue pressure on the local infrastructure e.g. water supply, poor highways connections, health etc. You agree Stanton Wick is the nearest settlement. At the Pensford you said you liked the site because of size, an easy creation of an out-of- Bath ghetto. Explain how adoption of GT2 will not contravene this policy?
7. Promoting opportunities for healthy lifestyles ... what, on an arsenic contaminated site?? Do you realise that remediation costs will be HUGE? Figures of 600 lorry loads out of the site with contaminated soils, 600 lorry loads into the site with new soils, and a cost of £1.8 million -just for the dumping of the contaminated soils. How much will highways remediation cost? Therefore the site is unsustainable at your projected numbers. Firstly the assault on the Green Belt with Stowey Quarry and now the Stanton Wick Green Belt. BaNES - Making Bath [but not necessarily North east Somerset] an even better place to live, work and visit.

Appendix 3

Opposition to BaNES proposal to develop the Old Colliery Site, Stanton Wick [GT2] .
Councillors, are you listening?

- You were voted in by us, your settled community.
- You are paid by us, the settled community.
- Yet with Liberal Un-democracy the Cabinet will not listen to our factual arguments properly.
- 1 00% of the residents of Stanton Wick, & 95% of Stanton Drew residents oppose the proposed development on planning & procedural grounds. We all agree that the matrix is deeply flawed. Even a secondary unspecified screening process delivered a flawed result. Yet with demonstrable negligence some sites were still put forward on the preferred list.

According to PPT 2012, BANES is required

1. To reduce tensions This has clearly not happened so far.
2. To enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health ... How can they do at GT 2, an unhealthy, unsafe, remote site?
3. • Identify and update annually, a supply of deliverable sites ... At Cabinet meeting 9 May 2012 it was suggested that the need for sites be re-assessed and suitable land i.e. outside the GREEN BELT far south of the district be investigated. Have the Cabinet done this? Has the Cabinet understood the consequences of not taking into account the Scrutiny Panel's

recommendation? 4. Protect local amenity and environment, Please explain how development of light industrial employment will safeguard the SNCI & protected wildlife species from light & noise pollution and further hazardous contamination?

5. No very special circumstances will be demonstrable especially where MOD sites are available. [You would lose some 106 levy of course if you replaced some social housing with a couple of pitches]. Jacob Rees Mogg is asking Andrew Robathan's [Parliamentary Under Secretary of State] consideration on this. Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. GT2 is DESIGNATED Green Belt, the description 'brownfield' for the buildings. They are still Washed over GB.

6. Strictly limit new traveller sites ... away from existing settlements ... do not dominate the nearest settled community ... avoid placing undue pressure on the local infrastructure e.g. water supply, poor highways connections, health etc. Explain how adoption of GT2 will not contravene this policy? We agree Stanton Wick is the nearest settlement. At the Pensford Cabinet members said they liked the site because of size, an easy creation of an out-of- Bath enclave.

7. Promoting opportunities for healthy lifestyles ... what, on an arsenic contaminated site?? Do you realise that remediation costs will be HUGE?

Figures of 600 lorry loads out of the site with contaminated soils, 600 lorry loads into the site with new soils, and a cost of £1.8 million -just for the dumping of the contaminated soils.

Respondent: 1549 / 1 Name: J.A. J A Harvey Organisation: Stanton Drew Parish Council

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes! The Old Colliery Site at Stanton Wick- I can remember when it was a working colliery. My father worked there as a blacksmith. I visited the site on numerous occasions as a youngster and used the bath-house facilities. As clerk to the parish council, I have visited the site many times reference planning applications on the site: Spoil removal, winding house, bath-house site, old Lime Lagoons, erection of singles dwelling and building. Availability- the site owner is bankrupt and desperate to sell as BANES knew before issuing their request for sites. Suitability- totally unacceptable. BANES planning policy, access, facilities, site contamination, etc. Achievable- BANES appear to be able to change their planning rules to suit themselves so who knows.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No- Opportunities. There are none for the gypsy community, no employment prospects, Two small primary schools. No public transport. The water supply pressure is very bad. There is no sewage disposal system. Do they want opt live on a dangerous and contaminated site?

Constraints.- Generally Agree. But there are many most. Again BANES appear to make up/ change planning rules to suit themselves. No mention of historical significance of site, wildlife, nature conservation, site safety.

No Mention of the potential devaluation of country properties or how access will be improved.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No- It is totally unsuitable. It will totally engulf the Hamlet of Stanton Wick. The local primary schools will not be able to cope. I do not believe this site is where the Gypsy community will want to live. I do not believe it is a safe site for children to live. The infrastructure costs will be prohibitive. Property valuations will plummet. Two potential sales have been recently lost due to the notification of the suggested site. It does not comply with existing planning requirements.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

What is the point of using your scoring matrix and then completely ignoring it? I.E. moving a site from 17th to in the top six. Why was the request for sites not advertised in rural newspapers such as the Western Daily Press, The Somerset Guardian, etc. Who In the rural areas read the Bath Chronicle. Was it the least people know of the request for the sites the better? Not my idea of a fair consultation and surprise, surprise 3 of the preferred sites are in the rural area; Stanton Wick, Whitchurch, and Keynsham.

Respondent: 1555 / 1 Name: Mrs S. Heathman Organisation: Stowey Sutton Parish Council

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

During the last ten years you have identified (Cathryn Humphries, Neighbourhood Environment Manager) 15 sites (totalling 19 occasions) of unlawful occupation within the authority. With the exception of two in Keynsham and one in Whitchurch all have been in Bath. We believe this shows that the demand for pitches is within an urban setting and not a rural one and that the selection of proposed sites is almost totally inappropriate as, without even examining the merits of the individual locations, with one exception, they do not meet the demand as demonstrated by the sites chosen over the ten year period. In addition the site at Stanton Wick was scored 17th out of 23 possible sites and we fail to understand how this can then be chosen as one of the preferred top 7 sites. Other concerns include the fact that the land there is green belt, the site is not accessible to services, amenities or public transport and there are unstable mine workings. It would therefore appear that this site is totally inappropriate and it was decided to object to the proposal for a site at Stanton Wick for these reasons.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2559 / 1 Name: Mr Clive Narrainen Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I believe the site is unsuitable.

1. Greenbelt
2. Highway (narrow lane, single track tight corner, no pavement)
3. Pollution from increased number of vehicles and noise
4. Contradicts previous planning decisions of this area.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree with the council - Beesus

1. Nature conservation - horseshoe bats, adders
2. Number of occupant of travellers will number local residents
3. Accessibility for emergency services
4. Site received very low score on the matrix, but still a preferred site, after coming 17th out of 20.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO TOTALLY UNSUITABLE

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I feel that the liberal democrat cabinet has an attitude to carry on regardless.

1. Not keeping in local residents informed early in the Traveller site process.
2. Not listening to the FACT OF UNSUITABILITY of the Stanton Wick site.

Respondent: 2559 / 1 Name: Mr Clive Narrainen Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree with the Council's assessment. Stanton Wick is a tiny hamlet. Such a large development as the one proposed would overwhelm this small community. And who is to say that it might not be further extended in the future. The lane leading to the proposed gypsy/ traveller site is narrow and limited. It is not a safe walking route and there is no public transport nearby. My understanding is that the water supply to Stanton Wick is at capacity and there is no mains sewerage connection. Consideration of the infra-structure alone would render this application invalid.

This is a rural site and there is limited employment in the area. The site itself is said to be polluted and the old mine shafts make it dangerous.

Aside from local considerations the Stanton Wick site is in the Green Belt and as such is an inappropriate development. Wherever possible we must not nibble away at it. Yesterday we learned from the official census that Britain's population is growing. The Green Belt is an easy target, but ironically, this must be resisted. We need these breathing spaces.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

I do not agree that this proposed pitch provision should be taken forward for stated reasons.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Council's duty to promote racial equality should not be a factor in this decision. This is not a racist issue. The only Romany gypsies I have ever seen in the Valley were the ones who occasionally stay with us and were made welcome at Dumpers House in Chew Magna. Our objection is solely based on the inappropriateness of this proposed development in a small, isolated community in the Green Belt. Please let us protect this heritage.

Respondent: 2600 / 1 Name: Mrs Liz Richardson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

We write to you as the joint owners of the Winding House, Wick Lane, Pensford, BS394BU, the land and property next door on the north side to the above land under consultation. We purchased the property and moved in end September 2011 .

During the legal process of purchase, we were made aware of a series of planning rejections at a local coach yard, the most recent being on the basis of inappropriate use of Green Belt which would detract from the openness and rural character of the area. Subsequent to this, on reapplication, a further rejection took place on the same grounds, inappropriate use of the Green Belt. Additional grounds also given in support of these rejections included congestion and inconvenience to other road users as well as the unsustainability of the location. If you are not aware already, the coach yard is the neighbouring property on the south side of the proposed travellers site. It should be pointed out that mention was also made of the fact Wick Lane is predominately a single track highway.

We proceeded with the purchase largely on the basis of the property being within the Green Belt and BANES clearly

demonstrating their respect for the Green Belt by rejecting these applications, clearly this appears to be no longer the case!

To be informed last week that BANES were putting forward the Old Colliery Buildings as a potential travellers site has left us bemused, particularly as new national guidelines from central Government, of which you are part, state clearly that traveller sites on Green Belt are inappropriate development. There are clearly no "very special circumstances" in this case, particularly when this site scored so badly for suitability on your own scoring matrix. Would you please confirm if you are prepared to spend significant sums of taxpayers money carrying out this consultation knowing full well that you will be acting against your own Governments guidelines and therefore unlikely to succeed.

In addition we would like you to explain how a site that scored so lowly for suitability, finishing 17th out of the 20 sites put forward, could remain on the shortlist for consultation ? On the surface it would appear that the result didn't fit with your expectation so you disregard it.

2nd May 2012

Further to my recent letter of 1/5/12 (regrettably letter undated) I would like to ask 2 further questions. As explained in my letter, several planning applications have been rejected by BANES to extend the usage of Filers coach yard to 20 vehicles, the land being immediately next door to the south of the proposed site. The rejections being for inappropriate use of the Green Belt which would detract from the openness and rural character of the area. Additional reasons in support of the rejections being congestion and inconvenience to other road users as well as the unsustainability of the location.

1) Can you explain to me how you can possibly see the two situations as being different. Both are Brown Field sites within Green Belt. One is rejected as being inappropriate development of Green Belt with the location being deemed unsustainable. The other is deemed appropriate use of Green Belt (at least enough to be put forward for consultation) with the location being considered sustainable. Please explain how this can be.

2) Filers coach yard reapplication 11/05078NAR was due for a decision 24/1/12. Can you explain why this decision has been delayed by 3 months so far.

Respondent: 2600 / 2 Name: Mrs Liz Richardson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Thank you for listening to my representation at the council cabinet meeting on 9th May 2012.

I note you comment that it would help cabinet if communities sought alternative locations for Gypsy and Traveller sites. While this is somewhat outrageous whel') the council has itself been researching such areas for a substantial time, in an effort to assist the process I would like to make the following observations.

Firstly I note that some local councils have dropped their DPD in light of the fact that government policy has changed, below is an extract from South Gloucester Council website:

Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document • March 2011 Update

As a result of announcements from the Secretary of State, progress on the Gypsy and Traveller DPD has been halted. The Council is carrying forward this work through its Core Strategy document.

Further to that I observe that several councils now successfully incorporate allocation for Gypsy and Travellers pitches within new major developments.

I •note also that within the Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan – including minerals and waste policies -Adopted October 2007 there appears to be several proposed developments of a medium to large size, could you confirm if the council is looking to make provision for Gypsy arid Traveller pitches within any of these new residential developments.

Referring to section B9 - General Development Sites, in particular the large developments mentioned in 86, 813, K1, K2, NR2, NR4, NR15, may from initial observations be suitable regarding amenities and location for the allocation of a small number of pitches. In addition to these there are developments at other disused MOD sites within the BaNES area, again if these are to include a significant number of residential dwellings in the re-development then ought these also be looked at for appropriate positioning of small numbers of pitches.

I would be interested to know if any of these GO Sites have been assessed for inclusion into the search for Gypsy and Traveller sites, if they have why allocation was not deemed suitable and if they have not maybe they could be.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2600 / 3 Name: Mrs Liz Richardson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Further to my recent letter of 1/5/12 (regrettably letter undated) I would like to ask 2 further questions.

As explained in my letter, several planning applications have been rejected by BANES to extend the usage of Filers coach yard to 20 vehicles, the land being immediately next door to the south of the proposed site. The rejections being for inappropriate use of the Green Belt which would detract from the openness and rural character of the area. Additional reasons in support of the rejections being congestion and inconvenience to other road users as well as the unsustainability of the location.

1) Can you explain to me how you can possibly see the two situations as being different. Both are Brown Field sites within Green Belt. One is rejected as being inappropriate development of Green Belt with the location being deemed unsustainable. The other is deemed appropriate use of Green Belt (at least enough to be put forward for consultation) with the location being considered sustainable. Please explain how this can be.

2) Filers coach yard reapplication 11/05078/VAR was due for a decision 24/1/12. Can you explain why this decision has been delayed by 3 months so far.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2601 / 1 Name: Mr E.G. Bond Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

On the 2nd May I wrote to you objecting to suggestions that is permanent and 5 transit sites should be promised at the above mentioned site for gypsies and Travellers. My letter also asked several questions. Being that I have not had any response from you I am writing to you again to confirm my objections to this suggestion or any variations thereof. If this makes me NIMBY then no be it.

I am aged 86 and have lived in Stanton Wick for almost 50 years. I am a disabled ex serviceman having been wounded in Germany in the Second World War and discharged with a Disability Pension.

I chose to live in Stanton Wick because it was peaceful and quiet and I hope to continue to live a peaceful and quiet life in Stanton Wick for the rest of my life. The last thing I want are the problems which are possible if not probable if the proposal is approved.

Having looked back to the grounds for refusal for the many previous planning application for development of this land which have been for less contentious I find that these reasons are still applicable.

I also understand that the site fails miserably to meet the Governments criteria for the suitability of sites for the use for gypsies, travellers etc.

I am given to understand that on the basis of these 2 items alone a robust legal challenge could be mounted should it prove necessary.

Wick Lane which runs from Stanton Wick to Pensford which would provide the access to the site is a narrow, neglected country lane. It has been resurfaced twice in the last Half Century. At its widest, 2 cars can pass if they both slow down and drive carefully. At its narrowest a car can pass a Pedestrian if the pedestrian stands close to the hedge and the car driver drives carefully.

You can still see where the words SLOW were once painted on the road but they are no longer discernable. There is a Highway Authority sign on the road which warns that the road narrows to 6" -0" ahead.

I wonder if the Cabinet Members who I believe are all Liberal Democrats should declare that they have a vested interest in this matter. The vested interest being their determination that the wonderful city of Bath and its immediate surroundings (rather than North East Somerset) should not be associated with proposals such as these.

I have not attended any meetings with the Cabinet but the people who have given me the impression that Cabinet members consider the involvement of Local Inhabitants to be unhelpful, unnecessary and that they are determined to see that their proposals are approved by fair means or foul.

A press release that I have seen seems to imply that the site if approved there will be no further unauthorised sites. I would suggest that the gypsies, travellers etc will still want to live where they want to live rather than where the Authorities want them to live.

The press release also makes much of the fact that the gypsies, travellers will become liable to pay ground rent. Do they really believe that these people will actually pay this fee.

I trust that the members of the Cabinet will show some form of integrity and respect the feeling of local residents and abandon their proposals.

Respondent: 2601 / 2 Name: Mr E.G. Bond Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Having been to two public meetings about the shortlisted site being considered for a Gypsy & Travellers site at the old Colliery site at Stanton Wick, I feel compelled to add my voice in protest.

We moved to Stanton Wick in 1964 and have seen various businesses on the site (concrete works, plant for mixing farm chemicals, coat depot & workshop) and know the proposed area of the site to be contaminated and unsafe with mineshafts and asbestos found in surveys.

How is it then, that this site reached 10 on the Council matrix and is one of 7 sites being considered on 9th May?

Also there are no shops, schools, transport or sewage which will all be required if travellers are to be housed here.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2601 / 3 Name: Mr E.G. Bond Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing to object to the above suggestion and to place on record my concern that certain works have started on the site this week. People may think that the owner is just being optimistic or that he is privy to information which is not available to the public.

I cannot believe that members of a party which Mr Clegg has claimed on TV this week as being a caring party are prepared to ignore the feelings of the Council Tax paying residents of the small settlement of Stanton Wick in favour of a much longer number of nomads some of whom may possibly be non British subjects.

I am given to understand that the members of the Cabinet who will be debating this suggestion are all from one particular political party. Is this democracy.

If the suggestion is approved and the site goes ahead are the Council prepared to guarantee that they will put in place a standard of management which will ensure that there will be no repetition of the major incident in Essex which received worldwide publicity.

You may or may not be interested to learn that if it should prove necessary I have agreed to contribute to a fund to secure the services of a lawyer / planning consultant to put the case for local residents.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2675 / 1 Name: Lisa Huggins Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The proposed development will contradict many planning policies and guidelines which I will set out below.

B&NES Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007

- a)Policy GB1: the proposed development of this area would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt
- b)Policy GB2: the proposed development of this area would detract from the openness and rural character of this area within the designated Green Belt.
- C)Policy T1: the proposed location is remote from services and public transport facilities. Therefore there will be an increase in vehicle journeys (not a reduction) to and from the site which will have an impact on travel journeys and the environment in this area.

Planning Policy Guidance Note No. 13

- a)The proposed development is remote from services and public transport facilities and therefore there will be a significant increase in vehicular traffic in this area.
- B)Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA): this proposed development should be subject to an EIA.

National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012

- a)Core planning principles, item 17: the proposed development does not protect the Green Belt or recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside or support the rural community around this site.
- B)Supporting a prosperous rural economy, item 28: this proposed development does not support the existing local businesses within the vicinity and could be detrimental to them
- c)Travel plan: this proposed development will generate significant amounts of movement and therefore a travel plan will be required
- d)Minimise journey lengths, item 37: this proposed development will maximise journeys as there are not immediate employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities in this area
- e)Overall quality of the area, item 58: planning decision should aim to ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area. This proposed development will have the opposite effect if this is approved.
- F)Promoting healthy communities, item 69: this proposed development will not promote a safe and accessible environment but create a fear of crime and disorder and will undermine the quality of life and the existing community cohesion.
- G)Green Belt, item 87: this proposed development is inappropriate and will be harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved
- h)Conserving and enhancing the natural environment, item 109: this proposed development will not enhance the natural and local environment or protect and enhance a valued landscape
- i)Unacceptable environmental risk, item 109, 120 and 121: this proposed development could be adversely affected by soil contamination and land instability due the former mining activity that took place there. Has the landowner and Council undertaken professional surveys before recommending this site?
- J)Minimise pollution, item 110: as there isn't a mains foul water and sewerage system in the area, there is a risk that the stream within the area could be affected by any run off from this site

Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012

- a)Protect the Green Belt, item 4: this states that the Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development. This proposed development is inappropriate development

- b) Provision of suitable accommodation, item 4: this proposed development will have little or no access to education, health, welfare and employment. The local schools are full, the nearest doctors are 5 miles away, no welfare services and there is little employment in the area
- c) Protection of local amenity and environments, item 4: this proposed development will have a huge impact on Stanton Wick and the neighbouring villages. Stanton Wick population will double and so will the traffic on the country lane going through it
- d) Sustainable economically, socially and environmentally, item 11a-f: this proposed development goes against everything stated in this planning policy. There won't be an integrated co-existence between the site and the community. There isn't any public transport to this site or village. The access road is a single country lane carriageway, there isn't any mains services (e.g. gas, foul water, sewage)
- e) Policy C, sites in rural areas, item 12: states that the local planning authority should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community. This proposed development will out-number the existing residents of Stanton Wick.
- F) Policy E, traveller sites in Green Belt, item 14: I quote, "inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved. Travellers sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development" unquote.
- G) Policy H, determining planning applications for travellers sites, item 23: this proposed site will not respect the scale of the local community, it will dominate the local community and will place undue pressure on the local infrastructure. The country lane is unsuitable for this amount of additional traffic, the access into and out of Stanton Wick from the main road is extremely dangerous as vision is impaired in both directions, there are no mains services and no public transport

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)

- a) Local Planning Policy Context, item 2.7: the proposed site does not have good access to local services, facilities and public transport, it does not have safe and convenient access to the road network (Stanton Wick junction is notoriously dangerous), it will not blend in as the proposed site is on an elevated position, there are not services for foul and surface water drainage and there will be a harmful impact to local residents and local businesses due to the close proximity of this site. There are no local services within easy walking distance or served by public transport

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2675 / 2 Name: Lisa Huggins Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes, plenty of evidence on why Stanton Wick is not suitable – all your own, and Government's, policies and procedures, as listed below:-

B&NES Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007

- a) Policy GB1: the proposed development of this area would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt
- b) Policy GB2: the proposed development of this area would detract from the openness and rural character of this area within the designated Green Belt.
- c) Policy T1: the proposed location is remote from services and public transport facilities. Therefore there will be an increase in vehicle journeys (not a reduction) to and from the site which will have an impact on travel journeys and the environment in this area.

Planning Policy Guidance Note No. 13

- a) The proposed development is remote from services and public transport facilities and therefore there will be a significant increase in vehicular traffic in this area.
- b) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA): this proposed development should be subject to an EIA.

National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012

- a) Core planning principles, item 17: the proposed development does not protect the Green Belt or recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside or support the rural community around this site.
- b) Supporting a prosperous rural economy, item 28: this proposed development does not support the existing local businesses within the vicinity and could be detrimental to them
- c) Travel plan: this proposed development will generate significant amounts of movement and therefore a travel plan will be required
- d) Minimise journey lengths, item 37: this proposed development will maximise journeys as there are not immediate employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities in this area
- e) Overall quality of the area, item 58: planning decision should aim to ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area. This proposed development will have the opposite effect if this is approved.
- f) Promoting healthy communities, item 69: this proposed development will not promote a safe and accessible environment but create a fear of crime and disorder and will undermine the quality of life and the existing community cohesion.
- g) Green Belt, item 87: this proposed development is inappropriate and will be harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved
- h) Conserving and enhancing the natural environment, item 109: this proposed development will not enhance the natural and local environment or protect and enhance a valued landscape
- i) Unacceptable environmental risk, item 109, 120 and 121: this proposed development could be adversely affected by soil contamination and land instability due to the former mining activity that took place there. Has the landowner and Council undertaken professional surveys before recommending this site?
- j) Minimise pollution, item 110: as there isn't a mains foul water and sewerage system in the area, there is a risk that the stream within the area could be affected by any run off from this site

Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012

- a) Protect the Green Belt, item 4: this states that the Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development. This proposed development is inappropriate development
- b) Provision of suitable accommodation, item 4: this proposed development will have little or no access to education, health, welfare and employment. The local schools are full, the nearest doctors are 5 miles away, no welfare services and there is little employment in the area
- c) Protection of local amenity and environments, item 4: this proposed development will have a huge impact on Stanton Wick and the neighbouring villages. Stanton Wick population will double and so will the traffic on the country lane going through it
- d) Sustainable economically, socially and environmentally, item 11a-f: this proposed development goes against everything stated in this planning policy. There won't be an integrated co-existence between the site and the community. There isn't any public transport to this site or village. The access road is a single country lane carriageway, there isn't any mains services (e.g. gas, foul water, sewage)
- e) Policy C, sites in rural areas, item 12: states that the local planning authority should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community. This proposed development will out-number the existing residents of Stanton Wick.
- f) Policy E, traveller sites in Green Belt, item 14: I quote, "inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved. Travellers sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development" unquote.
- g) Policy H, determining planning applications for travellers sites, item 23: this proposed site will not respect the scale of the local community, it will dominate the local community and will place undue pressure on the local infrastructure. The country lane is unsuitable for this amount of additional traffic, the access into and out of Stanton Wick from the main road is extremely dangerous as vision is impaired in both directions, there are no mains services and no public transport

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)

- a) Local Planning Policy Context, item 2.7: the proposed site does not have good access to local services, facilities and public transport, it does not have safe and convenient access to the road network (Stanton Wick junction is notoriously

dangerous), it will not blend in as the proposed site is on an elevated position, there are not services for foul and surface water drainage and there will be a harmful impact to local residents and local businesses due to the close proximity of this site. There are no local services within easy walking distance or served by public transport

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I do not agree. The evaluation was poorly done, inaccurate and should never have gone through to the consultation stage. I fail to understand the logic behind this. How can such a low score (and should have been lower if done properly) still be ok? The score is speaking for itself – the site does not meet the requirements that are set out in all the documents you refer to. If an evaluation was done properly, a minimum score should have been set for a 'pass rate'. If a site fails to meet that score, it is deemed not suitable and rejected. But, guess what, no such pass rate was done and guess what, Stanton Wick would never have got past this pass rate if one had been set.

The assessments and evaluations are flawed, this process needs to stop, and the whole thing re-considered before you waste even more tax payers money.

The Council has not acknowledged all the constraints on this site or even considered that this site is special in relation to bats and the potential destruction of their environment either.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I do not agree. There should be no pitch provision as this site fails to meet any of the essential criteria set out in any of your policies and procedures as I have fully stated in item 1. And a site must meet ALL the criteria set out, not just because of its size!

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Please see my full response in item 1, but all the policies below are not being adhered to.

- a) B&NES Local Plan - Policy GB1, GB2 and T1
- b) Planning Policy Guidance Note No.13
- c) National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 items 17, 28, 37, 58, 69, 87, 109, 120, 121, 110
- d) Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012 items 4, 11a-f, Policy C, item 12, Policy E item 14, Policy H, item 23
- e) Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations DPD , item 2.7

Respondent: 2676 / 1 Name: Mr Roger and Connell Organisation:
Elizabeth

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Stanton Wick site is in the Green Belt and therefore against planning guidelines. It would completely overwhelm the village of Stanton Wick. The available site is very large and would be open to illegal encampment much larger than the proposed amount of 20 pitches. It would be practically impossible to police and just as hard to access along the single track road. There are no local services like shops, doctors or schools without transport, drainage, water supply and contamination on site are also problems which appear to have been ignored during the selection of this site. This is also a heritage site in an area of natural beauty. It should be treasured not wrecked.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No: the shortlist of sites was drawn up using criteria which were supposed to be at least considered. The only one that applies to this site is that is big and outside of Bath City.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

National guidelines state that greenbelt is unsuitable for Traveller sites. There is also no local need for Travellers sites in the Chew Valley and never has been. There is however a need for affordable housing in the area for local, ordinary people.

Respondent: 2676 / 1 Name: Mr Roger and Connell Organisation:
Elizabeth

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site at Stanton Wick is unsuitable as it is in greenbelt and against planning guidelines. There is no local requirement in the Chew Valley for a travellers site. It would completely overwhelm the adjacent hamlet of Stanton Wick even at the suggested size of 20 pitches. This site is large, wide open to unauthorised encampment and would be very difficult to police. The single track road could not cope safely with the traffic such a site would engender. The site is miles away from any medical, shopping or educational facilities. All of these would have to be accessed by car as there is no public transport nearby. The site has been found to be contaminated and has dangerous mineshafts. The local water supply is already inadequate. It is not on a recognised traveller route. This is a mining heritage site of which there are very few and should therefore be protected, not decimated.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO. In my opinion this site should never have been included in the shortlist of sites.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

National guidelines state that greenbelt is unsuitable for travellers' sites. There are no unauthorised travellers' encampments locally to accommodate. The Council's method of shortlisting sites appears to make no sense. This site would be impossible to sustain.

Respondent: 2676 / 1 Name: Mr Roger and Connell Organisation:
Elizabeth

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We, the undersigned, wish to object in the strongest possible terms about B&NES plans for a Gypsy and Travellers' Site at the hamlet of Stanton Wick in the beautiful tourist spot that is the Chew Valley. This site, which is not even on a preferred route for travellers, is difficult enough to access by car, never mind with lorries and caravans, has no shopping or public transport access within the recommended distances, is atop an old mine with all the dangers that brings and, as you must realise, has the capacity to explode in size. Were this to happen and I think we all know well that it would, it would be the end of this peaceful community, which even at the size proposed, would be completely dwarfed by this site. The nearest surgery is way outwith the recommended distance and it is already very difficult to get an appointment to see a doctor there within a fortnight.

This site is completely unsuitable and it must not be allowed to go ahead.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2676 / 1 Name: Mr Roger and Connell Organisation:
Elizabeth

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I note that despite all letter, e-mails, petitions and some excellent representations by local people, the cabinet voted on 9th May to press ahead with plans for a gypsy and travellers site at Stanton Wick. I would like to reiterate my strong objections to these inappropriate plans for a greenbelt site which neither the local settled population nor the travelling community actually want. I also have some questions on the matter which I would like answered. These are as follows:

1. Previous planning applications have been refused where there was likely to be an increase in traffic as this is a very narrow road, single track in places. It is an isolated site, miles from any schools, doctors or services, completely unsuitable for walking to the same as there are no pavements and far from any bus stops. How do B&NES plan to make this route safe for the unknown number of cars, trucks etc. that at least 100 extra people would need to use to get anywhere? and how much would it cost? It is not possible to widen the road in places. How would this be policed?
2. This site is in greenbelt and against national guidelines. Why do B&NES after refusing planning applications on greenbelt grounds previously, think that these rules should now be broken?
3. This site has not even been properly surveyed and is contaminated. There are two mineshafts. How do B&NES justify their plan to house travellers in these conditions? Do they plan to clean it up and at what cost?
4. The Travelling Community traditionally prefer small family sites which are close to amenities. This site is large and has the potential to become much larger still. How do B&NES justify proposing to break national guidelines on this? and how do they plan to ensure that there would be no illegal expansion of the site?
5. National guidelines state that sites should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement. Even if this proposed site were to stay at 20 pitches and not expand, Stanton Wick's residents would be outnumbered by 2 or 3 to 1. How do B&NES justify this?

I strongly feel that this site is entirely inappropriate for use as a travellers site and demand a public meeting attended by yourself and fellow cabinet members to explain why you think that it is and to answer these questions.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2677 / 1 Name: Mr Gary Watling Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I would just like to correct you that no consultation has taken place by BANES. All roadshows are pre-consultation as was said at last chamber meeting. To date you have not been in consultation with anyone because this would involve two way communication, and you providing answers to residents questions of concern, about the process you have used on site selection and the reasons for sites selected even though they do not fit government guidelines.

At the roadshows council personnel only give information that is already in public domain and not there to debate the real issues as above. I, as a resident at Stanton Drew think that you should drop your political agenda and start to represent the people that live in the BANES area in the correct manner. You are discriminating against small communities and wasting public time and money in the process.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2677 / 1 Name: Mr Gary Watling Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No, as the matrix used by BANES none of them are fit for purpose. Especially Stanton Wick Old Colliery site which ranked 17th in your assessment.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. there are no benefits for any travellers at this site as it does not fit government guidelines for planning in the green belt area.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, the actual proposal would be detrimental to the environment. Due to the lack of sewage services, water supplies in the area are very poor, the additional residents would swamp the existing population to service such a site.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

BANES has shown discrimination towards their own residents by not strictly following the government guidelines for the travellers sites within the greenbelt areas. You have not consulted residents at any time. The road shows were a shame, where no councillor could answer any questions of concern from residents and hoping that prolonging this so called consultation process, the residents would roll over and let BANES carry on. As at 'special meeting' in chamber, the council should drop political agenda and do the best for existing council tax payers.

Respondent: 2677 / 1 Name: Mr Gary Watling Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

How can BANES even consider this site when they have previously rejected several planning applications by the landowner and other coach business in the past?. Is there a hidden agenda as to why the council planning reject what seems to be legitimate planning proposals by residents. Is it maybe to secure jobs in departments that monitor this activity or is there more sinister activities going on?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2678 / 1 Name: Peter Sherwin Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

As a home owner and a voter from Bath, may I urge you to stop the proposed Stanton-Wick traveller site which will completely overwhelm the Village, with an influx which will more than double the population of the Village and the Green Belt. There is no school capacity, the ground is unsafe due to abandoned mine shafts, no public transport, no water supply, insufficient and dangerous walking and road access. Please stop this misguided plan before it reaches fruition with disastrous results for all parties involved.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2679 / 1 Name: Steven Howell Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The proposed site at Stanton Wick is on greenbelt land, my understanding of Greenbelt land is that it can only be built on if exceptional circumstances are provided. I understand that a large majority of land within BANES is greenbelt but to build a permanent traveller site is surely not exceptional circumstances.

There are currently 25 houses in Stanton Wick but the proposed site would have over 45 caravans and over 200 people. This would mean the traveller site would out number the population in Stanton Wick substantially. With such a large increase in the local population there would be a big impact on the local schools. I am currently expecting my first child and fear that the local school in Pensford would become over subscribed and there may not be enough room for my child or other local residents children when they come to start school.

The proposed site has been deemed to be contaminated land in the past, it is on the site of a disused mine refuse tip and only recently a land mine shaft collapsed there. If I was a traveller I would not want to live on land contaminated with arsenic and the possible danger of a mine shaft collapsing. Additionally, there are no local facilities within the recommended distance from a proposed traveller site and the access is also inadequate. Access is through a small single track road from Pensford, myself and many residents feel it unsafe to increase traffic numbers along this small road and it would only be a matter of time before an accident would occur. Only a few years previously the business next door to this site was not allowed one additional coach because of the increase in traffic this would cause but with this proposed plan there would be over 45 caravans and 200 people causing additional traffic but BANES do not consider this to be an issue.

The proposed site is being put forward after a scoring system has been applied, a matrix as I understand. The site scored very low on this score for many reasons but BANES seem keen to use the site because of the size of land available. I am not against the idea in principal as I feel that if travellers are going to reside in BANES land then they should pay council tax and contribute to the local community but this site and how this proposal has been put forward is completely wrong.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2680 / 1 Name: Mrs Wendy Marsh Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I cannot see how it is legal for a council to give planning permission to a group of people that out number the residents of a hamlet 3 to 1. Stanton Wick is a Green Belt and to have a caravan site on the top of the pit would spoil the views of the countryside for the surrounded villages. There are no footpaths in Wick Lane, Stanton Wick Lane or A368, and the latter you have to take your life in your own hands to walk along this road. Wick Lane cannot take any more traffic, the road is subsiding in several places especially where the bridge is.

Respondent: 2680 / 1 Name: Mrs Wendy Marsh Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The occupation of the site would over take the population of the hamlet.

This is a green belt and it would totally destroy the picturesque of the surrounding countryside and there is insufficient road access to the sight.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2681 / 1 Name: Ms Pauline Ward Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I believe the position in the Green Belt is totally unsustainable from a financial situation (how much will it cost to buy,

prepare and run the site). Also it will alter the demographics of the village more than doubling its size in one go. There are no local facilities (e.g. doctors) within walking distance.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2681 / 2 Name: Ms Pauline Ward Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Proposed site in the Green Belt is this is against government recommendations. The land is contaminated with arsenic and there are mine shafts to which I believe to date you have not had details from the Coal Board as to the safety of the site. Both of these conditions could lead to the detriment of the health of the travelling community. The infrastructure is none existent – no mains water, gas, sewerage – how much will this cost to install? The Highways have already rejected planning requests to Filers Coaches for expansion due to increase in traffic but with the proposed pitches (15 Permanent and 5 Transits the volume of local traffic in the narrow lanes would be dreadful. There is also a lack of local community services, shops, local health facilities, public transport, secondary education 4.1. miles away – would this mean coaches or taxis taking the children to school - more traffic – all this is against the Policy CP11 of the Draft Core Strategy ? The proposal of the pitches will dwarf the local hamlet of Stanton Wick – at least doubling the population; surely this is unacceptable. The site is visible from a great distance – would there be suitable landscaping? Apparently bats are present on the site – as a protected species what are the proposals regarding them? This site is not on a recognised route for travellers.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2682 / 1 Name: Mrs Laura Baxter Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing to convey my concern regarding the proposal of a gypsy/traveller site at Stanton Wick, which is due to be discussed at Cabinet on the 9th May.

Firstly, I would like to make clear that I agree that there should be permanent sites within BANES. However, I am against the site at Stanton Wick as it is not suitable. I would have the same concerns if this were a proposed housing development.

Road access to the site is also key. The road is almost entirely single track - hardly suitable for large vehicles and increased traffic. The travellers would have to drive to the local shop and school -they are only just walkable but there is no safe

path. The doctor's surgery s definitely not walking distance being around 5 miles away (at Chew Stoke not Chew Magna as stipulated in " appendix 5 detailed assessment tables") The shortest route to the main road, the A37 is through the village of Pensford. Wick Lane flows onto the one way system at Church Street which crosses a small bridge. As the houses on Church Street generally do not have a drive, cars are parkded on both sides and so there is little space for cars to pass. It is hardly suitable for large vehicles.

The guidelines within "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites" (March 2012) states that traveller sites in the green belt are "in appropriate development, except in special circumstances." This site is in green belt land . According to BANES very special simply means a lack of sites. This is surely the same situation all councils looking for sites are in.

There are a whole raft of reasons why this site is unsuitable which is clearly demonstrated by the council's own methodlogy. Out of a maximum score of 47 the Stanton Wick site only scored 10 and came 17th of the 23 proposed sites . Surely the point of such a system is to find suitable sites. If the scores are all low and hence the sites are unsuitable, then the search should recommence. An unsuitable site is still unsuitable even if it is the only one left.

It seems obvious to me that due to the number of requirements for such a site that finding a suitable site would take time, especially bearing in mind that the site will be permanent. It does not seem suprising to me that only threee sites held in private ownership were offered for consideration when the "call for sites" only latest for three months and was held during the part of the year when people are concerned with more exciting prospsects like Christmas.

To build a single home people spend years looking for a site which fits their needs.

It seems to the general observer that this site is being proposed despite being unsuitable and failing to meet almost all national guidelines. It appears to be the case that the council wish to use Stanton Wick because it is so large and can solve 70% of their permanent unmet need overnight. I would suggest at this point that only those sites considered to meet the criteria and hence are suitable are considered further and the search recommenced for more suitable sites. When the site is so unsuitable what is the point of wasting money to perform contamination surveys and highways assesments. The council has a duty to use its resources with economy, efficiency and effectiveness as it is at the end of the day publicly accountable.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

The size of the proposed site is totally unreasonable in relation to the hamlet of Stanton Wick which has around 40 residents. The proposed site would cater for approximately 100 permanent residents therefore wholly outnumbering the current residents. Policy document " Planning Policy for Traveller Sites" (March 2012) states that "sites in rural areas respects the scale of and does NOT dominate the nearest settled community." It is very unlikely that such a large dominating site will encourage social cohesion. Further, I note that in Appendix 5 "Detailed assessment table" (contained within the agenda reports for the 9th may), that the size has a holding capacity of 50 pitches. I wonder how it is proposed that the size of the site could be contained at is if permission is so given . Is this not what happened at Dale Farm i.e. an illegal site being created next to a legal one?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2682 / 2 Name: Mrs Laura Baxter Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Stanton Wick site is not suitable;
 - it is in a greenbelt for a start
 - access is horrible and dangerous
 - the site dominates the village
 - it is on dangerous contaminated land.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The constraints have been noted - poor highways ect but they have been simply written down. Wjere is the official report? Similarly, the land may be contaminated - where is that report? Etc etc..

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This site should never have been taken further after its assessment using the matrix. It got a terrible score and so is totally unsuitable. Gypsies deserve a good home like everyone else in a suitable location. The matrix is meant to be a tool showing that decisions are made in an unbiased way. What a fane! The council have wasted time and money consulting the public on a matrix they then later ignore.

Respondent: 2683 / 1 Name: John Hudson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree with the opportunities BANES suggests this site offers. The water supply is insufficient for the existing residents at the present time and the development of this proposal site would increase the population of the hamlet by 3-400%. There are also no mains sewerage facilities within Stanton Wick. The site would have a huge impact on all residents of Stanton Wick as all the traffic it would create would have to travel through the entire hamlet. The site is in a green belt area the part of the site where the buildings are located makes up 30% of the proposed site, the other 70% has never been developed.

The frontage of the site is on a higher level than Stanton Wick lane and is clearly visible from the highway and surrounding areas.

The suggested constraints I agree with are:-

1. Access to the site is single track in places and has several tight bends and has led to a number of other planning applications being turned down on highway issues even though these applications would have involved far less traffic
2. The site is known to be unsafe and contaminated and remedial work would be horrificly expensive and involve a huge amount of heavy vehicular transport
3. The site has no access within reasonable walking distance to any local services, i.e. shops, schools, doctor's surgery, this would obviously create a huge increase in the volume of traffic travelling through Stanton Wick

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

The proposed pitch provision for this site could mean that up to 200 people could be accomodated there and this would totally overwhelm the existing population of Stanton Wick and therefore contravene government policy.

Furthermore according to research done by BANES with the travelling community they prefer to live on sites of no more than 5 pitches.

Employment opportunities are very limited in this area and it is difficult to envisage how so many extra people could earn a living in the area.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This proposal is for 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches but BANES have not ruled out increasing these numbers and have given no-one any assurances of how any illegal increases in the number of pitches would be dealt with.

Government policy clearly states that Gypsy and Traveller sites are inappropriate development in green belt areas.

The site is a site of Nature Conservation Interest and is a habitat for a number of important species.

This site was originally placed 17th out of 23 possible sites according to the matrix scale used by BANES, local residents are still awaiting an explanation as to why the site was suddenly elevated to the top 6 preferred sites.

Respondent: 2683 / 1 Name: John Hudson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing to you to raise my concerns about the proposal by Bath and NES Council to shortlist the site at the Old Colliery Stanton Wick as a possible Gypsy and Travellers site.

1. A settlement of 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches could attract a total of 60 families or in total 200 -250 people to this site and would totally dominate the hamlet of Stanton Wick which currently has less than 100 inhabitants. This is contrary to the Local Government Planning Policy for Traveller Sites Policy C 12 which states that local planning authorities 'should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest community'.
 2. There are no mains sewerage facilities at Stanton Wick and the existing mains water supply would not cope with such an increase in demand.
 3. The road access is insufficient for such a large number of vehicles that this proposal would create. By Bath & NES' own admission quoted on their site allocation D.P.D. The site is heavily constrained by its access which is single track in parts.'
 4. The site has several old mineshafts within it and these could be liable to subsidence at any time, furthermore the entire site could be contaminated from years of mining waste dumping making it totally unsuitable for such a use especially as there would be a significant number of children on the site at any one time.
 5. There are no schools shops or doctors surgeries that can be accessed via a safe walking route.
 6. The site lies within the local green belt area, and recent Government policy dictates that Gypsy and Travellers sites are 'inappropriate development for the green belt'.
 7. With reference to Bath & NES Gypsy, Travellers & Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations D.P.D. Issue 1 Site size Paragraph 4.6. Which states that 'The need for smaller sites in Bath & NES District is supported by West of England G.T.A.A. which found that most survey respondents preferred to live in family sized units of no more than 5 sites .
- I trust that the above concerns will be given due consideration at the forthcoming cabinet meeting on the 9th of May 2012. and the cabinet will realise that this is not a sustainable proposal.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2683 / 1 Name: John Hudson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

1. A settlement of 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches could attract a total of 60 families or in total 200 -250 people to this site and would totally dominate the hamlet of Stanton Wick which currently has less than 100 inhabitants. This is contrary to the Local Government Planning Policy for Traveller Sites Policy C 12 which states that local planning authorities 'should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest community'.
2. There are no mains sewerage facilities at Stanton Wick and the existing mains water supply would not cope with such an increase in demand.
3. The road access is insufficient for such a large number of vehicles that this proposal would create. By Bath & NES' own admission quoted on their site allocation D.P.D. 'The site is heavily constrained by its access which is single track in parts.'
4. The site has several old mineshafts within it and these could be liable to subsidence at any time, furthermore the entire site could be contaminated from years of mining waste dumping making it totally unsuitable for such a use especially as

there would be a significant number of children on the site at any one time.

5. There are no schools shops or doctors surgeries that can be accessed via a safe walking route.

6. The site lies within the local green belt area, and recent Government policy dictates that Gypsy and Travellers sites are 'inappropriate development for the green belt'.

7. With reference to Bath & NES . Gypsy, Travellers & Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations D.P.D. Issue 1 Site size Paragraph 4.6. Which states that 'The need for smaller sites in Bath & NES District is supported by West of England G.T.A.A. which found that most survey respondents preferred to live in family sized units of no more than 5 sites

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2683 / 2 Name: John Hudson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

THE OLD COLLIERY STANTON WICK is quite preposterous as a potential Gypsy traveller site. Anybody who cares about human welfare would never consider such a site.

i)The Old Colliery site is actually unsafe for the nature of the proposals

a)The geography of this site falls away steeply down to the disused railway line, and could be liable to subsidence as much of this site is covered with mining waste. We all know what happened in Aberfan. Would any of us want that on our conscience?

b)THE OLD MINE SHAFT DID ACTUALLY COLLAPSE RECENTLY

c)The ground is contaminated with arsenic and from years of mining waste according to an official study.

All of which make this site totally unsuitable for families and children

ii)Local Government Planning Policy for Traveller Sites Policy C 12 states that local planning authorities 'should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest community'.

Stanton Wick is a Hamlet of 26 dwellings.

B&NES proposals for the site would accommodate up to 60 families, a total of 200-250 people.

Approx. 5 times the inhabitants of Stanton Wick.

iii)Government Planning Policy for Travellers Sites Policy E clearly states 'travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development

The proposed site at Stanton Wick is Brownfield in Greenbelt

Two planning applications from Filers Coaches recently have been refused on Green Belt and Agriculture land issues.

Filers Coaches, BS39 4BU. Application Ref 09/02418/ 14/06/02010

Refused Agric Land Class 1, 2, 3a, Greenbelt, Coal fields, Forest of Avon, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5

Filers Coaches, BS39 4BU .Application Ref 11/03051 13/07/2011

Refused Greenbelt, Forest of Avon, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Agric Land Class 1,2,3a,Coal fields

iv)B&NES quoted on their site allocation D.P.D. 'The site is heavily constrained by its access which is single track in parts.'

The volume of traffic this site would create would be devastating on the local environment.

50% of Stanton Wick lane to Pensford is a narrow one track lane totally unsuitable for Caravans and heavy traffic. There is no Pedestrian walkway and is totally unsuitable for children.

Stanton Wick to Stanton Drew is entirely a one track lane with no pedestrian walkway. High hedges and sharp bends mean no visibility and there are very few passing places for vehicles.

A school bus collided with another vehicle recently in this lane.

v)There are no mains sewerage facilities at Stanton Wick

- vi)The water supply is so inadequate that many residents use a header tank
- vii)There are no amenities i.e. shops within the recommended distance
 There are no shops in Stanton Wick or Stanton Drew
- viii) No doctor within the recommended distance
- ix) No school within the recommended distance
- x)B&NES Gypsy, Travellers & Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations D.P.D. Paragraph 4.6. States that 'The need for smaller sites in Bath & NES District is supported by West of England G.T.A.A. which found that most survey respondents preferred to live in family sized units of no more than 5 sites '.

All these points clearly contravene Government and Local Government policy and guidelines on Travellers sites.
THIS SITE SHOULD NOT BE ON ANY LIST

I am curious to know how out of 23 sites, when we were originally placed 17th on the Matrix scale you used, we are now placed within the shortlist of 6?
 I would like an answer please.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2684 / 1 Name: Ms Tracy Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

- It is in a green belt area - how can you accept buildings for this site when I can't even get a "granny annexe" for my elderly mother built, as I am told I am in the green belt. Isn't this double standards?
- Access to this site is limited - how will the travellers get their caravans/vehicles to the site safely - there are no pavements
- There are no local shops - how will they get to any - there is no pavement or shop in Stanton Wick
- How will children get to a school? There is no local school that is accessible safely.
- The area is full of mine shafts. What happens if someone was to fall down one. Would they sue you?
- What about the natural habitat. The bluebells and all the wildlife. How can we destroy these?

If the council is insisting on using this site to house people (which us locals believe it is not suitable) then would it not be more sensible for the council to listen to the locals put some affordable housing on it? or build something that would make money and be able to put this money back into the community?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2684 / 2 Name: Ms Tracy Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The site cannot be suitable for travellers/anyone:
 No public transport
 No safe walking distance
 No amenities
 Hardly any employment in area
 No safe route to schools
 Too much money will have to be spent to get this site safe and suitable.
 No doctors surgery close by.

Respondent: 2685 / 1 Name: Mr John Kelly Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Inexplicably alone of all the proposed sites - including many larger, the Stanton Wick site has a suggested number of pitches in excess of the recommended Government maximum. Thus the (my) Council is choosing to ignore both central government and (I am sure you will be aware by now) localism.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Council are also guilty of applying double standards in respect of Green Belt land. An application to use 2 additional vehicles by the adjacent Filers Coaches was rejected yet it is now proposing to allow 30 or 40 times this at the Stanton Wick site

the Council has not followed the most critical element of the process outlined in its own document 'Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)'. In para 4.13 it states '..... A draft scoring matrix is set out at Appendix B. This will use a sequential approach to indicate the most suitable and sustainable sites. High scoring sites will be put forward as preferred options in the next consultation document, the Options Paper.....' This has not happened. Instead, irrespective of matrix score, sites have been rejected either for reasons within the matrix (which eventuality is already catered for by the matrix) or for other reasons (why were these not transparently incorporated in the matrix?). If the matrix was applied as it was stated it would in the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document, the requirement for pitches is satisfied by over 3 times before the need to even consider the Stanton Wick site.

Respondent: 2685 / 1 Name: Mr John Kelly Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I attended the Cabinet Meeting on the evening of 9 May and I understand that the consultation process begins today. I am writing to object to the proposal to create a Gypsy/Travellers site on the above, which is within the Green Belt. I am a resident of nearby Pensford.

I have really grave concerns about the probity of the process thus far. At the meeting of 9 May the proposal re Camerton was dismissed. While I have no objection per se for the Camerton site dropping out I have to say that I do not understand the process. The arguments on the evening in respect of rejecting the Stanton Wick site were if anything more compelling yet this site remained as a preferred option.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2685 / 1 Name: Mr John Kelly Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Perturbed that sites WITHIN Green Belt have been chosen and ex MOD sites ignored.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Absolutely not. Assessment is deeply flawed and profoundly biased.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Stanton Wick site is inappropriate because inter alia
It is within the Green Belt (contrary to Government guidance)
It would dominate the local community (contrary to Government guidance)
Surrounding road access is inadequate
No safe walking route to Pensford / Stanton Drew schools etc
No accessible public transport

Respondent: 2685 / 1 Name: Mr John Kelly Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I attended the Cabinet Meeting on the evening of 9 May and I understand that the consultation process begins today. I am writing to object to the proposal to create a Gypsy/Travellers site on the above, which is within the Green Belt. I am a resident of nearby Pensford.

I have really grave concerns about the probity of the process thus far.

At the meeting of 9 May the proposal re Camerton was dismissed. While I have no objection per se for the Camerton site

dropping out I have to say that I do not understand the process. The arguments on the evening in respect of rejecting the Stanton Wick site were if anything more compelling yet this site remained as a preferred option.

Can you please explain the process whereby the Camerton site was dismissed.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2685 / 2 Name: Mr John Kelly Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I believe that the consultation process in respect of the above begins today. I am writing to object to the proposal to create a Gypsy/Travellers site on the above, which is within the Green Belt. I am a resident of nearby Pensford.

I have really grave concerns about the probity of the process to date.

The procedure for selecting 'preferred options for allocation in the next consultation document' seems to be less than transparent.

The Council said A draft scoring matrix is set out at Appendix B. This will use a sequential approach to indicate the most suitable and sustainable sites. High scoring sites will be put forward as preferred options in the next consultation document, the Options Paper'. Clearly this has not happened and a different process adopted.

Can you please explain what in fact the process was and in particular how the Stanton Wick site which scored 10 and was placed 17th out of the 23 and yet was still selected.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2685 / 3 Name: Mr John Kelly Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Old Colliery Buildings Stanton Wick: Proposed Gypsy/Travellers Site I understand that the consultation process began yesterday. I am writing to object to the proposal by Bath and North East Somerset Council Cabinet to create a Gypsy/Travellers site on the above, which is within the Green Belt. I am a resident of nearby Pensford.

I have really grave concerns about the probity of the process thus far. At the Cabinet Meeting of 9 May myself and others

voiced criticism about the process for sourcing suitable sites for Gypsies and Travellers. You responded/answered to the effect that 'we asked Parish Councils to put sites forward'.

If this indeed was the only approach adopted I have real doubts as to its effectiveness. Can you please explain what other means BANES adopted to call for land and in particular how the Stanton Wick site, on Green Belt land, came to be included?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2687 / 1 Name: Mr Peter Undy Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

This site is totally unsuitable for this type of development. In particular the area suggested for the site is in the Green Belt and government planning guidance states that traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate. There are a multitude of other reasons why the area is unsuitable for this type of development including access, facilities, utilities, schooling and the fact that this is a former mining site, with the associated safety issues. Such a residential development in the small hamlet of Stanton Wick would completely change the nature of the area.

It also seems strange that this unsuitable development, the largest Traveller site proposed by BANES council, should even be considered for this area. It has always been difficult to get planning permission for building in the Chew Valley area and past requests for the relevant site to be used for other purposes have been contentious and regularly refused. Only plans for one residence have previously been approved. It would seem, however, that for travellers BANES believe that previous planning concerns can be ignored.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2687 / 2 Name: Mr Peter Undy Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site scoring matrix for Old Colliery made no mention of the problems relating to the former mine workings on site and therefore these have not been evaluated accordingly. Since the Pre-submission document, with ratings, was prepared there has been a mineshaft incident that required immediate remedial attention. The condition and extent of the old mine workings should be added as another negative factor to the scoring for the Old Colliery site.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I disagree with the currently published consultation document and the associated site shortlist. Old Colliery was ranked 17th of 23 sites on the original assessment document yet subsequently was included in the top 7 sites carried forward. No justification has been provided for this promotion of the Old Colliery site and the decision making process involved should be published. The cost of producing the original Pre-submission document should also be released and BANES should be asked to justify the cost and reasons for ignoring the findings of this report.

Many of the shortcomings of the Old Colliery site were identified in the original Pre-assessment report but were then ignored or glossed over in the subsequently published shortlist document.

The major concern is that of development in the green belt. Numerous planning requests in the area have been rejected in the relevant area because they were considered inappropriate in the green belt, some of these being only minor changes. Indeed Filers Coaches on the next site cannot get permission to for parking further coaches, let alone 60 or more caravans. More specifically National guidelines state that gypsy and traveller sites "are inappropriate" development in the greenbelt Roads to the proposed site are totally inadequate for the volume of traffic that would be generated by such a development and the proposal, which is greater than the national guidelines for traveller sites, would overwhelm the tiny local community. The road to the east of the development is totally unfit for use by the Old Colliery site. This would mean that the road to the west, already defined as inadequate for further development of the site, would put significantly increased traffic volumes through the small local community.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

As mentioned in (a) above the proposed number of pitches would dwarf the local community and cause chaos on the local road. In any case this type of development in the green belt is inappropriate. There is no, therefore. absolutely no logic to the decision to override the original assessment rating for the Old Colliery site and it should immediately be removed from the shortlist for consideration

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The original Pre-submission rating for Old Colliery identified the site has unsuitable for inclusion on the shortlist. The decision to ignore the original rating is incomprehensible and illogical.

Respondent: 2688 / 1 Name: Frances Hudson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

NO the site at the Old Colliery at Stanton Wick is totally UNSUITABLE for gypsy/traveller people as I will explain overleaf.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO I do not agree with the councils opportunities:-

The water supply at Stanton Wick is so inadequate that residents use header tanks

There is no mains sewerage at Stanton Wick and because of the structure of the land in question sewerage would not be dealt with through septic tanks

The additional traffic created would have a huge impact as it would have to travel through the entire hamlet

70% of the site has never been developed and 100% of the site lies within Green Belt

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO The potential pitch provision would totally overwhelm the community by a factor of 2 to 3

The land at the Old Colliery is contaminated and not suitable for children and families

According to the DPD report gypsies and travellers do not want large sites. They prefer small family size sites.

BANES have quoted in the DPD report 'the site is heavily constrained by its access which is single track in parts!'

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The site is very close to Pensford Conservation Area and is a site of nature conservation interest.

The site is actually dangerous with disused mine shafts. One of which collapsed recently.

Government planning policy for traveller's sites policy E currently states 'Travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the greenbelt are inappropriate development. The Old Colliery is 100% within green belt.

Stanton Wick to Pensford is 50% a single trackline

Stanton Wick to Stanton Drew is totally a single track lane.

Respondent: 2688 / 1 Name: Frances Hudson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I wish to object to B&NES proposal for a Travellers and Gypsy site on The Old Colliery at Stanton Wick on the following grounds:

i) Local Government Planning Policy for Traveller Sites Policy C 12 states that local planning authorities 'should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest community'.

Stanton Wick is a Hamlet of 22 dwellings.

B&NES proposals for the site would accommodate 60 families, a total of 200-250 people.

Approx 5 times the inhabitants of Stanton Wick.

ii) Government Planning Policy for Travellers Sites Policy E clearly states 'travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development The proposed site at Stanton Wick is brownfield in Greenbelt

Two planning applications from Filers Coaches recently have been refused on Green Belt and Agriculture land issues.

Filers Coaches, BS39 4BU. Application Ref 09/02418/ 14/06/02010

Refused Agric Land Class 1. 2. 3a. Greenbelt. Coal fields. Forest of Avon. Agric Land Class 3b,4,5

Filers Coaches,BS39 4BU .Application Ref 11/03051 13/07/2011 Refused Greenbelt. Forest of Avon. Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Agric Land Class 1 .2.3a.Coal fields

iii) B&NES quoted on their site allocation D.P.D. 'The site is heavily constrained by its access which is single track in parts.'

The volume of traffic this site would create would be devastating on the local environment. 50% of Stanton Wick lane to Pensford is a narrow one track lane totally unsuitable for Caravans and heavy traffic. There is no Pedestrian walkway and is totally unsuitable for children.

Stanton Wick to Stanton Drew is entirely a one track lane with no pedestrian walkway. And very few passing places for vehicles.

iv) There are no mains sewerage facilities at Stanton Wick

v) The water supply is so inadequate that many residents use a header tank

vi) There are no amenities i.e. shops within the recommended distance

There are no shops in Stanton Wick or Stanton Drew

vii) No doctor within the recommended distance

viii) No school within the recommended distance

ix) B&NES Gypsy, Travellers & Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations D.P.D. Paragraph 4.6. States that 'The need for smaller sites in Bath & NES District is supported by West of England G.T.A.A. which found that most survey respondents preferred to live in family sized units of no more than 5 sites '.

X) The Old Colliery site could actually be unsafe for the nature of the proposals

a) The geography of this site falls away steeply down to the disused railway line, and could be liable to subsidence as much of this site is covered with mining waste (slag) We all know what happened in Aberfan. Would any of us want that on our conscience?

B) liable to subsidence due to old mine shafts

c) contaminated from years of mining waste.

All of which make this site totally unsuitable for families and children

All these points clearly contravene Government and Local Government policy and guidelines on Travellers sites. I hereby

wish my views to be noted and taken into account at the cabinet meeting on May 9th 2012. And any other times when this matter is discussed.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2689 / 1 Name: Mr Chris James Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I have now had chance to reflect – as I am sure you have – and some things seem clearer now. As you may remember I asked why the Old Colliery site which was 17th on the original Matrix “jumped” into the top 7 for the meeting on 9 May. You told me that the matrix was “a paper exercise” and that other factors were also taken into account, for example visibility. You also confirmed that only the 6 “preferred sites” will now be considered – the remaining 17 sites are excluded from future consideration.

According to your own BANES documentation the Matrix was “a method of applying a consistent and objective methodology to site selection”. So why did the Old Colliery move into the top 6? Which officer or councillor was responsible?

You confirmed to me that BANES has allocated £1.8 million to the provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites. You also confirmed that as the Old Colliery is privately owned, no public money would or could be spent on its development: all costs incurred would be borne by the site owner or developer. This one site, therefore, as proposed, can deliver nearly all the permanent pitches and some of the transit pitches which are planned – all at no cost to the local ratepayers! No wonder it is attractive. Is it too good to be true?

You said at the meeting on 9 May that no decisions had been taken in relation to sites. Yet, as you said at the end of the same meeting, the Cabinet has permanently excluded reconsideration of any of the other sites which under the consistency and objectivity of the Matrix had been considered more suitable. This is neither logical, nor consistent nor objective.

This decision also has far reaching consequences because , if the Old Colliery site were to be withdrawn, it would be impossible using only the remaining 5 sites to meet the intended target of 22 permanent pitches, 20 transit pitches and 1 showman’s yard. Therefore, in order to achieve your target, the Old Colliery site has to be selected, or the previously excluded sites reconsidered or new sites considered. So by default you have made a decision which means that the Old Colliery Site has to be selected – unless by chance new sites are proposed which are considered more suitable.

The Old Colliery site breaches government and BANES criteria and guidelines for Gypsy and Traveller sites, in particular it is in the Green Belt, would dwarf the local community, has inadequate road access and access to local amenities and additionally there are significant health and safety and wild life issues. Indeed, a number of applications to develop the land by the present owner have been rejected as “inappropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore harmful to the Green Belt by definition”. Applications by a neighbouring business have been refused on grounds of inadequate road access.

So, how can this site be considered as suitable? BANES own DPD on Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations states: Any sites in the Green Belt will be considered less favourably than those outside the Green Belt. In accordance with national planning policy, Gypsy and Traveller sites are normally considered inappropriate development on Green Belt land. Draft Policy Statement Planning for Traveller Sites removes the word ‘normally’ from the above policy.

New guidelines issued in March 2012 by the Government state:

The Government is committed to the protection of the nation's green spaces and this policy will protect Green Belt land and countryside. Traveller sites are an inappropriate development on Green Belt land and the new guidance makes clear that there should be due regard for the protection of the local environment and amenities when local authorities set out

their criteria for allocating sites (<http://www.communities.gov.uk/news/corporate/2114100>)

In order to allow this site to be developed as a Gypsy and Traveller site an exception will have to be made to BANES and government policies and guidelines, particularly planning. Gypsies and Travellers would, therefore, be treated differently from BANES residents.

The Liberal Democrat party, locally and nationally, has a long tradition of fighting for justice and democracy. The banner slogan on your national website is “for the many not the few” and the Programme for Government signed up to by Nick Clegg is “freedom, fairness and responsibility”. Locally you and your colleagues in the administration were elected as representatives of the people of BANES, based on these principles of fairness and democracy.

Therefore, how can it be fair and just and to the benefit of the many that a small number of non-residents have preferred treatment over local residents? How can it be seen as democratic that the overwhelming opposition to this proposal is disregarded? How can this be seen as the action of a responsible administration?

This is the reason for much of the opposition to the proposal: the strong feeling of not being listened to or treated equally with others.

There is also serious concern that the Old Colliery site, if authorised development were allowed despite everything, even on a smaller scale, would gradually expand, as an authorised or an unauthorised site, as at 27 acres the site as a whole is considerably larger than required under the present proposal. One of the arguments you put forward to me and also mentioned by your colleague at the Cabinet meeting is that having authorised sites would reduce the financial cost to the local ratepayers of evicting Gypsies from unauthorised sites. I agree that authorised sites should strengthen the hand of the police and courts in the eviction process. However, this did not happen in the case of Dale Farm in Essex. Dale Farm, a former scrapyards in Green Belt, was an unauthorised site next to Oak Lane, an authorised site. It took 10 years to evict the travellers from Dale Farm at a cost to local ratepayers of at least £4.5 million. According to the BBC the final costs were up to £18 million.

At Dale Farm the land was bought by a traveller in 2001 and unauthorised development on the site started. The 6 acre site eventually had 49 illegal plots, reportedly sold at £50,000 each. At its height Dale Farm and the adjacent legal site of Oak Farm (with 34 pitches) was home to over 1000 gypsies and travellers, the largest concentration anywhere in the United Kingdom.

This could easily happen at the Old Colliery site which is 4 times the size of Dale farm. The present owner could sell the land to a traveller or gypsy developer. If BANES allowed even a small legal site, the remainder of the land could be sold to a traveller and unauthorised pitches established.

However, if the Old Colliery site were withdrawn from consideration, on the grounds of unsuitability and breach of national and local guidelines and policies, particularly planning, this would strengthen the legal basis for eviction in the event of unauthorised occupation. This would be further strengthened if the site were designated as a protected site, for example a heritage site, under the Localism Act, which the Coalition has now passed into law.

This issue is too important to be decided simply on political party lines. It concerns us all and all political parties. The present Cabinet policy of allocating sites and pitches in one go on the basis of unreliable data from 2007 is a case of “act in haste and repent at leisure”. A sensible and pragmatic approach is to adopt a “piecemeal” incremental approach, ie to allocate and develop a few sites, after proper local consultation with residents and the gypsy community, and to gradually over time and by democratic and consensual means increase gypsy and traveller sites as and when they become available and according to updated information in regard to need, location and changing legislation. This approach which other councils in the UK have adopted, allows time for other potential sites to be considered, for local communities to view existing sites and form an opinion about them and avoids a damaging and unnecessary confrontational approach to local government.

The Cabinet meeting on 13 June and the full Council Meeting on 18 June offer the opportunities for reconsideration. To change a policy as a result of consultation and debate is not weakness but wisdom. It would also help to restore trust and belief in local politics and politicians.

If it does not change its policy, does the Liberal Democrat administration of BANES wish to be remembered as

- 1) The council that ignored its own planning rules
- 2) The council that ignored the democratically expressed views of its electors
- 3) The council that did not treat its own electors, residents and communities equally with non residents
- 4) The council that allowed a landowner and developer to profit at the expense of the community
- 5) And potentially, the council that allowed a second “Dale Farm”

Is this the legacy which you and your colleagues want to leave the electors and residents, not just of Stanton Wick and the neighbouring villages, but of the whole of BANES?

The slogan at the top of your leaflet on the DPD is

“Making Bath & North East Somerset an even better place to live, work and visit”.

I do not think the residents of Stanton Wick, Stanton Drew, Pensford and surrounding areas would agree.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2689 / 1 Name: Mr Chris James Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

- 1.It is in the Green Belt. BANES own document (DPD) on Gypsy and Travellers Site Allocations states : Any sites in the Green Belt will be considered less favourably than those outside the Green Belt. In accordance with national planning policy, Gypsy and Traveller sites are normally considered inappropriate development on Green Belt land. Draft Policy Statement Planning for Traveller Sites removes the word ‘normally’ from the above policy. A Planning Application in 2010 for residential development on the Colliery Site (Application 10/01429/FUL) was refused , the first reason being it was “inappropriate development in the Green Belt and is therefore harmful to the Green Belt by definition”.
- 2.It is remote from public services and community facilities The BANES DPD states Locations in or near existing settlements are prioritised in Circulars 01/2006 and 04/2007. Such locations are generally more sustainable than those in remote areas, with better access to health and education services, shopping facilities, transport networks and employment opportunities. They are also more likely to reduce the need for car travel. The Old Colliery site has no public transport and Chew Magna, the nearest village with shops, secondary school and surgery, is too far to walk. Application 10/01429/FUL was refused partly because its “location was remote from public services and community facilities”.
- 3.Road access is unsuitable. The road between Stanton Wick and Pensford is narrow, winding and has no footpath. A Highways Report on a Planning Application for the Old Colliery highlighted the blind bends and single carriageway as a reason for objection. Filers Coaches operate out of the Old Colliery and have applied on several occasions to increase the number of coaches using the site by 50%. So far these applications have been refused. To refuse a local business to expand, but allow access to a larger number of caravans would be inconsistent planning policy.
- 4.Sites should not dominate the local community. Government policy states that “local planning authorities should allocate the number of pitches to the surrounding population’s size and density.” And that “sites in rural areas and the countryside should not dominate the local population.” The hamlet of Stanton Wick consists of about 22 houses which would be overwhelmed by a “village” of 15 permanent and 5 transit pitches where “an average family pitch must be capable of accommodating an amenity building, a large trailer and touring caravan...drying space for clothes, a lockable shed...parking space for two vehicles and a small garden” (National Guidance on “Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites”). The numbers of people on site could be over 100, including significant numbers of children.
- 5.Health and Safety Issues. The Old Colliery is contaminated. The Sanctus Report of 2010, based on thorough research, found significant amounts of arsenic on the site and recommended costly remedial action to make the site safe. The report also highlights the potential problem of ground gas. Both these issues are endorsed by Steve Manning from Planning Support in his report dated 20 December 2010. This report states that a detailed investigation and remediation scheme must be conducted “to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared.”
- 6.Ecological Issues. Planning Application 10/01429/FUL was refused partly because “the application fails to demonstrate that bats present on the site would not be adversely effected contrary to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and Policy NE.10 of BANES Local Plan.” Bats and possibly other protected wild life on the site (e.g.

badgers) would be at considerable risk from the proposed development of 20 Traveller/Gypsy pitches.

In summary, I believe that Pensford Old Colliery is unsuitable and unsustainable for development as a site for Travellers and Gypsies. It does not meet the criteria set out in Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD), particularly Paragraph 2.7. I understand that locations were considered initially and prioritised using the Site Selection Scoring Matrix which is intended to be "a method of applying a consistent and objective methodology to site selection" The result was that the Colliery site was identified as 17 out of 20. Yet, it is now at the top of the recently published list. Why?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2690 / 1 Name: Mr Leigh Coomber Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

In particular I am concerned that arsenic pollution, land instability and the lack of safe access and egress will render this proposal impractical and unaffordable.

Arsenic pollution is typical of these colliery sites, this is not thin layer of contaminated material, as with other ex industrial site, but tens of metres in depth and over one million tons in total, making removal impractical. Whilst sealing and capping this unstable site, would present technical difficulties and incur considerable expense. If the proposal was implemented and considering the occupants will comprise of a high percentage of children, failure to deal effectively with this problem could well result in serious health issues and risk costly litigation.

The location of the site is isolated and well away from the essential services required to support the proposed facility. The provision of the necessary infrastructure and the work required to upgrade the single-track access road and to provide adequate water and waste disposal together with electrical supplies, would further significantly increase the cost of implementing this proposal.

There are many other ways in which this proposal fails meet the "Good Practice Guide for the selection of Gypsy and Traveller Sites" many of which were identified in the selection process. On the council's "Scoring Matrix" this site was placed 17th out of 23 proposed site. It therefore remains a mystery why it is still under consideration?

Banes are not the first local authority to identify a disused colliery as one suitable for a traveller's site - refer Barnsley Stairfoot site etc. Invariably however, on examination of the difficulties, these proposals have been abandoned. My concern as a local taxpayer is that this proposal should be withdrawn now; before more of our council's diminishing resources are expended on this flawed proposal.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2690 / 1 Name: Mr Leigh Coomber Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The selection criteria, for the current list of "Preferred Sites" fails to adhere to the authorities declared selection process, in a number of respects. Similarly the authority has departed from its own consultation process.

1. Although a Site Selection Scoring Matrix was completed and scores obtained indicated the suitability and sustainability of sites, these scores have been ignored in the selection process. Consequently, sites that scored highly on the Matrix, have been permanently excluded and others which had low scores are now in the Preferred Sites list.

2. The Authorities consultation procedure requires that "No decision is made on final site allocations prior to the conclusion of the consultation process . However several decisions have already been made. One was to ignore the Matrix scores, also one site was removed from the list of preferred sites prior to the conclusion of the consultation process whilst another decision was to permanently exclude the remaining 17 sites from reconsideration.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. My reasons are as follows:-

The Council's own Selection Scoring Matrix placed this site 17th out of 23 sites considered. This objective and consistent methodology highlighted a number of planning issues, which make the site unsuitable for development for anything other than consent already granted for conversion existing buildings to a single dwelling.

The Council's planners have in the past consistently refused planning permission on the site, both to the present owner and to the Coach firm occupying the adjoining site. The main reasons given were " inappropriate development in the Green Belt" and therefore harmful to the Green Belt (for residential development) and inadequate road access (for storing additional vehicles by the Coach firm). Application 10/01429/FUL was refused partly because its "location was remote from public services and community facilities".

It is inconceivable that an application for a caravan park would succeed on this site given the planning history, however the Council is considering doing exactly that by including the Old Colliery in the shortlist of Preferred Sites for Gypsies and Travellers.

New guidelines issued in March 2012 by the Government state:

The Government is committed to the protection of the nation's green spaces and this policy will protect Green Belt land and countryside. Traveller sites are an inappropriate development on Green Belt land and the new guidance makes clear that there should be due regard for the protection of the local environment and amenities when local authorities set out their criteria for allocating sites

(<http://www.communities.gov.uk/news/comorate/2114> l. 00)

In conclusion, in order to allow this site to be developed as a Gypsy and Traveller site an exception would have to be made to BANES and government policies and guidelines, particularly planning. Gypsies and Travellers would, therefore, be treated differently from BANES residents.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No: - The proposed pitch provision would swamp the tiny hamlet of Stanton Wick and exceed the government guidelines. In addition the site is sufficiently large to expand (with or without planning consent) to become a ghetto and reach an unmanageable proportion. The example of Dale Farm should be a salutary lesson in this respect.

Additionally there are significant health and safety and ecological issues in relation to the development of the site. (E.g. contaminated land, unsafe mine shafts, no safe walking routes to local amenities, and wildlife conservation issues).

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2691 / 1 Name: Mr Leonard Heland Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am a Pensford resident, and I am writing to register my extreme concern regarding the proposed establishment of a permanent traveller site on the land behind the Pensford colliery building at Stanton Wick. The site is completely unsuitable for such a development. It is on green belt land in a beauty spot with only a single track access road which is totally unable to support the suggested expansion in traveller dwellings and vehicles. Furthermore, the land in question sits on contaminated ground in an exposed position far from shops and amenities and has inadequate water/drainage. It is totally wrong to even consider having people live on this site. I therefore ask that you reject this proposal with immediate effect and instead consider alternative sites,

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2691 / 1 Name: Mr Leonard Heland Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am a Pensford resident and I am writing to register my extreme concerns over a proposal to establish a traveller site on the land behind Pensford colliery at Stanton Wick. This site is totally unsuitable because:

1. its situated on green belt land surrounded by beautiful countryside (used and much appreciated by myself and other local people)
2. the access road is unable to support such a development
3. it is in an exposed position on contaminated ground fare from shops/amenities and has inadequate water/drainage

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2691 / 2 Name: Mr Leonard Heland Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I live in Pensford and I am writing to register my objection to the establishment of a permanent traveller site on the land behind the Pensford Colliery at Stanton Wick. The site is totally unsuitable for dwellings of any kind because:

1. Its situated on green belt land in an area of beautiful countryside
2. the access road is unable to support such a development
3. it is in an exposed position on contaminated ground far from shops and amenities and has inadequate water/drainage

The proposed development on this land is completely wrong therefore the council should immediately reject it and consider alternatives instead.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2691 / 3 Name: Mr Leonard Heland Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes. The Old Colliery Site is an inappropriate site for development. There is contamination, no infrastructure and its GREENBELT LAND. It is important we ensure NO DEVELOPMENT takes place on our beautiful greenbelt land.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Colliery site at Stanton Wick is totally unsuitable. It's on greenbelt land where access is very limited due to narrow single track road. A part from a small shop in the village the nearest shops and amenities are several miles away. The council should consider BROWN FIELD sites where Gypsy caravan accommodation can sit alongside other housing (private as well as social housing) near to shops and services. An example would be the MoD sites in Bath. This approach is the right thing to do (there are success stories in other parts of the country that BANES could learn from.)

Respondent: 2692 / 1 Name: Ms Katrina Davies Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

1. Please confirm the accepted level of traveller % to local resident % that has been agreed / approved in previous suggested sites. My understanding is that 25 people live in Stanton Wick against some proposed 200 travellers. Is there no % that is considered an unacceptable level of dwarfing on a local community ?
2. Please confirm how many children are expected within the travellers that are intended to use the site and what schooling they are being offered ? My understanding is that Pensford School had 14 places this year, all of which have been taken. I am unsure how many places would / could be available in Stanton Wick / Drew but cannot imagine there are many. How will the travelling children have the amenities they require if local schools do not have places available ?
3. Please confirm what steps have been taken and how additional teaching resources have been funded and made

available for any additional children that will be attending local schools ? It is possible that children of a travelling community who have gaps in their education and / or move schools will need additional assistance in order to maintain acceptable / expected levels of attainment, what are the calculated projections of the learning needs of the traveller children and how have these needs been considered and addressed ? If this is the case how many additional teachers will be available to them and how are the costs of this being met ? Are there any plans to expand the local schools to accommodate ? And if not why not, if this is necessary ? If you are unaware of how many children will need placement - how can you consider it to be a suitable site without this information ?

4. Please confirm which GP surgeries will be expected to deal with the registration of an additional circa 200 people and how this will impact on abilities of the surgeries to deal with timely local appointments. Are additional GPs being brought into the area and if so how many and how will this be funded ?

5. Please confirm the Highways responses to date regarding significant traffic on these currently infrequently used roads, if the highways are yet to comment please confirm when they will do so and where the responses can be accessed . Please confirm how the additional strain on these roads will be monitored and how the roads will be maintained and funded for this maintenance ? Please confirm what the thought process has been regarding access issues on these narrow roads and what systems are being put into place to deal with the same and how this is being funded ?

6. Please confirm the levels of ecology awareness that have been undertaken to date. Has the site being inspected for endangered species / flora / fauna etc. How has the wildlife and countryside act been adhered to ? Are there any veteran trees on the site ? Has a bat survey been undertaken ? Please provide a copy of the ecological reports to date or advise where these may be viewed ?

8. Please confirm what refuse will be available to the travellers and how this will be funded ?

9. Please confirm what level of council tax banding the travellers will be expected to pay and what proof of payment will be available. Please also confirm what the penalty for non payment will be and how this will be enforced ?

10. Please confirm how you will deal with unauthorised expansion should this situation occur and how this will be monitored in order to stop such a situation from occurring ?

11. I have been advised that the site is a brown site in a green belt but that it has been previously rejected planning permission. Please confirm if this is accurate - why the previous planning was rejected and why this new planning / development differs and is being considered?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2693 / 1 Name: Mr a Jamie and Smart
Louise

Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing to you in order to state my objections to the above proposal. I understand that the council intends to provide 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches (for use by travellers for three months at a time) for use by the travelling community, at the aforementioned site.

I am strongly opposed to this proposal for the following reasons/concerns:

- The site is within the designated Green Belt
- Access to the site is via a narrow country lane, and increased traffic will result in the lane becoming even more hazardous than it currently is.
- There is no public transport that serves that area.
- The ground is unsafe i.e. mineshafts, and as I understand to be the case previous examination of the land have found it to be contaminated.

- According to your matrix/requirements for a traveller's site as stated on the council website the proposed site does not provide shopping within the recommended distance.
- Again, according to your matrix/requirements for a traveller's site as stated on the council website the proposed site does not provide a doctor within the recommended distance.
- How can the proposal for a site of this size be approved by the council, when previous planning applications for dwellings at the same site have been denied for some of the concerns/reasons listed above by the same council.
- The site will impact on the local environment e.g. water supply, drainage capability and power (electric) capacity.
- The proposed site is not on a recognised traveller route.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

- Occupation of the proposed site would dwarf the community of Stanton Wick, which comprises approximately 25 houses.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2694 / 1 Name: Mr Dean Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The impact to the wild life in this area:

There is bird of prey which rears its young close to the proposed site and also owls, bats, snakes, deer, voles, hedgehogs, squirrels that I have personally seen myself. I expect with closer inspection there will be a lot more that could be seen to be living in this area which will be affected or lost for good. That is without mentioning any of vegetation/natural habitat that could also be destroyed.

The land

My understanding of the Old Colliery is that the land is quite dangerous with mine shafts collapsing and toxins in the soil which have been leeching into the ground for many years. The land itself although sits in a brown field area, (my understanding from your own planning department) and from my own dealing with your head of planning at the time, was that you need to include all surrounding areas of which is greenbelt in your planning decision.

Access

Access to the land from either end is by mainly by a winding narrow road, which already has too much traffic on for the size of the road. If any more traffic use this road I think it will be only a matter of time before a serious accident would happen.

Scoring Matrix

I have checked the matrix scoring system that you have used for all of the sites and it seems to put the Old Colliery site down in 17th spot for being a suitable area for travellers and still somehow the Old Colliery seems to be one of the shortlisted sites. My opinion is that the site is still being shortlisted not because it's suitable or viable in any way, but the fact that BANES needs to fulfil certain quota on spaces available for travellers. This will enable BANES to get a grant from the Government. This seems to be an easy option.

Amenities

All I can say to this is that there isn't any within your recommended distance.

Schools in the area – I believe Chew valley school is already oversubscribed and is a very good school. Pensford Primary school, although not oversubscribed, works very hard to raise the level of education with a lot of time spent by locals helping at the school. A lot good will fund raising is done by locals and parents to assist with the already shortfall from BANES . A lot of this good will from disillusioned locals/parents will probably be lost. My understanding that Stanton Drew

school functions exactly the same with a lot of good will from locals/parents.

Utilities

Electricity in the area seems to be at near capacity with the old infrastructure that is in place and with the additional load put onto the area would possibly cause more outages and overload to existing cables.
Water as with the whole area there seems to be quite a low pressure and with extra usage would magnify the problem further.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2695 / 1 Name: Mrs Sandy Veal Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing in response to the BANES council proposed development of The Old Colliery in Stanton Wick to provide 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches for travellers.

I would like to raise strong objections to this development on the following grounds:-

Schools:-

The primary schools in the Stanton Wick area (Pensford & Stanton Drew) are small rural schools, whilst there are some spaces at these schools the impact of a large intake of children at all year levels would have a detrimental effect on the quality of education provided to all children due to the amount of time and resource it would take to assess the abilities of the new intake children. The resources at these schools would be severely stretched.

Access to both these schools, which are more than 1.5km from the proposed site, is very poor and there is no suitable footpath making walking to school extremely hazardous. There is limited parking at both schools and additional vehicles would further increase this problem with the likelihood of an increase in illegal parking causing danger to children outside of schools.

Environment:-

A development of the size would have a detrimental effect on the environment. There is no mains drainage in the village of Stanton Wick and therefore Septic tanks would need to be provided for all pitches.

There are bats and no doubt other rare species on this land which need protecting. Wildlife would be disturbed and possibly destroyed during a development of this size. There is a danger of mine shafts collapsing.

I would also mention that this site is in greenbelt – central government guidelines suggest that travellers sites should not be located in greenbelt. It is also interesting to note that Filer coaches who are a well respected local business located next door to the proposed travellers site made an application to extend their premises to accommodate an additional 10 coaches. This application was turned down due to "Inappropriate development in the Green Belt, detracting from openness and rural character of the area:- resulting in congestion and inconvenience to road users and unsustainable location of the site". A reapplication was made and rejected on 29 September 2011 (only 7 months ago) on the same grounds. It therefore seems amazing that a development of the size suggested and the amount of traffic it would create is now being considered.

Local Business Impact.

Many visitors come to the area to visit the stone circles located in the nearby village of Stanton Drew and the area is well known to walkers for its many beautiful walks and outstanding landscapes and views across the countryside. There are many reasons for visitors to come to the Chew Valley area including Chew Valley lakes and Blagdon lakes. Chew Magna was recently voted the best village in Britain which will have increased visitor interest in the area. A development of this size would have a detrimental effect on the landscapes, the countryside walks and would generally deter visitors from coming back. This will have a detrimental effect on local businesses which rely heavily upon the tourism trade such as hotels, bed & breakfast establishments, pubs & restaurants.

I would also like to make the following comments in reference to your Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People site allocations development plan document.

Page 6 of this document refers to a core strategy policy which states that sites should have

:-

A – local community services and facilities including shops, schools and health facilities should be accessible by foot, cycle and public transport.

This is not true of the proposed site at Stanton Wick – access to this site is only via very narrow country lane with no footpaths. To travel by foot or cycle is hazardous. There is NO public transport in Stanton Wick. The nearest bus stop is in Pensford which is a 1.5km walk down a narrow winding lane with no pavements. The nearest train station is Keynsham but there is no public transport link from Pensford to Keynsham. Alternative train stations are Bath or Temple Meads in Bristol both of which are a considerable bus journey away. There are no motorway links nearby. The nearest Doctors surgery is in Chew Stoke which is not accessible by a direct public transport link.

b- satisfactory means of access can be provided and the existing highway network is adequate to service the site

I would reiterate the highway network consists of very narrow lanes (one vehicle width) with a few passing points. The highway network is not suitable for the increased traffic which a development of this size would create. Please also refer to my previous comment with regard to an additional 10 coaches causing “congestion and inconvenience to road users”.

C – the site is large enough to allow for adequate space for on-site facilities and amenity, parking and manoeuvring as well as any commercial activity.

Yes the site is large enough for this but this activity will cause increased noise levels and a great deal of disturbance this small rural community. In addition although the proposal is for 15 permanent sites and 5 transit sites, due to the size of the parcel of land there is plenty of scope for illegal expansion of the site.

D – the site does not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area

The proposed site is located within a very small, quaint, characteristic village and there is no doubt that the character and surrounding area will be detrimentally affected. There are currently approximately 22 houses in the village of Stanton Wick – this development is for 20 pitches (15 permanent and 5 transit) – each pitch consisting of an average of 3 caravans which is a total of 60 potential caravans which is triple the number of residential homes currently in the village. It is impossible to predict this would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

E – adequate services including utilities, foul & surface water and waste disposal can be provided as well as any necessary pollution control measures.

There is no mains drainage and no gas within the village. The general infrastructure of the village and indeed the surrounding villages would not cope with a development of this size.

According to your scoring matrix on pages 17 & 18 of the DPD this site would score extremely low, I believe the score achieved was 10 out of a possible 47 and the proposed site does not seem to meet any of the guidelines set out in your own documentation.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

This is clearly an over development of the site in greenbelt which will have a huge detrimental effect on the surrounding

residents and facilities including roads and schools.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2695 / 1 Name: Mrs Sandy Veal Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am writing in with regard to the BANES council proposed development of The Old Colliery in Stanton Wick to provide 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches for travellers.

I would like to raise strong objections to this development on the following grounds:-

This site is in greenbelt and on contaminated land. I have looked at the current planning permission (reference 10/03029/REN which is a renewal of application 05/02227 /FUI and note that condition 7 states:- "the guest accommodation, spa and stable shall only be used for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the main dwelling". The reason stated for this is:- "to prevent an over intensive use of the site".

In my opinion a site of 20 pitches would be an over intensive use of the site and is an overdevelopment of the site.

I also believe there could be bats and other protected wildlife species and plants on this site.

These need to be protected and I believe with a development of this size it would be impossible to successfully implement measures to protect the wildlife.

I also note with interest the comments from the Highways Officer dated 23 August 2010. The highways officer has indicated that she was in favour of the change of use of the site from industrial to residential as this would reduce traffic from the former industrial site, in particular HGV traffic. However the highways officer is not in favour of the site being used for residential and B1 uses due to the level of traffic which would be generated and the highways officer has noted "such a proposal would not be in line with local & national policies". Finally as stated by the highways officer a decision on the application was made before comments from highways were received -these comments would have been one of objection.

In summary it would seem that Highways would be against a development of this size and I agree that the infrastructure around this site would not cope with an increase in the number of residents in the area and the increased traffic.

Roads leading to the site are narrow and have no pavements, an increase in traffic will no doubt lead to an increase in road traffic accidents.

According to BaNES councils own documentation this site scored 10 points out of a possible 47 points using the scoring matrix. There were 23 potential sites, the site at Stanton Wick with a low score of only 10 was number 17 on the list- therefore how did it arrive in the top 7 potential sites?

This is clearly an over development of the site in greenbelt which will have a huge detrimental effect on the surrounding

residents and facilities including roads and schools. would therefore urge you to remove this site from your shortlist of potential sites at the meeting on 9 May 2012.

Respondent: 2695 / 2 Name: Mrs Sandy Veal Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am writing in with regard to the BANES council proposed development of The Old Colliery in Stanton Wick to provide 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches for travellers.

I would like to raise strong objections to this development on the following grounds:-

This site is in greenbelt and on contaminated land. I have looked at the current planning permission (reference 10/03029/REN which is a renewal of application 05/02227 /FUL and note that condition 7 states:-

"the guest accommodation, spa and stable shall only be used for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the main dwelling". The reason stated for this is:- ~"to prevent an over intensive use of the site".

In my opinion a site of 20 pitches would be an over intensive use of the site and is an overdevelopment of the site.

I also believe there could be bats and other protected wildlife species and plants on this site. These need to be protected and I believe with a development of this size it would be impossible to successfully implement measures to protect the wildlife.

I also note with interest the comments from the Highways Officer dated 23 August 2010. The highways officer has indicated that she was in favour of the change of use of the site from industrial to residential as this would reduce traffic from the former industrial site, in particular HGV traffic. However the highways officer is not in favour of the site being used for residential and B1 uses due to the level of traffic which would be e:enerated and the highways officer has noted "such a proposal would not be in line with local & national policies". Finally as stated by the highways officer a decision on the application was made before comments from highways were received -these comments would have been one of objection.

In summary it would seem that Highways would be against a development of this size and I agree that the infrastructure around this site would not cope with an increase in the number of residents in the area and the increased traffic.

Roads leading to the site are narrow and have no pavements, an increase in traffic will no doubt lead to an increase in road traffic accidents.

According to BaNES councils own documentation this site scored 10 points out of a possible 47 points using the scoring matrix. There were 23 potential sites, the site at Stanton Wick with a low score of only 10 was number 17 on the list- therefore how did it arrive in the top 7 potential sites?

This is clearly an over development of the site in greenbelt which will have a huge detrimental effect on the surrounding residents and facilities including roads and schools. would therefore urge you to remove this site from your shortlist of potential sites at the meeting on 9 May 2012.

Respondent: 2827 / 1 Name: Mark Cooksley Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I understand that Gypsy families need to be placed somewhere and i am not against their inclusion into society but i feel that this particular site is completely unsuitable, the site is accessed by one lane which just cannot cope with the extra traffic that this site will bring, which if the site gets the go ahead will be nearly 50 extra vehicle's, there are very few passing point's to accommodate these.

I have a young family and we love walking/cycling up and down the road, also taking our pony up and down for exercise, this is the reason we left the hustle and bustle of city life, for the peaceful life of the countryside, but unfortunately if the proposal goes ahead this will be shattered, and that will become a very dangerous activity.

May i also point out that our property is joined to Broadoak Cottage and is directly lane side, we have both on occasion in the short time we have lived here had transit van's and lorry's scraping the side of our property as the lane is so narrow. Then getting stuck on the narrow 200 year old railway bridge, which is completely impassable and having to reverse back past our properties causing more damage to verges also.

The closest local shop, school and other amenities which are 2 miles away from us and the proposed development would mean the extra traffic would pass our property every day, as there is no pedestrian highway available, that said, it is the same case in both direction's.

There are many other reason's for the denial of this project i.e. :

As the site is on a disused mine quarry, only last week the council were called in to repair a collapsed mine shaft.

The land has also been found to be contaminated, which, in itself is just cause not to press forward with this venture.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I feel completely helpless to stop this project going ahead, it seems BANES main agenda is to put Travellers camps as far away from Bath as is possible [as shown on their list of proposal's] and to show complete disregard for people's opinion's and suitability of the development

Respondent: 2827 / 2 Name: Mark Cooksley Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

NO

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE COUNCILS ASSESSMENTS

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

I DO NOT AGREE THAT THIS SITE SHOULD BE PUT FORWARD

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I FEEL THAT THIS SITE IS COMPLETELY UNSUITABLE AND SHOULD NEVER HAVE MADE IT ON THE PREFERRED SITE LIST IN THE FIRST PLACE.

THE ACCESS IS SINGLE FILE IN BOTH DIRECTIONS.

THERE ARE NO LOCAL AMENITIES.

THERE IS NO STREET LIGHTING
 AND MORE IMPORTANTLY THIS SITE WOULD DWARF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

Respondent: 2827 / 3 Name: Mark Cooksley Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am very concerned that the proposed site in Stanton Wick is now under consultation as the unsuitability is blindingly obvious.

I expect you to respect me and my family by dutifully giving me answers to these issues of concern i have listed below.

I have been paying my tax's and contributing to society for 30 years now and we deserve some answers.

I understand your desire to provide/build a community for the travelling/gypsy population, but question your motives in finding suitable sites.

- 1.GreenbeltIt is in greenbelt. National guidelines say that gypsy and traveller sites in green belt "are inappropriate" development. That means that planning permission would not be available.
- 2.Inadequate road accessIn their assessment BaNES accept that the road access is incapable of coping with the increase in traffic but claim that the increase will be modest. Approx 100 people will have to use the cars in order to get anywhere producing a traffic increase of many times the current level. All planning applications have been refused where there was likely to be an increase in traffic. How are BaNES going to keep everyone safe? How are the roads supposed to cope with the traffic without accidents? BaNES have not even asked the Highways Dept to look at this proposal.
- 3.Access to amenitiesThe site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors etc only a steep, unlit and muddy track. BaNES have not explained where all the children will go to school or how they will safeguard people walking around with no pavements? This development is unsustainable as everyone will have to use cars to access the basics of life.
- 4.SizeThe proposed 20 pitches is larger than the government's stated maximum making it "difficult to manage." BaNES report boasts that the site has potential to expand to 50 pitches – more than three times the maximum. The site is over half size of the whole of Victoria Park in Bath. BaNES have not explained how many people they expect OR how they will deal with unauthorised expansion across the site, OR what business activities will be allowed and volume of lorries etc.
- 5.Overwhelming the nearest settlementNational guidelines state that the site should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement. Even at 20 pitches the travellers would outnumber Stanton Wick's residents, possibly 2 or 3:1. BaNES have not explained how social cohesion will be achieved under these circumstances. They are obliged to ensure integration and cohesion. How are they satisfying this requirement?
- 6.Contamination and safetyIn an expert report and survey the site was found to be contaminated with dangerous levels of arsenic that has not been removed. The majority of the site has not yet been surveyed. It has mineshafts and safety issues have not been considered. BaNES have not explained what they intend to do about this.
- 7.Traveller preferencesThe site has nothing in common with the type of site preferred by travellers as shown in the West of England Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Travellers prefer close proximity to amenities and small family sites of up to 5 pitches.
8. Cost to Rate Payers.BaNES have not explained who will be paying for any or all of work required to make the site habitable, bring in water, sewage and electricity. They have not explained what the cost is for any mine safety work or roadwork costs or the costs to enable children to be accommodated in the schools

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2832 / 1 Name: Ms Adele Collier Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Preferred options are non-Green Belt sites or ex-MOD land.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I think any development on Green Belt land sets a worrying precedent for future planning/development. The land is a harbour for wildlife and provides the natural habitat for many animals so any development could endanger their habitat. In addition, my concern is that the size of the proposed development would overwhelm the local community, which does not have the infrastructure to support it.

Respondent: 2832 / 1 Name: Ms Adele Collier Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

As a local resident, I believe that the infrastructure is not set up to cater for an influx of up to 200 people. My main concerns are as follows:

- Out of the three local villages (Stanton Drew, Stanton Wick and Pensford), only Pensford has a shop, which is extremely small and has limited supplies.
- Pensford school has a limited capacity, so local children may be affected by a large number of additional people in the community
- The site is positioned on a small country lane, with limited access and not appropriate for heavy vans or caravans.

Importantly, the area is in the green belt, a beautiful area of unspoilt countryside - attractive to walkers and people visiting the area. Having seen the state of the current traveller site on the outskirts of Bath, it distresses me to think this area could end up looking similar. I believe this would certainly deter people from walking in or visiting the area, as well as being detrimental to the wildlife.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2834 / 1 Name: Mr Kenneth Payne Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The information that I have is as follows:

The site is in the Green Belt and would constitute (inappropriate development'.

There is inadequate road access.

B&NES have cited traffic problems in previous planning refusals.

There is inadequate access to amenities.

There are no shops in Stanton Wick nor Stanton Drew and only a very small post office in Pensford.

The nearest Doctors' surgery is about 5 miles away and there is no public transport. The site is contaminated and would require significant cost to make safe. The water supply at Stanton Wick is unreliable and is at capacity for the current infrastructure. The site includes several old mineshafts and these could be liable to collapse at anytime.

The site is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and provides habitat for some important species.

There is no safe walking to either Pensford or Stanton Drew Schools.

There is no public transport within safe walking distance, and what public transport there is, is very sparse.

The overall site is much larger than earmarked for current plans, and we have no assurances that expansion will not take place.

There is very limited employment in the area.

The large development as proposed would overwhelm the small settled community at Stanton Wick.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2834 / 2 Name: Mr Kenneth Payne Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am sure that you have heard full details of many of the local residents' objections, so I don't need to repeat them here (but I am quite happy to do so if you wish).

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

What concerns me, apart from the fact that the site is clearly unsuitable and, I understand does not fulfil the criteria, is that the planning process has been conducted in what seems to be an underhand fashion and meant that we local residents were not made aware of BANES' plans until the process was a long way down the line

I, like many others, was unaware of any consultation in November 2011 and strongly object to not being advised of BANES' plans until almost the last minute.

It seems that political idealism, rather than the residents' wishes, which you as an elected representative are supposed to work for, is taking the upper hand.

Respondent: 2834 / 3 Name: Mr Kenneth Payne Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

There are eight key issues that are of concern and relate to;

- 1 Greenbelt – Gypsy and traveller sites are 'inappropriate developments'
- 2 Inadequate road access – only single track with no walkway
- 3 Access to amenities – there are no shops in Stanton Wick and Stanton Drew, and only a very small post office in Pensford. The nearest Doctors Surgery is about 5 miles away in Chew Stoke
- 4 Size- large unmanageable site exposing local ratepayers to potential considerable expense
- 5 Overwhelming the nearest hamlet of Stanton Wick - There is no chance of social cohesion.
- 6 Contamination and safety – Our resident paediatrician believes this to be a wholly unsuitable site for children's health and wellbeing.
- 7 Traveller preferences – they like to be near services, but they won't find any near the site
- 8 Cost to rate payers – the site is contaminated, needs to be made safe and adequate services i.e. water, electricity, and sewers need to be provided. The resident colony of bats will require protection.

The arguments put forward by local residents or representatives of local residents relating to the above eight points, likewise appear to have been unanswered.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2835 / 1 Name: Mr I R Bennett Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I was very surprised to see this site on the short list after reading the needs for the vulnerable community (Gypsy travellers) the council want to support. This site is isolated with no facilities, poor access, mine shafts, contaminated unstable land and numerous other defects. I would not like to bring my family up on a site like this with the many health and safety issues especially for children.

The nearest secondary school (Chew Valley) is miles away and have been over subscribed for years. There is no public transport near to this site. A large development at this site would need a lot of vehicles to enable access to any facilities and local services and would have to drive on very narrow lanes with no pavements or street lighting an accident waiting to happen.

The development of this site would appear to be a quick fix to the Councils problems because a large site is on offer. In Bristol it's said that travellers prefer "smaller sites with extended family close to amenities".

I am also concerned about who would run this site, it has been said that a developer from up north had ear marked this land last year because he knew BANES needed land for the Gypsy and Travellers sites and hoping to sale it to the council for a premium price. If this land was fit for habitation why hasn't it been put forward for the much needed housing

development?

I would like you to consider and please answer the questions below.

- a) Is this site in the best interest of the Gypsy travellers?
- b) Would you feel comfortable with your family living on this land?
- c) Has this land been put forward in order for the land owner to reap maximum financial benefit?
- d) Is this site a quick fix, short term gain for long term pain?
- e) Would the Tax payer be expected to pick up the overheads incurred by this site, e.g. running cost, transportation for children going to school and getting to the Doctors and other services and facilities?
- f) If some thing catastrophic was to happen on this site who would be responsible and liable for damages?

Looking at the site scoring matrix; I feel some of the scores appear to be higher than they should be in particular hazardous place and safe access to public highway, however, the overall score came out quite low but it is still one of the preferred sites.

This site really doesn't offer anything good for the Gypsy travellers, we all have a duty of care and I don't believe this is suitable and in the best interest of the Gypsy travellers.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

As the Gypsy travellers need and prefer to be included within the community have you thought about integrating a number of Gypsy traveller pitches in with housing development such as the redundant Ministry of defence sites in Bath Foxhill, Enleigh and Warminster road.

I believe there are spare places on existing Gypsy traveller's sites in neighbouring authorities have you considered these in your assessment?

Respondent: 2835 / 1 Name: Mr I R Bennett Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Old Colliery Stanton Wick

Previous planning application for residential development on this site was rejected due to:

- 1, The site being in a location remote from public services and community facilities.
- 2, Inappropriate development in Green Belt.
3. Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations.

Land contamination report

Arsenic level indicating a potentially significant risk to human health.

Carbon Dioxide and Methane above action level.

A transport company in Wick Lane, Stanton Drew, adjacent to the proposed site.

Planning application to extend area of coach/bus stationing for additional vehicles refused due to:

- 1, Inappropriate development in Green Belt.
- 2, Detract from the openness and rural character of this area.
- 3, Increase in vehicle movement on the local road system which is unsuitable to accept additional traffic.
4. Site in a location remote from services and public transport to enable people access to the site resulting in an increase in vehicle journeys.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No - Scored to high on the Matrix and should never have got on to the list of preferred sites.

This site is not suitable and sustainable and does not fulfil any of the national guidelines.
 Would dwarf local community.
 Numerous Health and Safety issues, Mineshafts, Disused tip, Contaminated Land, Close proximity to disused viaduct.
 Very unsafe access especially for children, no pavements, street lights, etc.
 Insufficient road access and capacity.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No - Completely unacceptable.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Gypsy traveller pitches should be included within housing development sites.

Gypsy and travellers prefer small sites of 5 pitches or less and in close proximity to amenities.

National newspaper reports, May 2012, Gypsy family was awarded £105,000 in compensation by Surrey County Council after the site they were living on was declared contaminated, forcing them to leave.

Respondent: 2836 / 1 Name: Ms Julie Ford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

How can it be possible for the Council to even consider the provision of permanent and transit pitches on a site that is in the Green belt and a area of outstanding natural beauty ?

How can it be possible that 40 plus pitches could be planned on a site that has previously only been considered for ONE dwelling .

Could you please explain how the Council seems to change rules to suit themselves. Surely rules are put in place for us all to abide by ?

The need for an appropriate site is not disputed ,and I have studied the matrix prepared by your offices .Logically the most suitable site would be the one with the highest score not one near the bottom of the list.

The site at Stanton Wick has low marks for good reasons ,access ,utility problems ,no shops ,no doctor ,etc. ,not to mention contamination and mine shafts.

There would appear to be no good reason for this site to be considered if all the guidelines are adhered to ,and I urge you to take another look at your matrix and chose a location that would be safe and suitable.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Firstly, I was shocked to hear that this topic has been on the agenda for nearly two years and a letter in my local paper is the first I had heard of this .

I have since learnt that even my Parish council had not been informed .It would appear that either the Council is lacking in communication skills or it was trying to keep it under the radar.

I have since contacted the action group and from the information they have put together , it would seem that keeping it under the radar was the intention.

Respondent: 2838 / 1 Name: Mr Paul Baxter Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

These comments refer specifically to the site at Pensford colliery. The colliery site is in greenbelt. Development of the site as proposed would be harmful and inappropriate. The access road has been deemed insufficient in previous planning applications and passes through the Pensford conservation area. The land is home to rare bats and is contaminated with arsenic. It is far from amenities with no safe walking route to any. Planning permission for two houses on the site was turned down. over 90% of local residents are opposed to this development. In this context very special circumstances are unlikely to exist.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The council perceive an opportunity to house up to 200 people on the site. This could only be achieved by breaking the planning laws and disregarding the desires of the people who live here. I therefore disagree with that perception. The council has given insufficient weight to the constraints on the site, namely it is in greenbelt, it is contaminated, they have erroneously placed it within a safe walk of schools and shops. They have overlooked highways objections and therefore promoted an unsuitable site to the shortlist. I disagree with their reasoning.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

By taking forward such an unsuitable site for more costly investigation the council would be failing in their duties to both the settled and travelling communities.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The law and house of commons guidance are clear that gypsies and travellers are to be treated fairly and with equality in planning as compared to settled communities. The council's process to date suggests a strong pro traveller bias in considering developments that would/have not been considered for settled communities. This is racist and incompetent.

Respondent: 2838 / 2 Name: Mr Paul Baxter Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am contacting you to express my concern at your consideration of the former colliery at Stanton Wick as a possible site for the provision of permanent traveller pitches. As you know the site falls within the green belt. The "Planning policy for traveller sites" (March 2012) states that inappropriate development is harmful to the green belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. I am aware from the documents you have issued on-line that you feel the scale of the unmet need in the area combined with the relative scarcity of non green belt land constitutes very special circumstances. I am afraid you may have been badly advised. Statutes and guidelines are written with great care and words are included only where they are meant to confer meaning. The use of the term special does not refer to those things that are merely unusual or peculiar but to things that are so far outside the ordinary course of events as to be remarkable and demanding of unique treatment. A special situation is one where the outcome cannot be achieved by ordinary means. A third of BANES is non green belt land so whilst it may take longer to find your quota of sites than in other areas it is by no means impossible and does not require a deviation from the guidance.

You should also note the inclusion of the word very. This is not verbiage, nor is it a general prefix in law for the word special. It is only included where the legislature intends for the exemption to be strictly interpreted. As my lecturer used to say, special is one in a hundred, we await the second coming for a judgement on the meaning of very special. Added to this the removal of the word normally from the latest draft of this guidance and it becomes clear that the prohibition is intended to stand in practically all circumstances.

Your call for sites lasted only three months and by your own reckoning the Stanton Wick site was found to be of very poor quality (coming 17th out of 23). The site you are proposing is larger than the government's recommended maximum by 33% and dwarfs the local village. The access road is poor and the site itself is exposed and may be contaminated. To claim that this site is suitable for residential development on this scale is deeply questionable, to claim it is an excellent solution to an otherwise intractable problem is clearly untrue.

Whilst I admire your resolve in pushing this site forward I fear it will be struck off the list the moment it leaves your hands. I would urge you to think carefully about how much more time and capital, both economic and political, you are willing to invest in pursuing an outcome that is all but impossible.

There is no brownfield exemption from the guidelines.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2839 / 1 Name: Mr Daniel Harris Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

YES. Stanton Wick has no services, no doctors surgery, no adequate access, no shop, poor water supply, and little industry, and so little prospect of employment. It also has no public transport whatsoever to Bath, poor transport to Bristol and Radstock, which are the main centres of employment in the area. Given this is not in dispute, where do the Local Authority think the new people will work? The implication is that this community will be "dumped" in Stanton Wick, away from any prospect of employment and without facilities, which could be argued is a very anti-Gypsy policy, and one that the local authority should be ashamed of.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The Local Authority has not conducted a proper assessment of this site. Had it done so it would be clear that it is wholly unsuitable. It fails to meet any of the criteria, and Local Authority Staff have even stated that they are prepared to manipulate the criteria to make it meet them. It is on Green Belt, polluted, has poor access, would overwhelm the local population, has no public transport and so it cannot be claimed with any degree of credibility that the councils assessment has any merit.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Given the fact that the only criteria that the Local Authority can legitimately rely on is the fact that is a big site, and no other, it would be ridiculous to suggest that Stanton Wick should be considered, let alone taken forward as a formal allocation.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The preferred options paper is a flawed document. The decision to shortlist the Stanton Wick site has more to do with the fact that it is a large site than any suitability. It completely misses the planning criteria and the Local Authority are determined to press ahead because it offers the route of least resistance to meet targets. There has been NO consultation at an appropriate stage and the Local Authority have devoted time and resource to an extent that they have committed themselves to the Stanton Wick site before proper consultation begins. The current process is a sham and a internal review is inevitable.

Respondent: 2839 / 2 Name: Mr Daniel Harris Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

It has come to my attention that the above development has been proposed.

Indeed it appears that a considerable amount of work has been undertaken over a period of around one year, without providing the local residents with any opportunity to provide their input. The issue now is that a decision appears to have been made by the Local authority, without seeking the views of local residents - those who are going to be directly affected by this development. The belated attempt to 'tick the consultation box' can be considered to be no more than a hollow, disingenuous exercise, which is being conducted mala fides, and so contrary to national local planning guidelines.

I write to you to seek your support to vote against the proposed development. The grounds for my objection are:

- 1.The size and the nature of the proposed development is wholly disproportionate to the size and nature of the surrounding villages.
- 2.The location of the proposed development is of little use to the travellers as it is far from the cities of Bristol and Bath, centres of potential employment.
- 3.Local public transport is virtually non existent.
- 4.The area lacks the facilities and amenities to cater for the current population, let alone a further 200 people, and as far as I am aware, no adequate consideration has been given as to how this will be addressed, and no budget has been set aside.
5. The access roads are narrow, in places extremely steep, and unsuitable for additional traffic.
- 6.The proposed area is over a disused mine; wholly unsuitable for inquisitive children, and dangerous for heavy vehicles.
- 7.The sewerage and other utilities are not adequate for the purpose.
- 8.Local schools could not cope with the influx of an additional 20-50 children.
- 9.The area, let alone the site, has no traveller tradition.
- 10.The local medical surgeries are unable to cope with the current populace, and do not have the capacity to accept a large influx of additional patients.
- 11.The site may be brown-field, but it is also within the green-belt.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2898 / 1 Name: A J Morley Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes.

1. The site is within Green belt and has previously been turned down for development as was considered unsuitable by B&NES
2. The ground is contaminated and previous mine workings are collapsing.
3. The land has inadequate access to local amenities by road or foot.
4. The local amenities would be overwhelmed by the scale of the development, the size of which could dominate the local community.
5. The site does not have the benefit of any services including sanitation.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The site has previously been turned down by B&NES as being unsuitable for even smaller developments. There are serious and life-threatening regarding contamination and collapsing mine workings on the site. The site does not have the benefit of any of the essential services IE: power, drainage, water, sanitation, and in all other respects is entirely unsuitable to sustain a decent quality of life.

Respondent: 2921 / 1 Name: Jeff Mountford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I write to you, with the hope that you as the "Proposer", and the rest of the liberal Democrats on the B&NES Cabinet will acknowledge that what you are proposing to do on the above referenced site is completely unacceptable in light of all reasonable argument, and that you will strike it from the list of potential sites.

The principal objections to this site have nothing to do with Nimbyism (not in my back yard, if you are unaware of the colloquialism) but down to facts as:-

- It is on Green belt
- it is on a single track badly maintained road
- The access at the A367 end is a blind spot, and dangerous
- The access at the other end of the lane, is via a one way system, right through the heart of Pensford
- "ALL" planning permission has been previously refused.
- The proposed site would totally overwhelm and consume the existing local community of Stanton Wick (26 houses)
- Water supply is inadequate at present with local houses all in need of domestic booster units to ensure pressure; the draw on this supply from a potential extra 100 people would render it unsustainable.
- The site itself is dangerous, with mineshafts in unstable condition.
- The site has Arsenic, and would need remediation work, and I want to know- who would pay for this (Estimate £120 per tone- and with 600mm of spoil to be taken away across the site -this could run to several hundred thousand pounds).
- No adequate local services I schools I shops I surgeries etc.

In light of the above obvious obstacles to this, I demand that you as an elected councillor, listen to the views of all that lobby you on this subject and act accordingly, and strike this site from your shortlist, this at least will save the taxpayer money, and you avoid wasting valuable time.

I, like you agree, that councils should provide for the travellers, and B&NES record on this is shameful, but this in no way should encourage you to select totally unusable and unsustainable sites, just to fulfil your obligations to national government, and tick that one off your to do list.

I now expect a full answer to all the questions you have been asked with regard to this proposed development, and confirmation, that you will do what national government, all reasonable people would expect you to do, and put an end to this sorry saga.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2921 / 2 Name: Jeff Mountford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

YES:

Land is contaminated (arsenic)
 Insufficient water supply and drainage
 One single track road with dangerous exit onto A368 and also into a one way system in Pensford is unsuitable.
 Nearest Doctors - 5 miles
 Nearest Dentist - 3 miles
 School 1.5 miles
 (no safe walking route to the above)
 Outnumbers residents 3:1
 It is greenbelt

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No: Existing on site services are an electricity supply (restricted) and water supply - suitable for single domestic use at low pressure,
 No : mains drainage and septic tanks would not cope with such a development.
 Development of this site would not assist social integrations and have a massive impact on neighbouring residents being outnumbered 3:1
 No: This site is not well screened from local roads and would be in full view.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No: because of above
 Highways issue - the only road is unsuitable for all additional traffic and the exit road to Pensford is straight into a heritage area and one way system.
 No services - schools/doctors/dentist (5 miles)
 A settlement of this size would outnumber local (SW) residents 3:1.
 It is on greenbelt/special nature constraints.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Being a local resident - is imperative that 'greenbelt' is upheld everywhere and especially here.
 This site goes against - national Govts. Guidelines and is wholly unsuitable for travellers and existing residents.

Respondent: 2921 / 3 Name: Jeff Mountford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I write to you, with the hope that you as the "Proposer", and the rest of the Liberal Democrats on the B&NES Cabinet will acknowledge that what you are proposing to do on the above referenced site is completely unacceptable in light of all reasonable argument, and that you will strike it from the list of potential sites. The principal objections to this site have nothing to do with Nimbyism (not in my back yard, if you are unaware of the colloquialism) but down to facts as:-

It is on Green belt

It is on a single track badly maintained road
 The access at the A367 end is a blind spot, and dangerous
 The access at the other end of the lane, is via a one way system, right through the heart of Pensford
 "ALL" planning permission has been previously refused.
 The proposed site would totally overwhelm and consume the existing local community of Stanton Wick (26 houses)
 Water supply is inadequate at present with local houses all in need of domestic booster units to ensure pressure; the draw on this supply from a potential extra 100 people would render it unsustainable.
 The site itself is dangerous, with mineshafts in unstable condition.
 The site has Arsenic, and would need remediation work, and I want to know- who would pay for this (Estimate £120 per tone – and with 600mm of spoil to be taken away across the site- this could run to several hundred thousand pounds).
 No adequate local services I schools I shops I surgeries etc.

In light of the above obvious obstacles to this, I demand that you as an elected councillor, listen to the views of all that lobby you on this subject and act accordingly, and strike this site from your shortlist, this at least will save the taxpayer money, and you avoid wasting valuable time.

I, like you agree, that councils should provide for the travellers, and B&NES record on this is shameful, but this in no way should encourage you to select totally unusable and unsustainable sites, just to fulfil your obligations to national government, and tick that one off your to do list.

I now expect a full answer to all the questions you have been asked with regard to this proposed development, and confirmation, that you will do what national government, all reasonable people would expect you to do, and put an end to this sorry saga.

Respondent: 2960 / 2 Name: Catharine Brown Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The selection criteria, for the current list of "Preferred Sites" fails to adhere to the authorities declared selection process, in a number of respects. Similarly the authority has departed from its own consultation process.

1. Although a Site Selection Scoring Matrix was completed and scores obtained indicated the suitability and sustainability of sites, these scores have been ignored in the selection process. Consequently, sites that scored highly on the Matrix, have been permanently excluded and others which had low scores are now in the Preferred Sites list.

2. The Authorities consultation procedure requires that "No decision is made on final site allocations prior to the conclusion of the consultation process. However several decisions have already been made. One was to ignore the Matrix scores, also one site was removed from the list of preferred sites prior to the conclusion of the consultation process whilst another decision was to permanently exclude the remaining 17 sites from reconsideration.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. My reasons are as follows :-

The Council's own Selection Scoring Matrix placed this site 17th out of 23 sites considered. This objective and consistent methodology highlighted a number of planning issues, which make the site unsuitable for development for anything other than consent already granted for conversion existing buildings to a single dwelling.

The Council's planners have in the past consistently refused planning permission on the site, both to the present owner and to the Coach firm occupying the adjoining site. The main reasons given were " inappropriate development in the Green Belt" and therefore harmful to the Green Belt (for residential development) and inadequate road access (for storing additional vehicles by the Coach firm). Application 10/01429/FUL was refused partly because its "location was remote from public services and community facilities".

It is inconceivable that an application for a caravan park would succeed on this site given the planning history, however the Council is considering doing exactly that by including the Old Colliery in the shortlist of Preferred Sites for Gypsies and Travellers.

New guidelines issued in March 2012 by the Government state:

The Government is committed to the protection of the nation's green spaces and this policy will protect Green Belt land and countryside. Traveller sites are an inappropriate development on Green Belt land and the new guidance makes clear that there should be due regard for the protection of the local environment and amenities when local authorities set out their criteria for allocating sites

(<http://www.communities.gov.uk/news/comorate/2114100>)

In conclusion, in order to allow this site to be developed as a Gypsy and Traveller site an exception would have to be made to BANES and government policies and guidelines, particularly planning. Gypsies and Travellers would, therefore, be treated differently from BANES residents

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No: - The proposed pitch provision would swamp the tiny hamlet of Stanton Wick and exceed the government guidelines. In addition the site is sufficiently large to expand (with or without planning consent) to become a ghetto and reach an unmanageable proportion. The example of Dale Farm should be a salutary lesson in this respect.

Additionally there are significant health and safety and ecological issues in relation to the development of the site. (E.g. contaminated land, unsafe mine shafts, no safe walking routes to local amenities, and wildlife conservation issues).

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

BANES own DPD on Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations states:

1. Any sites in the Green Belt will be considered less favourably than those outside the Green Belt. In accordance with national planning policy, Gypsy and Traveller sites are normally considered inappropriate development on Green Belt land Draft Policy Statement Planning for Traveller Sites removes the word 'normally' from the above policy.

2. Locations in or near existing settlements are prioritised in Circulars 01/2006 and 04/2007. Such locations are generally more sustainable than those in remote areas, with better access to health and education services, shopping facilities, transport networks and employment opportunities. They are also more likely to reduce the need for car travel.

Government policy states:

3. "local planning authorities should allocate the number of pitches to the surrounding population's size and density." And that "sites in rural areas and the countryside should not dominate the local population."

Respondent: 2983 / 1 Name: Mr Tony Heaford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I consider the Stanton Wick site to be inappropriate development both on this site and in the green belt. You should give more detailed consideration to the MOD sites which are becoming available and consider the Somerdale site in Keynsham.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. I do not agree this site has many more constraints than opportunities. I can see it has the opportunity to expand which would be even more disastrous. The BANES Enforcement Department is not known for it's rigour. The site is known to be contaminated, with poor access.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I do not agree. This site with the proposal for 20 pitches would totally overwhelm the Parish of Stanton Wick and have a significant impact on the village of Pensford and its few amenities.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I think the preferred option paper is badly flawed. Firstly this site is green belt and I can see no special circumstances which would permit the development. Secondly the matrix has been bent and twisted to bring this site (17 out of 23) into the reckoning.

Respondent: 2983 / 2 Name: Mr Tony Heaford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing to object to the proposal to be laid before your Cabinet on May 9th to create a Travellers Site on the Old Colliery at Stanton Wick. I am a resident of Pensford and this site will have a profound effect on this village.

I am astonished that BANES should have selected the Old Colliery for such a substantial and significant Travellers site, not only is this site in the Green Belt, but it hardly meets any of the criteria laid out in your Site Allocations Consultative document. I am sure these will be outlined by other residents at the Cabinet meeting and I will not go over them again in this letter. Suffice it to say that I am surprised that there is no Environmental Impact Assessment as this site has in the past been known to be contaminated. Also whilst the site is not in a Conservation Area, Wick Lane which would no doubt be one of the access points to local facilities leads straight into the heart of the Pensford Conservation Area through some very narrow lanes, a full Traffic Survey will also need to be carried out.

This Site would totally dominate the village of Stanton Wick and has the potential to do the same for Pensford.

Your Consultative Document set out the criteria which needed to be met and a methodology for creating a scoring mechanism for determining the priority of sites. In the schedules attached to the report to Cabinet the Old Colliery is shown with a score of 10, placing it at 11 out of 23 sites considered. The Green Belt guidance issued by the Government specifies that only in "Very Special Circumstances" should such land be used for a Travellers Site. Your own document specifies that those very special circumstances will be met as there is no other land. This would not seem to be the case as you have identified a number, which by the scoring mechanism laid out in your document, have a much higher score than the Old Colliery which by your definition must make them more suitable.

I believe that you have identified the Old Colliery not because of its suitability, but because it provides a site which will meet most of your needs. It ignores the guidance you gave in your consultation document but satisfies your needs and I do not believe it will stand up to scrutiny.

The process appears to me to be flawed and ultimately will be seen to be so. It is neither Democracy or Localism and I urge you and your Cabinet colleagues to reject this site for inclusion in the list of suitable sites.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2984 / 1 Name: Mrs Jennie Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The MOD sites are the most obvious, but certainly the most sensible option is to look at future requirements to find the required pitches.

Site commenting on: **GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick**

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No - it is a complete farce and is flawed there are NO opportunities ONLY constraints. Tim Ball only likes this site because it is BIG and outside Bath. These are NOT reasons to select this site.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Absolutely not, nobody in their right mind would put this site forward as a formal allocation. It has the potential to be a worse nightmare than Dale Farm! How much did that cost £18 million !!

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

It is inappropriate development on the greenbelt. It is far too big and is a very scary proposition the council would NOT be able to control its expansion.

History of planning refusals

Single track lane

No shop/schools/bus route/doctors

Not a safe walking route

Would not be possible to integrate into local community

Water/electricity/sewerage not adequate

Contaminated, unstable land

THIS IS NOT SUSTAINABLE

. Letter attached - dated 16th July 2012 ..

Dear Mr Ball

Re: Proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Stanton Wick

I don't know if you are aware of some of the background to the landowner offering you this site as a gypsy/traveller site, but I think it is something that you do need to take into consideration.

The landowner had quite a serious dispute with the neighbouring business owner Pat Filer. I do not know the details of the dispute, but I believe there were considerable legal costs involved and caused massive bad feeling between them, maybe you should contact Pat Filer for more detail.

Following this, the landowner started telling a number of people (one of which was my husband) that he was going to turn this site into an illegal gypsy site. He told my husband this in December 2010, I assume before you had been offered this land as a site. Allegedly, he was quite vocal about his intention.

His brother also informed my husband and I of this in March 2011 and told us that it was 'to get back at Pat Filer'. His brother also said that this unauthorised gypsy site was going to be 'bigger than Dale Farm' and at that point the landowner had agreed the sale to gypsies/s.

Of course, much of this is hearsay and you may not be interested in the background or reasons for the landowner offering this land.

Putting this aside when I heard, ten days ago, about this site being offered as a gypsy site which would potentially home 200 people and the capability for more in the future I was absolutely shocked that this site was seriously being considered as an authorised site.

It makes no difference whether this site is being proposed as a gypsy site or whether for enough houses for 200 people.

The issue is simply that this is unsustainable, the infrastructure is not in place to support this and it would dwarf the tiny hamlet of Stanton Wick and also have a huge impact on Pensford.

Not only that, but it is within the greenbelt. The government has made it very clear that these sites should not be within the greenbelt unless there are very special circumstances. You state that those circumstances are met because there is no other land. Yet your report shows that there are 22 other sites which you have considered. Practically all of which score higher against the criteria set out in your Consultative Document.

There are also numerous other issues: the lane leading down into Pensford is a very narrow lane which floods on the tiny bridge with blind corners. The bridge is also very old and I would suspect you would need to check its structure. Where

the lane comes into Pensford is already very congested with existing traffic. There are issues with contamination, apparently collapsing mine shafts, lack of space in local schools, no buses, no doctors surgery (you state on your report that there is a doctors surgery in Chew Magna, this has now moved to Chew Stoke and is not on a bus route), no superstore. In fact there is really very little in its favour from the villagers point of view or the gypsies. However, it suits the council as it is large and you can put a great big fence around it !!

According to feedback from the gypsies, they prefer smaller sites close to all local amenities. Who in their right mind would choose to live on what is essentially an exposed, dangerous, contaminated slag heap in total isolation? I have studied your calculation on the scoring matrix and come to a total of minus 2 for this site. The lane is NOT safe for children to walk to school, this site is NOT on a bus route, it is hazardous and the access to public highway is NOT safe. Have any of your councillors or gypsies visited this site? I suggest that they do as a matter of urgency, because all would agree that there is nothing suitable about this site for us or the gypsies.

In conclusion, I feel that you need to go back to the list of nominated sites and re-consider. Some of the high scoring sites have been 'dismissed out of hand' it would seem. I think you need to withdraw this site from nomination before more money and time is wasted on a site that ultimately will have to be rejected as it meets virtually none of the criteria required. Previous Councils have also come up against this problem, but you simply cannot try to force a big square peg into a tiny round hole, you will have to keep searching until you find sites that fit the required criteria and lets hope you put as much time effort and money into providing Affordable Housing.

Yours sincerely ..

Respondent: 2985 / 1 Name: Mr Tim Ruthven Organisation: Buccaneer Holdings Ltd.

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

It has been brought to my attention the potential for the Old Colliery to be turned into a Gypsy & Traveller site. Buccaneer Holdings Ltd are the owners of the Carpenters Arms, Stanton Wick, BS39 4BX, www.the-carpenters-arms.co.uk.

This is a grave concern to us, primarily on these grounds:-

1. Increased traffic; we have twelve letting bedrooms at the Inn and in this ever increasing difficult economic time it is a concern to us that residents will be disturbed by a potential of up to 40 vans and over 80 other vehicles coming past the pub. Some of our residents rooms face directly onto this road and in spite of internal double glazing, vehicles can be heard in the rooms. Obviously in the summer the windows are left open at night and we already have some complaints from our customers about passing traffic.
2. Our car park is split having a large section across the road, with heavily increased traffic this is an added danger to our customers, especially as a large percentage are elderly.
3. Our other concern is water pressure as we already have to put pumps on machinery to enable them to operate correctly, with a possible further 200 people drawing on the water supply it will surely further impact on our business.

Lastly we take pride in advertising our Inn being in a 'tranquil and picturesque setting' as we are in an area of outstanding natural beauty and we are majorly concerned that a potential of a further 200 people living so close could have a majorly negative impact to our business, which could then have a knock on effect with the employment of our staff.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2986 / 1 Name: Mr Andrew Hillman Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I and my family have lived in Pensford for 24 years. I am a Churchwarden at All Saints' Church, Publow. I am Chairman of Bristol Charities, a large group of charities in Bristol whose mission is to support older people. I am currently President of the North Somerset Agricultural Society, which runs a major one day show each year and has an increasing activity in promoting the interests of younger people in food, sustainability, and careers in agribusiness. I believe that I am an informed and unbiased member of the community.

I am sure that providing sites for the Gypsy and Traveller population is a pressing issue for many local authorities such as BANES. However, solving that issue has also to be balanced against the needs of the wider population.

In my view, housing for younger, less financially advantaged people is a major issue in Pensford. I cannot understand why this is not progressed more – I suspect it is due to the lack of suitable sites. If the Wick Lane site is suitable for the purpose mentioned, presumably it is also suitable for conventional residential buildings?

There are very many reasons why the proposed site appears to be unsuitable for further accommodation for people, whether conventional housing or for the Gypsy and Traveller population, including:

- quite appalling road services – Wick Lane is narrow, in a dreadful condition and totally unsuitable for increased traffic flows – I imagine that the Highways Department will laugh the proposed development out;
- there are no general services within a suitable distance (utilities of all kinds, public transport);
- the site is a long way from specific essential services including shops, medical services, schools.

The above are obvious drawbacks and I understand there may be other technical issues which are also vital such as Greenbelt, unsafe ground conditions (mineshfts etc).

To repeat, I am in favour of the provision of further affordable housing in Pensford, but I believe the needs of local residents should come first. The specific site seems unsuitable on almost any basis.

I am therefore extremely surprised that the proposal has received any "air time" at all and I look forward to hearing that the proposal is not to proceed, as a matter of urgency.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2987 / 1 Name: Colin & Irving Organisation:
Christine

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We are writing to protest at the proposed travellers site at the old colliery Stanton Wick. This site is completely unsuitable

for such a purpose. local services could not cope with such an influx. Also to place this site so close to a sensitive world heritage site(Stanton Drew Stone Circles) is completely irresponsible. We have informed English heritage of your proposal. No doubt they will have a strong objection to this. Also have you considered the reaction of the many local pagan religious groups who use the circles, and consider it sacred. The potential for trouble that it could cause, is not beyond ones imagination.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2988 / 1 Name: Mr Robert Withey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site is not suitable for this type of development as it does not meet or comply with any of the current planning guidelines. The planning granted currently for the site amounts to 1 dwelling and this proposal is for the equivalent of 15 and 5 temporary! The proposal should be rejected purely by the highways alone and should not be considered further.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The constraints are many and this was evident in the BANES scoring matrix. So why is it included in the sortlist or potential sites?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No! It is absolutely unsuitable.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

As previously stated, it does not comply with planning criteria and would be rejected if a private application were being made of this site. The government guidelines are being ignored, reciting to amenities including healthcare. The site is contaminated with arsenic and my understanding is that a traveller who attended the Bath meeting made it clear that they had no desire to live there!

Respondent: 2988 / 2 Name: Mr Robert Withey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing to oppose the proposal that Banes has made to use the Old Colliery at Stanton Wick as a Gypsy and Traveller site based on the following facts which I am aware of.

This totally unsuitable site has mysteriously managed to make the top seven sites short listed, even when according to Banes own website it only managed to make position 17 out of 20 of the suitable sites proposed, when assessed, using the Banes Matrix scoring procedure.

The site is located in the green belt and has had other previous planning permission refused based on these grounds.

The site in general and adjoining land has poor, and in many parts, single track access which would heavily constrain its use, and has had other previous planning permission refused based on this point.

Banes have obviously dragged their feet in their obligations to provide legal Gypsy and Traveller sites and are now pressing for this site's use to make the deadline set out by the government as it is large enough to provide all the "pitches required". This should not be the reason to make this site a preferred one on the shortlist.

Being an old colliery there are very serious safety grounds why it should not be developed as was illustrated perfectly this last week as a mineshaft has collapsed. I wonder how well shafts and tunnels have been documented and what dangers are lurking, waiting to present themselves. I also understand that the ground has high levels of Arsenic present and that the site is contaminated with Asbestos sheeting.

My interpretation of the requirements set out for this type of use, as set out by the government, are clearly not met with regards to the following points.

- 1, Insufficient Road access and capacity- A recent planning application was refused because of increased traffic.
- 2, Insufficient walking access and capacity- and of course there is no public transport to or passing anywhere close to this site.
- 3, The water supply in the main part of Stanton Wick is not good at all requiring many residents to use header tanks to maintain enough water volume and pressure for their daily requirements. This site's size will put further strain on this service and others as it will increase the demand significantly.
- 4, There is no shopping within the recommended distance.
- 5, There is no Doctor within the recommended distance.
- 6, There is no School capacity.
- 7, The site is not on a recognised Traveller route.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2988 / 3 Name: Mr Robert Withey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

- Greenbelt issue - it is my understanding that under the National Guidelines for gypsy & Travellers sites it is inappropriate for these to be located in a greenbelt and planning would not be available.
- Proximity to an established community - Stanton Wick is in very close proximity, almost neighbouring, and the potential new population from the site would overwhelm Stanton Wick community.
- Site Access - Have or will the Highways Department be involved in the consultation for clearly an issue with access onto a single carriageway, very narrow and a dangerous route for pedestrians into Pensford
- Amenities- the nearest doctors is at Chew Stoke some 5 miles away and not an easy journey by public transport. Where will the children go to school? Have the nearest schools got capacity for an influx?
- The site - this is the site of a former colliery with inherent dangers and I understand that the ground is contaminated. It is also a very large site with potential to grow far beyond the "planned legal pitches" - how are the Council going to police the site to ensure there is not another Dale Farm?
- From the Councils' own matrix to identify sites the Stanton Wick site fails on most criteria so why is it up for consideration at all?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2988 / 4 Name: Mr Robert Withey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Having looked at the B&NES Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocation Development Plan Document (DPD) and in particular the very clear criteria for considering suitable sites, clearly the site at Stanton Wick fails most of these criteria. The site is in a Green Belt area and is in close proximity to an existing established community (Stanton Wick). Having a permanent and transit site at the Old Colliery Buildings, where a new population of up to 200 people would be created would overwhelm the existing established community and, in my opinion, have a harmful impact. There must also be a serious highways issue where the access to the site is onto a single lane road with a windy and dangerous route to the nearest shop and school at Pensford. There could also be health and safety issues on this former coal mine site where I understand that only in the last few days work has been necessary as one of the old mine shafts has collapsed.

On the Draft Site Selection Scoring Matrix accompanying the DPD, on my calculations the site would only score 8. It is my understanding that B&NES score the site at 10 and that the Stanton Wick site was 17th out of the 23 sites considered in the consultation. It seems ludicrous that you have now placed Stanton Wick at the top of your preferred shortlist – this makes no sense whatsoever. Which site on the matrix score came out number one and why is that not at the top of your list? Presumably those involved in the consultation process have visited each of the sites before providing a short list?

We fail, therefore, to see any reason why the Stanton Wick site should be considered on your shortlist.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2989 / 1 Name: Mr John Garner Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes.

I am not aware of the availability or ownership of this site, although it is rumoured that the owner (or a recent owner) may be keen to achieve ANY uplift in value regardless of method.

As to suitability and achievability, the site is:

- * almost inaccessible by road to the nearest sizeable village, Pensford; any significant number of dwellings or pitches on this site must be doubtful on highways grounds;
- * utilities seem to be lacking, meaning that the cost of development to any reasonable standard is likely to be very high and uneconomic;
- * the nearest villages have very limited, or no, facilities for shopping, medical, schooling and other social amenities. The proposed development would place huge pressures on such resources;
- * the site is of ecological interest;

- * the site is likely to be contaminated as a former coal mining pithead;
- * there is a critical need for social/affordable housing in the locality and that sort of development should take priority over this proposal – if any development is possible at all;
- * Pensford and surrounding villages constitute an area of great ecological/social/environmental sensitivity being so close to the Bristol conurbation. ANY development in the area should only be allowed after the most detailed consideration.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2989 / 1 Name: Mr John Garner Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I write to object, in the strongest possible terms, to your Council's proposal to allow a Gypsy Travellers Site on the Old Mines Site in Stanton Wick.

My grounds for objections are as follows:

- 1) I understand that the ground, comprising mines waste, is contaminated (not least by Arsenic), and is certainly unstable - collapsed mine workings having recently been the subject of repair by the Mines Authorities. This clearly represents a significant Health and Safety Risk, and in itself renders the site unfit for habitable development without extensive and very costly remediation and stabilisation work.
- 2) Access to the site is completely inadequate for the traffic which the proposed development would generate, as it comprises a single track lane and no footpath.
- 3) The site does not have the benefit of ANY of the essential services, i.e. water supply, drainage or power.
- 4) There is no public transport to the site and there are insufficient amenities within reasonable walking distance, i.e. shops, doctors surgery etc., capable of servicing the size of population the proposed development would allow.
- 5) Schools in the area are already at, or about, their maximum capacity.
- 6) The site is in Green Belt which has its own stringent Planning Regulations and has already been the subject of Planning Applications for much less disruptive developments which you have consistently turned down.
- 7) The size of the community on the proposed site would totally dwarf that of the local community.
- 8) You have contravened existing Planning Laws by failing to consult both local and adjoining communities.

We understand that BANES are obliged to provide sites for the Gypsy and Traveller communities, despite the fact that the area is not on a recognised Traveller route. We believe that you have shortlisted the site at Stanton Wick, as it represents a "quick fix" for yourselves with regard to the number of pitches you are obliged to provide. In pursuing this "quick fix" you appear to have ignored both Central Government and your own Local Planning Laws with regard to Green Belt, and your decision completely flies in the face of your own Government's Localism Agenda.

It is evident from recent meetings that the existing local community share my views. Please bear in mind that it is they who, by the democratic process, voted you into the position of power which you currently enjoy. In registering my objection I would ask that you do not override their legitimate concerns for the sake of one individual's commercial gain, nor for your own political expediency.

I understand that by writing to you by the 4th May 2012, the views expressed in this letter will be considered at the Cabinet Meeting on the 9th May 2012. I look forward to your response.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2990 / 1 Name: Mr Matthew Pierce Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes I do.

The scoring system undertaken to assess suitability of the identified sites, gave the Stanton Wick site 10 points. It was deemed the 17th most suitable site out of the 23 sites listed. Yet even that low score is still too high, since that some scoring is completely at odds with the reality of the site.

- The Pensford Colliery site received a '+5' score for the criteria 'Near to a hazardous place?'. This is incorrect. This, because the scoring matrix assumes the answer to the above question is: 'No' (hazards are more than 1,000m away)'. B&NES' Development Plan Document (DPD) defines it further: "Hazardous sites include heavy industry, refuse sites and electricity pylons". This site is a colliery on disused mineshafts and tips. The criteria definition for determining whether the site is Hazardous or not does not take into account the geographical and environmental hazards associated with the site. Although the land is scored appropriately as being contaminated land, reference the recorded arsenic contamination of the site, I believe the DPD assumption that it is not 'Near to a hazardous place' is incorrect for many reason
- The phrase 'heavy industry', in broad terms, refers to industries which cause disruption to the environment, for which I would argue the proximity of the commercial coach company next door to the site would fit
- The site includes disused tips which without being properly assessed, may well constitute a hazard. Even if these tips were in an area of the site that is not part of the proposed development since it is within the Nature designation boundary, it would be naïve to assume that children would be unable to access this land from any adjoining development
- The fact that the site is built on and around mineshafts and tunnels should also have meant that the site was scored differently in this criteria, and that the proximity of the adjacent commercial coach company with its regular large vehicle movements and environmental impact, should also have been considered as part of the scoring process
- The list of hazardous sites as defined by the DPD criteria is not exhaustive; specific use of the word 'include' in the definition (ie "Hazardous sites include...") demonstrates that the examples given in the definition that follows ("heavy industry, refuse sites and electricity pylons") are not the only hazards that can constitute a hazardous site under the criterion, but rather three example of hazards for the purposes of brevity in the document. Therefore other hazards, including (but not limited to) the ones listed above, should have been considered as part of the suitability scoring process. Correct scoring of these would have further sent the site down the list of suitable sites for this development
- Since this process began, a mineshaft collapsed on the site. More evidence that both the initial assessment of the hazardous nature of the site was incorrect.

Mining Heritage not considered

The Pensford Character Appraisal document (here: <http://bit.ly/KDiKiF>) highlights many times the crucial importance of the mining heritage and industrial legacy of the Old Colliery Buildings in Pensford. These are the best remaining complete set of Colliery buildings in the entire North Somerset Coalfield, and as such an important social document of our whole area's history not just Stanton Wick and Pensford.

It stretches all credibility that this aspect has not been considered in any of the scoring or suitability exercises. I can only conclude that it's yet another example of how the processes undertaken by Planning Officers have either deliberately - or through unbelievably lax process (either is alarming) - not considered the importance of the heritage to this site, these buildings, and this aspect of the whole area's development. You can appreciate, I hope, that a site and wider area with such an important history (for the local community - as well as to all those ex-miners, families and relations throughout the

BANES area), is one that many residents of BANES will feel very passionately about, and that can simply not go unconsidered in any process of judging this site's suitability. As far as I can determine, no Heritage analysis or research was carried out as part of the process or considered.

The feelings of the local residents for whom this landscape is a key part of the social fabric of the area has gone unconsidered; building on this site would be to forever destroy a long-standing, precious industrial heritage that's an intrinsic part of the geography, genealogy, and social history of the area and its people. It's disgraceful that this aspect of the development's impact was never thought of in the process of determining site suitability.

Noise issues not suitably considered and appropriately scored

The issue of noise in the DPD criteria, clearly depends on how you define a detrimental health issue. It's a problem of subjectivity that BANES wouldn't have encountered if their own process has been built around a robust set of tightly-defined criteria; criteria that could have been objectively scored, with no possibility for open-ended, semantic interpretation.

I would argue that the couple living next door to (and overlooking) the adjacent proposed site would consistently be exposed to extra noise, and that irrespective of screening to mitigate it, the elevation of the Winding House property (at three stories, I believe, with far-reaching views across the whole of the proposed site area) means it would prove impossible to adequately or effectively screen or mitigate all noise from the site into their property.

Even assuming that scores of new residents might be as quiet as any other local resident (which, given the increased number of vehicles per household amongst G&T groups being on average higher per family than settled local residents, is probably unlikely), the increase in latent noise from that which the settled residents are currently used to in their position on rural Wick Lane, would be significant.

Assuming then that noise levels would increase materially over the levels currently being experienced by the site's immediate neighbours, then the only point of contention that remains is whether or not the increase in noise would be deemed 'a health issue'. That is clearly an unknown before the situation arises, but given that this process has already become a health issue for many residents of the affected areas, who have variously suffered insomnia, worry, stress, and anger about what is being allowed to happen by BANES, I dread to think of the potential health issues through constant noise increases that this site would have on the people living in neighbouring properties, and I would have grave concerns regarding the stress this would put them under if this site were to go ahead. I think BANES have a serious duty of care to consider this... although the Senior Planning Officer's quote to me at the Stanton Drew roadshow that she had not "deemed it important enough" to warrant a negative weighting against this Noise criteria because "it was only two properties", is alarming.

Conservation Area scoring

Although not directly in the Pensford Conservation Areas, all the amenities for this site, are situated there; it is inarguable that an increase in road traffic from this site to Pensford would have no environmental impact on the Conservation Area given the single track road into the area – over the medieval bridge and past the listed buildings. BANES' Character Appraisal Document makes much of the picturesque nature of the surroundings of the Conservation Area, stating variously: "Views from up near the viaduct into the village and to the surrounding hills are superb"... "There are several fine views out of the village into the open countryside... here, a break in development allows open views out to the surround pasture where grazing cattle and vegetation enhance the rural character of the village." "It is a great shame that the disused railway line running across the viaduct has been blocked at both ends, preventing the railway line being used for another purpose such as a footpath and a cycling track. Bringing this historic transport route back into use in some form would enhance the character of the village and benefit those who live in or near the area." I'm of the view that this is a project which would indeed have a transformational impact on the area as a place for ramblers and cyclists to extend their existing, natural journeys in and around the Chew Valley into the heart of Pensford's historic and most well-known structure. This disused railway line over the viaduct runs straight into the Pensford Old Colliery site, since it used to be the key means of transporting coal out of the Colliery. And I am again incredulous that several key findings of one of BANES' own documents appear not have been considered in the scoring and suitability processes ostensibly undertaken to determine its long- and short-list positions. I wonder if their insight into the public's mood, and their empathy for affected individuals, extends to considering the feelings of the local residents for whom this landscape is a key part of the social fabric of the area; building on this site would be to forever destroy a long-standing, precious industrial heritage that's an intrinsic part of the geography, genealogy, and social history of the area and its people.

Dominating the nearest settled community

The potential for the size of this site to dominate Stanton Wick (the nearest settled community of just 26 homes) was not an overt criterion in the matrix; this, despite it being deemed sufficiently important to deserve its own, discrete policy entry in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites government guidelines. "When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community." I can't accept that a factor as specifically-highlighted as being of key importance in the government's policy document (which must have been the key document of reference for Planning Officers, having been published in March 2012), can have been accidentally overlooked in the process' scoring exercise. Only two assumptions are possible: it was either deliberately ignored in order to make the SW site look more suitable, or BANES' Planning Officers didn't place any weight on it. Either is alarming – hinting at dereliction of duty vis a vis the scoring process.

Road access, infrastructure, quality and safety

Wick Lane (the lane that the site is situated on), is, by BANES' own admission (ref: planning applications for Filers coaches), entirely unsuitable for any extra traffic movements. It is the direct route to all the key amenities in Pensford (school, shop, public transport links), and is:

- Largely single-track
- Unlit
- Prone to flooding
- Features multiple 90 degree bends
- Regularly potholed
- Very steep towards the Pensford end
- Unsafe in icy conditions for getting to or from Pensford
- Unsafe during darkness for walking (by anyone)
- At the limit of what the DPD considers is the optimum distance (1,500m) from key amenities – although is clearly not "via a safe walking route" as described above.

An existing footpath from the back of the site down to Pensford is also not safe for vulnerable people in adverse weather conditions and does not offer a suitable alternative route for regular use (eg for shopping)

The positioning of this site could only increase reliance on use of cars, contrary to guidance which states "where possible the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites should seek to reduce reliance on the car"

This is a narrow country road already inappropriate for use by the levels of traffic. Regular traffic to the popular Carpenter's Arms pub, daily coaches from the Filers coach park that adjoins the proposed site and farm machinery and tractors for the surrounding fields already cause a level of concern for young families and animals in this area. I have two young daughters under five – both of whom I've had to shield from careless drivers as they travel to and from the pub and I've witnessed several near misses of dogs and walkers in this area.

Even the scoring matrix conceded the site's "Existing road network can not accommodate additional traffic movements" and were contributing factors to recent planning applications being turned down.

Proximity to key amenities

The nearest secondary school in the area, the Chew Valley School, is an already-oversubscribed school, and the local primary schools in Pensford and Stanton Drew, are so small as to be unable to cope with this scale of proposed increased population.

The nearest shop is a small Post Office in Pensford (unsuitable for weekly food shopping), that has been up for sale for two years, and may not exist going forward. The nearest available supermarkets are Midsomer Norton, Keynsham, or Bristol – all of which are way beyond the quoted appropriate distance as amenities.

The nearest doctor's surgery is in Chew Stoke, some miles away from this area. Even initial registration to this surgery can only be done via a visit to the surgery itself.

The responsibility of B&NES is to find a sustainable, safe site for the traveller community that doesn't segregate them from local communities, instead promoting integration, offering employment opportunities, and ensuring good links to healthcare, resources, amenities, schooling, etc.

This location would effectively isolate the travellers in a no-mans-land equidistant between a tiny hamlet and a small historic village, leaving them completely cut-off with a busy commercial site on one side (the Filers coach park), and a detached house on the other.

Situation in the Greenbelt

This site is in the greenbelt – as confirmed by BANES many times. Government policy says traveller sites represent inappropriate development in the greenbelt. Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt: “Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

If BANES is intending to claim that lack of available brownfield sites elsewhere in the whole BANES area justifies these ‘very special circumstances’ (the only reason I can think of that they may consider), then they will need to satisfy inspectors that they have:

- 1/ Exhausted all other potential brownfield sites suitable for development in the BANES area, and removed unsuitable sites from the list of potential sites in a demonstrably objective, fair, and logical way
- 2/ Run the process of searching for, identifying, consulting, and scoring, suitable sites as exhaustively and accurately as possible, using the correct media channels, timed to allow for maximum feedback, and advertised across the whole BANES’ region to those communities which may not live in the centre of Bath with the internet and communications benefits available
- 3/ Liaised effectively and proactively with adjoining local authorities in order to establish whether the identified needs could be delivered on suitable sites across the wider region if the required number of sites could not be found from brownfield sites within BANES
- 4/ Liaised as effectively as possible with local communities (both settled and travellers) to establish what kind of land would be considered most suitable by both and to hear local concerns – and answer queries effectively and speedily
- 5/ Identified as accurately as possible the number of travellers in BANES – and the wider West of England area – in order that such site selection is actually producing the right levels of sites for the current need.

The very special circumstances would ultimately have to justify why it was sensible to place a site within the greenbelt, on arsenic-contaminated land, on land that’s home to European protected species, far from any key amenities, in an area that dominates the nearest settled community, on a lane with no capacity for extra traffic movements that it unsafe for walking, that would not promote integration with local communities, with negligible local employment opportunities, that has 100% opposition from the nearest settled community, that would increase the reliance on car use, and that would destroy elements of the region’s mining legacy and heritage.

A cursory, layman’s examination of the evidence produced by BANES to justify the Stanton Wick site’s inclusion thus far shows that barely any of the above have been done to the standard required to demonstrate that very special circumstances exist – let alone to the level of due care and professionalism that scrutiny of a professional inspector or secretary of state would demand.

Nature and protected species considerations

This site is home to European protected species, and has a history of wildlife conservation considerations applying to the site with regards to inappropriate development going back nearly 20 years. I have included some of the correspondence from the Wildlife Trust and BANES within. I don’t believe there is any evidence that the adverse effect on indigenous wildlife of this development has been considered by BANES either when scoring the sites for their potential suitability (since no metric scoring was attached to the Wildlife criterion), or subsequent to the site being taken forward by Cabinet. This is a dereliction of process, and is further evidence of a flawed process that has either been disingenuously or incompetently conducted.

Contamination of land

This site has a history of arsenic contamination – an element of the development which has not been suitably considered

by BANES either when scoring the sites for their potential suitability (since it was not suitably investigated, or subsequent to the site being taken forward by Cabinet. This is a dereliction of process, and is further evidence of a flawed process that has either been disingenuously or incompetently conducted. The idea (mooted by Planning Officers) that a smaller area of the land could be subject to remedial decontamination, while leaving a large part of the land contaminated but fenced off from a traveller community, is unbelievably naïve, and does not take into account the fact that children will play in surround areas to their home regardless of fencing.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. See above comments.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. See above comments

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This whole process has been a shambles. I submitted 23 questions to Cllr Tim Ball before the first cabinet meeting. They were never included in the Cabinet meeting appendix (although other people's were), they were never answered, and this will form the basis of an official complaint through the correct channels

At the May 9th Cabinet meeting, one site was removed at Tim Ball's discretion (with no democratic vote, detailed analysis, or other criteria being highlighted other than "it's a children's playground").

So Cllr Ball correctly removed the children's playground. But it says quite a lot about the quality of the "Scoring matrix and the more detailed site selection assessment" used by the Planning Officers, that a children's playground ended up on the preferred site list at all. Might the "more detailed site selection assessment" used as a second, more in-depth assessment, have picked up the fact it was a children's playground and therefore unsuitable at a slightly earlier stage? Or is this example yet more evidence if any were needed, of a fundamentally flawed process when it comes to the whole assessment and suitability exercise.

The process was not adequately publicised.

From the timing of the initial 'Consultation over the issues document, and the call for sites' over the Christmas period, to the media outlets chosen (The Bath Chronicle doesn't even cover Stanton Wick). This process has not been well-publicised to residents outside of Bath; furthermore, I find the comments made in the Equality Impact Assessment of the DPD document about the use of positive media coverage in response to local community opposition, insulting to the very real concerns of local residents, and the very real damage that, as you may have heard at the Special Council Meeting, is being felt on a daily basis by affected communities.

I've seen no positive media coverage from BANES, in fact - yet another part of the process that's been ignored. Plus I've seen no evidence of any media strategy around this process at all, other than the minimum BANES clearly felt legally obliged to undertake in order that they could tick the 'publicised' box. If you could let me know why you think this was a "well-publicised" event for a community like Stanton Wick which includes many elderly residents, which has very poor internet access, for whom there is no local shop within walking distance, and for which Bath's largest paper refuses to cover the hamlet, then I'd be delighted to know.

Respondent: 2990 / 1 Name: Mr Matthew Pierce Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes I do.

The scoring system undertaken to assess suitability of the identified sites, gave the Stanton Wick site 10 points. It was deemed the 17th most suitable site out of the 23 sites listed. Yet even that low score is still too high, since that some scoring is completely at odds with the reality of the site. • The Pensford Colliery site received a '+5' score for the criteria 'Near to a hazardous place?'. This is incorrect. This, because the scoring matrix assumes the answer to the above question is: 'No' (hazards are more than 1,000m away). B&NES' Development Plan Document (DPD) defines it further: "Hazardous sites include heavy industry, refuse sites and electricity pylons". This site is a colliery on disused mineshafts and tips. The criteria definition for determining whether the site is Hazardous or not does not take into account the geographical and environmental hazards associated with the site. Although the land is scored appropriately as being contaminated land,

reference the recorded arsenic contamination of the site, I believe the DPD assumption that it is not 'Near to a hazardous place' is incorrect for many reason

- The phrase 'heavy industry', in broad terms, refers to industries which cause disruption to the environment, for which I would argue the proximity of the commercial coach company next door to the site would fit
- The site includes disused tips which without being properly assessed, may well constitute a hazard. Even if these tips were in an area of the site that is not part of the proposed development since it is within the Nature designation boundary, it would be naive to assume that children would be unable to access this land from any adjoining development
- The fact that the site is built on and around mineshafts and tunnels should also have meant that the site was scored differently in this criteria, and that the proximity of the adjacent commercial coach company with its regular large vehicle movements and environmental impact, should also have been considered as part of the scoring process
- The list of hazardous sites as defined by the DPD criteria is not exhaustive; specific use of the word 'include' in the definition (ie "Hazardous sites include ... ") demonstrates that the examples given in the definition that follows ("heavy industry, refuse sites and electricity pylons") are not the only hazards that can constitute a hazardous site under the criterion, but rather three example of hazards for the purposes of brevity in the document. Therefore other hazards, including (but not limited to) the ones listed above, should have been considered as part of the suitability scoring process. Correct scoring of these would have further sent the site down the list of suitable sites for this development
- Since this process began, a mineshaft collapsed on the site. More evidence that both the initial assessment of the hazardous nature of the site was incorrect.

Mining Heritage not considered

The Pensford Character Appraisal document (here: <http://bit.ly/KDiKIF>) highlights many times the crucial importance of the mining heritage and industrial legacy of the Old Colliery Buildings in Pensford. These are the best remaining complete set of Colliery buildings in the entire North Somerset Coalfield, and as such an important social document of our whole area's history not just Stanton Wick and Pensford.

It stretches all credibility that this aspect has not been considered in any of the scoring or suitability exercises. I can only conclude that it's yet another example of how the processes undertaken by Planning Officers have either deliberately- or through unbelievably lax process (either is alarming)- not considered the importance of the heritage to this site, these buildings, and this aspect of the whole area's development. You can appreciate, I hope, that a site and wider area with such an important history (for the local community- as well as to all those ex-miners, families and relations throughout the BANES area), is one that many residents of BANES will feel very passionately about, and that can simply not go unconsidered in any process of judging this site's suitability. As far as I can determine, no Heritage analysis or research was carried out as part of the process or considered.

The feelings of the local residents for whom this landscape is a key part of the social fabric of the area has gone unconsidered; building on this site would be to forever destroy a long-standing, precious industrial heritage that's an intrinsic part of the geography, genealogy, and social history of the area and its people. It's disgraceful that this aspect of the development's impact was never thought of in the process of determining site suitability.

Noise issues not suitably considered and appropriately scored

The issue of noise in the DPD criteria, clearly depends on how you define a detrimental health issue. It's a problem of subjectivity that BANES wouldn't have encountered if their own process has been built around a robust set of tightly defined criteria; criteria that could have been objectively scored, with no possibility for open-ended, semantic interpretation.

I would argue that the couple living next door to (and overlooking) the adjacent proposed site would consistently be exposed to extra noise, and that irrespective of screening to mitigate it, the elevation of the Winding House property (at three stories, I believe, with far-reaching views across the whole of the proposed site area) means it would prove impossible to adequately or effectively screen or mitigate all noise from the site into their property.

Even assuming that scores of new residents might be as quiet as any other local resident (which, given the increased number of vehicles per household amongst G& T groups being on average higher per family than settled local residents, is probably unlikely), the increase in latent noise from that which the settled residents are currently used to in their position

on rural Wick Lane, would be significant.

Assuming then that noise levels would increase materially over the levels currently being experienced by the site's immediate neighbours, then the only point of contention that remains is whether or not the increase in noise would be deemed 'a health issue'. That is clearly an unknown before the situation arises, but given that this process has already become a health issue for many residents of the affected areas, who have variously suffered insomnia, worry, stress, and anger about what is being allowed to happen by BANES, I dread to think of the potential health issues through constant noise increases that this site would have on the people living in neighbouring properties, and I would have grave concerns regarding the stress this would put them under if this site were to go ahead. I think BANES have a serious duty of care to consider this ... although the Senior Planning Officer's quote to me at the Stanton Drew roadshow-that she had not "deemed it important enough" to warrant a negative weighting against this Noise criteria because "it was only two properties", is alarming. '

Conservation Area scoring

Although not directly in the Pensford Conservation Areas, all the amenities for this site, are situated there; it is inarguable that an increase in road traffic from this site to Pensford would have no environmental impact on the Conservation Area given the single track road into the area- over the medieval bridge and past the listed buildings. BANES' Character Appraisal Document makes much of the picturesque nature of the surroundings of the Conservation Area, stating variously: "Views from up near the viaduct into the village and to the surrounding hills are superb" ... "There are several fine views out of the village into the open countryside ... here, a break in development allows open views out to the surround pasture where grazing cattle and vegetation enhance the rural character of the village." "It is a great shame that the disused railway line running across the viaduct has been blocked at both ends, preventing the railway line being used for another purpose such as a footpath and a cycling track. Bringing this historic transport route back into use in some form would enhance the character of the village and benefit those who live in or near the area." I'm of the view that this is a project which would indeed have a transformational impact on the area as a place for ramblers and cyclists to extend their existing, natural journeys in and around the Chew Valley into the heart of Pensford's historic and most well-known structure. This disused railway line over the viaduct runs straight into the Pensford Old Colliery site, since it used to be the key means of transporting coal out of the Colliery. And I am again incredulous that several key findings of one of BANES' own documents appear not have been considered in the scoring and suitability processes ostensibly undertaken to determine its long- and short-list positions. I wonder if their insight into the public's mood, and their empathy for affected individuals, extends to considering the feelings of the local residents for whom this landscape is a key part of the social fabric of the area; building on this site would be to forever destroy a long-standing, precious industrial heritage that's an intrinsic part of the geography, genealogy, and social history of the area and its people.

Dominating the nearest settled community

The potential for the size of this site to dominate Stanton Wick (the nearest settled community of just 26 homes) was not an overt criterion in the matrix; this, despite it being deemed sufficiently important to deserve its own, discrete policy entry in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites government guidelines. "When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community." I can't accept that a factor as specifically-highlighted as being of key importance in the government's policy document (which must have been the key document of reference for Planning Officers, having been published in March 2012), can have been accidentally overlooked in the process' scoring exercise. Only two assumptions are possible: it was either deliberately ignored in order to make the SW site look more suitable, or BANES' Planning Officers didn't place any weight on it. Either is alarming- hinting at dereliction of duty vis a vis the scoring process.

Road access, infrastructure, quality and safety

Wick Lane (the lane that the site is situated on), is, by BANES' own admission (ref: planning applications for Filers coaches) entirely unsuitable for any extra traffic movements. It is the direct route to all the key amenities in Pensford (school, shop, public transport links), and is: • Largely single-track • Unlit

- Prone to flooding
- Features multiple 90 degree bends
- Regularly potholed
- Very steep towards the Pensford end

- Unsafe in icy conditions for getting to or from Pensford
- Unsafe during darkness for walking (by anyone)
- At the limit of what the DPD considers is the optimum distance (1,500m) from key amenities- although is clearly not "via a safe walking route" as described above.

An existing footpath from the back of the site down to Pensford is also not safe for vulnerable people in adverse weather conditions and does not offer a suitable alternative route for regular use (eg for shopping)

The positioning of this site could only increase reliance on use of cars, contrary to guidance which states "where possible the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites should seek to reduce reliance on the car"

This is a narrow country road already inappropriate for use by the levels of traffic. Regular traffic to the popular Carpenter's Arms pub, daily coaches from the Filers coach park that adjoins the proposed site and farm machinery and tractors for the surrounding fields already cause a level of concern for young families and animals in this area. I have two young daughters under five- both of whom I've had to shield from careless drivers as they travel to and from the pub and I've witnessed several near misses of dogs and walkers in this area.

Even the scoring matrix conceded the site's "Existing road network can not accommodate additional traffic and were contributing factors to recent planning applications being turned down.

Proximity to key amenities

The nearest secondary school in the area, the Chew Valley School, is an already-oversubscribed school, and the local primary schools in Pensford and Stanton Drew, are so small as to be unable to cope with this scale of proposed increased population.

The nearest shop is a small Post Office in Pensford (unsuitable for weekly food shopping), that has been up for sale for two years, and may not exist going forward. The nearest available supermarkets are Midsomer Norton, Keynsham, or Bristol – all of which are way beyond the quoted appropriate distance as amenities.

The nearest doctor's surgery is in Chew Stoke, some miles away from this area. Even initial registration to this surgery can only be done via a visit to the surgery itself.

The responsibility of B&NES is to find a sustainable, safe site for the traveller community that doesn't segregate them from local communities, instead promoting integration, offering employment opportunities, and ensuring good links to healthcare, resources, amenities, schooling, etc.

This location would effectively isolate the travellers in a no-mans-land equidistant between a tiny hamlet and a small historic village, leaving them completely cut-off with a busy commercial site on one side (the Filers coach park), and a detached house on the other.

Situation in the Greenbelt

This site is in the greenbelt- as confirmed by BANES many times. Government policy says traveller sites represent inappropriate development in the greenbelt. Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt: "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

If BANES is intending to claim that lack of available brownfield sites elsewhere in the whole BANES area justifies these 'very special circumstances' (the only reason I can think of that they may consider), then they will need to satisfy inspectors that they have:

- 1/ Exhausted all other potential brownfield sites suitable for development in the BANES area, and removed unsuitable sites from the list of potential sites in a demonstrably objective, fair, and logical way
- 2/ Run the process of searching for, identifying, consulting, and scoring, suitable sites as exhaustively and accurately as possible, using the correct media channels, timed to allow for maximum feedback, and advertised across the whole BANES' region to those communities which may not live in the centre of Bath with the internet and communications benefits

available

3/ Liaised effectively and proactively with adjoining local authorities in order to establish whether the identified needs could be delivered on suitable sites across the wider region if the required number of sites could not be found from brownfield sites within BANES

4/ Liaised as effectively as possible with local communities (both settled and travellers) to establish what kind of land would be considered most suitable by both and to hear local concerns- and answer queries effectively and speedily

5/ Identified as accurately as possible the number of travellers in BANES- and the wider West of England area- in order that such site selection is actually producing the right levels of sites for the current need.

The very special circumstances would ultimately have to justify why it was sensible to place a site within the greenbelt, on arsenic-contaminated land, on land that's home to European protected species, far from any key amenities, in an area that dominates the nearest settled community, on a lane with no capacity for extra traffic movements that it unsafe for walking, that would not promote integration with local communities, with negligible local employment opportunities, that has 100% opposition from the nearest settled community, that would increase the reliance on car use, and that would destroy elements of the region's mining legacy and heritage.

A cursory, layman's examination of the evidence produced by BANES to justify the Stanton Wick site's inclusion thus far shows that barely any of the above have been done to the standard required to demonstrate that very special circumstances exist -let alone to the level of due care and professionalism that scrutiny of a professional inspector or secretary of state would demand.

Nature and protected species considerations

This site is home to European protected species, and has a history of wildlife conservation considerations applying to the site with regards to inappropriate development going back nearly 20 years. I have included some of the correspondence from the Wildlife Trust and BANES within. I don't believe there is any evidence that the adverse effect on indigenous wildlife of this development has been considered by BANES either when scoring the sites for their potential suitability (since no metric scoring was attached to the Wildlife criterion), or subsequent to the site being taken forward by Cabinet. This is a dereliction of process, and is further evidence of a flawed process that has either been disingenuously or incompetently conducted.

Contamination of land

This site has a history of arsenic contamination- an element of the development which has not been suitably considered by BANES either when scoring the sites for their potential suitability (since it was not suitably investigated, or subsequent to the site being taken forward by Cabinet. This is a dereliction of process, and is further evidence of a flawed process that has either been disingenuously or incompetently conducted. The idea (mooted by Planning Officers) that a smaller area of the land could be subject to remedial decontamination, while leaving a large part of the land contaminated but fenced off from a traveller community, is unbelievably naive, and does not take into account the fact that children will play in surround areas to their home regardless of fencing.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. See above comments.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. See above comments.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This whole process has been a shambles. I submitted 23 questions to Cllr Tim Ball before the first cabinet meeting. They were never included in the Cabinet meeting appendix (although other people's were), they were never answered, and this will form the basis of an official complaint through the correct channels

At the May 9th Cabinet meeting, one site was removed at Tim Ball's discretion (with no democratic vote, detailed analysis, or other criteria being highlighted other than "it's a children's playground").

So Cllr Ball correctly removed the children's playground. But it says quite a lot about the quality of the "Scoring matrix and the more detailed site selection assessment" used by the Planning Officers, that a children's playground ended up on the preferred site list at all. Might the "more detailed site selection assessment" used as a second, more in-depth assessment,

have picked up the fact it was a children's playground and therefore unsuitable at a slightly earlier stage? Or is this example yet more evidence if any were needed, of a fundamentally flawed process when it comes to the whole assessment and suitability exercise.

Giving the Planning Officer the benefit of the doubt, perhaps the second screening process was only applied after May 9th Cabinet (after which it became even more obvious that the SW site was wholly unsuitable). If so, it would have been illuminating to be able to interrogate this second screening's findings; the document was allegedly at the Stanton Drew roadshow, according to a Planning Officer, but she refused requests for us to see it at the time.

Furthermore, members of the group had an admission at the Stanton Drew road show that a second screening process was employed only when it became apparent that the SW site was not going to score highly enough in the matrix alone to justify it going forward.

Added to that, I've also personally been told by several Cllrs that if the SW site falls out of the process, then "the whole thing collapses" and that it can't collapse due to its impact on the Core Strategy.

This whole process has been based around the Stanton Wick site. There us simply no way BANES can deliver their quoted, targeted numbers unless the SW site stays in the process. Hence we've seen what BANES claim is a transparent, objective process being manipulated and appropriated to its own ends in order (ultimately, I believe) to ensure that an important element of the Core Strategy is not derailed. It's a disgrace.

The process was not adequately publicised.

I work in the media. And from the timing of the initial Consultation over the issues document, and the call for sites' over the Christmas period, to the media outlets chosen (The Bath Chronicle doesn't even cover Stanton Wick- ask the news editor, Paul Wiltshire). This process has not been well-publicised to residents outside of Bath; furthermore, I find the comments Meghan Rossiter makes in her Equality Impact Assessment of the DPD document about the use of positive media coverage in response to local community opposition, insulting to the very real concerns of local residents, and the very real damage that, as you may have heard at the Special Council Meeting, is being felt on a daily basis by affected communities.

I've seen no positive media coverage from BANES, in fact- yet another part of the process that's been ignored. Plus I've seen no evidence of any media strategy around this process at all, other than the minimum BANES clearly felt legally obliged to undertake in order that they could tick the 'publicised' box. If you could let me know why you think this was a "well-publicised" event for a community like Stanton Wick which includes many elderly residents, which has very poor internet access, for whom there is no local shop within walking distance, and for which Bath's largest paper refuses to cover the hamlet, then I'd be delighted to know.

Respondent: 2990 / 2 Name: Mr Matthew Pierce Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

1/ Why was the Pensford Colliery site – a disused colliery and tip on mins shafts (one of which collapsed this week), given a '+5 rating in the 'Near to a hazardous place' criteria of the scoring matrix? The definition of the criteria from the DPD for this criteria is 'No (more than 1,000m away)' where "Hazardous sites include heavy industry, refuse sites and electricity pylons". If this is new knowledge to you, do you now concede that this site should have been awarded a 'zero' rating in the scoring matrix exercise?

2/ Why did the Pensford Colliery site receive a 'zero' weighting, rather than a negative weighting in the Conservation Area category, given that all the local amenities (shop, school, public transport), are sited in the Conservation Area of Pensford?

Are you claiming that there would be no detrimental impact on the Conservation Area of Pensford from traffic travelling down the single track road to these amenities? If this is new knowledge to you, do you now concede that this site should have been awarded a negative rating in the scoring matrix exercise?

3/ B&NES' Planning Services' Character Appraisal Document of Pensford (published March 2008), clearly notes the importance of: "evidence of the former mining industry including miners' cottages, the miners welfare and abandoned mineworks in the surrounding area ... "The contrast between intimate enclosure within the village and the fine open space of the surrounding countryside", and points out that "The landscape setting of rolling grassland is essential to the rural character of Pensford". Furthermore, that "Pensford's inclusion within the Bristol-Bath Green Belt signifies the importance of the landscape setting and helps prevent development which would be harmful to the area", and that "The pastoral setting of the Conservation Area is essential to its rural character and should be protected". Would you agree that these aspects pointed out by B&NES' Planning Services should also have been considered and reflected accurately in the scoring matrix for the Pensford Colliery site?

4/ Can you tell me exactly how thoroughly the scoring matrix analysis was carried out– particularly, was any on-site inspection carried out in order to score the Pensford Colliery site?

5/ Can you tell me who (which department and level of seniority of person) carried out the scoring exercise, and whether you personally believe the scoring was carried out accurately, and to B&NES' satisfaction in regards to the Pensford Colliery site?

6/ Can you tell me if there was any disagreements about the Pensford Colliery site appearing on the shortlist, or any disagreement or discussion regarding the scoring it received, between yourself and anyone in the employ of B&NES? If so, can you explain those discussions please.

7/ Would you agree that under the various scoring criteria mentioned above, that the score awarded to the Pensford Colliery in the scoring matrix exercise is, in fact, erroneous and should be lowered?

8/. Would you agree that a site that scores bottom of a list of all the candidates proposed should not therefore be carried through as a proposed site suitable for this kind of use?

9/ Can you explain please why criteria that removed higher-scoring sites from the list (Eg: Clutton reason for rejection: "Green open space adjacent to existing housing boundary"; Fosseyway Environment Park "Green open space adjacent to existing commercial use. Significant health and well-being concerns"; Midsomer Norton, Radstock and Keynsham sites: "Very poor residential amenity"; Pennyquick Lane "significant incursion into open countryside") did not apply to the Pensford Colliery site? Do you believe that all of the above statements do NOT hold true for the Pensford site?

10/ Can you tell me please in your personal view, if you think the size of the proposed site would or would not 'dominate' the hamlet of 22 homes in Stanton Wick?

11/ Can you tell me in your personal view, if you think that a disused coalmine with recorded arsenic contamination, asbestos roofing, no mains drainage facilities, no access to gas, in an area with a very high water table and one prone to flooding, is suitable for vulnerable communities of families who have a higher than average mortality rate?

12/ Can you please confirm that you are aware that there is no shop, no public transport link, no school (primary or secondary), and no doctor or other health facility in Stanton Wick?

13/ Can you please confirm that you realise that Pensford is the nearest option for these amenities, and that you understand that the road from the proposed site to Pensford is a steep, single track with no room to manoeuvre at the village end (one-way road), that leads directly into the Conservation Area's historic centre?

14/ As you know, the site received no negative weighting under the "Noise issues' criteria, disregarding the fact that as the DPD defines it, there would be "noise issues affecting proposed or neighbouring residents" that "are a health issue that may require mitigation". Can you please tell me if you believe there would be no such noise issues affecting the

neighbouring two houses (The Winding House adjacent, and the bungalow opposite), that may require mitigation? Can you confirm whether you agree or not that any such noise issues would require a '-5' weighting being applied under the scoring matrix?

15/ Do you agree, as per all the guidance, that the siting of traveller sites should seek to reduce the reliance on the car? Do you think that this site achieves that, given it is beyond the recommended walking distance to any amenities down single track road with no lighting, prone to floods and unusable in the winter months by vehicles?

16/ Do you think that the road from the proposed site to Pensford is suitable for vulnerable people to walk down? Can you tell me if you and your family would be happy walking down that road in winter?

17/ Considering the illegal traveller sites in the area have overwhelmingly been situated close to amenities, nearer to the centre of Bath, do you agree that it is likely that the traveller community probably prefer these locations rather than isolated rural ones?

18/ Do you think that a location situated nearly a mile from a hamlet and a mile in the other direction from a village, is the correct location to promote integration and ensure good relations between travellers and local communities?

19/ Do you believe the roads are of sufficient quality, width, and capacity to support this site? Or do you agree with the matrix scoring which awarded it a 'zero' score for road capacity? Were the Highways agency consulted over this proposed site as part of the scoring process? If not, do you think they should have been?

20/ Are you aware this proposed site is an area of nature conservation, and have you consulted and examined the proposed existing buildings for protected species? When will you be doing this?

21/ Can you tell me why, when Filers coach company were refused planning permission for a relatively modest extension of their business on the adjoining plot due to "inappropriate use of greenbelt land that would detract from the openness and rural character" since it would likely include vehicle movements and be unsuitable due to the width and condition of the local roadway and would promote congestion, that such logic is not applied at the proposal stage for this site.

22/ Can you tell me when the owner of the land, Tom Smart, FIRST started talking to B&NES about the possibility of making it available as a traveller site?

23/ Can you confirm that your minibus had trouble negotiating Wick Lane, upon which the site is situated, during your site visit on the 3rd May 2012, and can you describe the difficulties you experienced please?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2990 / 3 Name: Mr Matthew Pierce Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

As a resident of Stanton Wick, I wish to raise my disbelief and myriad concerns regarding the Pensford Colliery site at Stanton Wick being included in the proposed site list as a suitable one for a traveller site.

I'm glad that B&NES are proactively looking for suitable sites for the travelling community; illegal sites clearly don't help travellers, the local council, or local communities in the short or long term.

That said, the scarcity of available sites in the local area doesn't make patently unsuitable sites highly suitable by default.

It just means we all should work harder to find locations that score highly, and that deliver the best solution for the traveller community, existing residents, the council and the environment.

In the recent scoring system undertaken to assess suitability of the identified sites, the Stanton Wick site scored 10 points. It was deemed the 17th most suitable site out of the 23 sites listed.

Yet even given its low score, it's still too high, since that some scoring is completely at odds with the reality of the site.

The Pensford Colliery site received a '+5' score for the criteria 'Near to a hazardous place?'

This, because the scoring matrix assumes the answer to the above question is: 'No' (hazards are more than 1,000m away)'. B&NES' Development Plan Document (DPD) defines it further: "Hazardous sites include heavy industry, refuse sites and electricity pylons".

With respect: This site is a colliery on disused mineshafts and tips! Did anyone consult a map?

Removing this erroneous +5 scoring, since it is incontrovertibly a hazardous site (upon which a mineshaft collapsed this week), would reduce the proposed site's TOTAL score of '5'. This would make it the second least suitable site on the entire list.

And then there's the Conservation Area score. '0' according to the scoring matrix; no negative weighting attached, despite all the local amenities for the proposed site being situated in the Pensford Conservation Area.

The importance of Pensford as a Conservation Area is clearly well known to B&NES and is recognised as such in their Character Appraisal document (here: <http://bit.ly/KDiKiF>).

It even begins by pointing out the local mining heritage in the Summary of Special Interest, noting the important: "evidence of the former mining industry including miners' cottages, the miners welfare and abandoned mineworks in the surrounding area"

That document goes on to note "The contrast between intimate enclosure within the village and the fine open space of the surrounding countryside", and points out that "The landscape setting of rolling grassland is essential to the rural character of Pensford"

Furthermore, that "Pensford's inclusion within the Bristol-Bath Green Belt signifies the importance of the landscape setting and helps prevent development which would be harmful to the area", and that "The pastoral setting of the Conservation Area is essential to its rural character and should be protected"

And since the Pensford Conservation area takes in the historic core of the village –a historic core featuring the only shop and school nearby to the proposed site, it's blindingly obvious it would have detrimental impact. Wick Lane leads from the proposed travellers' site directly to the narrow medieval bridge in Church Street via a one-way street onto the tiny streets and protected, listed buildings in this Conservation Area.

Correcting the clear mistake of not presuming any impact on the Conservation Area of Pensford would subsequently make the Pensford Colliery site the single most unsuitable site on the entire list.

But there's more. Under 'Noise issues' the site receives a '0' score. The site adjoins a large detached house that sold recently (sold to them by the owner of the proposed traveller plot), and is also opposite a bungalow. The DPD's criteria define the considerations further as: "Noise issues affecting proposed or neighbouring residents are a health issue that may require mitigation." It might only be two families who suffer from noise issues, but that criteria still means a '-5' score

should be applied to the site. (Unless those two families don't count for the purposes of this exercise?!)
Again, this would ensure the Pensford Colliery site was firmly the least suitable site on the scoring matrix.

Furthermore, while certain criteria were employed in order to remove higher-scoring sites from the list, those same relevant criteria were ignored when applied to the Pensford Colliery site. Eg: Clutton reason for rejection: "Green open space adjacent to existing housing boundary"; Fosseyway Environment Park "Green open space adjacent to existing commercial use. Significant health and well-being concerns"; Midsomer Norton, Radstock and Keynsham sites: "Very poor residential amenity"; Pennyquick Lane "significant incursion into open countryside". Any and all of these should clearly be applied to the Pensford Colliery site and should cause its deletion from the list.

It's blatantly obvious how inappropriate the site is when judged against almost all criteria: for the travellers, the greenbelt environment, the local infrastructure, the tiny hamlet of just 22 homes which it would "dominate" and "dwarf" (two factors specifically noted to safeguard against in the new government Traveller Policy guidelines), as well as impinging on the designated Conservation Area of Pensford, and the importance of the existing colliery buildings and the protected wildlife species.

And that's without detailing the significant environmental and health considerations for the proposed traveller community. Building on disused mineshafts (one of which collapsed this week!), and land with no mains drainage facilities, no access to gas, in an area with a very high water table and one prone to flooding as evidenced this week, contamination of arsenic from the industrial work, remote location from amenities and communities...

There is no shop, no public transport link, no school (primary or secondary), and no doctor or other health facility in Stanton Wick.

This makes Pensford the only option for these amenities - the road to which is a steep, single track with no room to manoeuvre at the village end (one-way road), that leads directly into the Conservation Area's historic centre. It's bad enough during good weather, but completely unusable by vehicle in snow or icy conditions, and certainly no use on foot by any vulnerable people at almost any time due to the surface, the traffic, the lack of lighting, etc.

There would therefore be a huge increase in traffic from the site seeking to take the only other route away - much further through Stanton Wick itself - along a small country road that itself suffers terribly in the winter and during periods of rainfall, and would cause an unacceptable increase in traffic pollution and massive safety concerns.

This is a narrow country road already inappropriate for use by the levels of traffic. Regular traffic to the popular Carpenter's Arms pub, daily coaches from the Filers coachpark that adjoins the proposed site and farm machinery and tractors for the surrounding fields already cause a level of concern for young families and animals in this area. I have two young daughters under five - both of whom I've had to shield from careless drivers as they travel to and from the pub and I've witnessed several near misses of dogs and walkers in this area.

Even the scoring matrix conceded the site's "Existing road network can not accommodate additional traffic movements" and were contributing factors to recent planning applications being turned out.

The responsibility of B&NES is to find a sustainable, safe site for the traveller community that doesn't segregate them from local communities, instead promoting integration, offering employment opportunities, and ensuring good links to healthcare, resources, amenities, schooling, etc.

The Stanton Wick site spectacularly fails to do any of the above.

The nearest secondary school in the area, the Chew Valley School, is an already-oversubscribed school, and the local primary schools in Pensford and Stanton Drew, are so small as to be unable to cope with this scale of proposed increased population. This site represents potentially a 300% population increase to Stanton Wick. Why did anyone think that it would be able to cope on any level?

Its development would effectively isolate the travellers in an unsafe no-mans-land equidistant between a tiny hamlet and a

small historic village, leaving them completely cut-off with a busy commercial site on one side (the Filers coach park), and a detached house on the other.

And slap bang in the middle of the greenbelt, on hazardous industrial land that's now home to protected species.

It could hardly be any more contrary to government guidelines and inappropriate for families to live on if it tried!

Given that the ink's barely dry on the Government's March 23rd "Planning Policy for Traveller's Sites" document, I wonder if the guidelines were not available when were considering the site for inclusion?

I'd prefer to believe that the council has just not had time to familiarise themselves and attach the relevant weighting to the recent Coalition Government's advice, rather than think this site leapfrogged multiple higher scoring sites simply because it offers, ostensibly, the largest capacity site out of site of the city centre, with the fewest local residents to oppose it and the biggest potential financial government incentives.

I wasn't intimately aware of the "Planning Policy for Traveller's Sites" until last week, but it's clear on many of the key issues that apply to the Pensford Colliery site. For example:

(Paragraph 9) "Local planning authorities should, in producing their Local Plan: relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density... [and] protect local amenity and environment"

(Paragraph 11) "Local planning authorities should ensure that their policies: promote... access to appropriate health services... ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis... provide a settled base that reduces the need for long-distance travelling... avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services... do not locate sites in areas at high risk of flooding"

(Paragraph 12) "When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community"

Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt: "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

(Paragraph 23) "Local planning authorities should strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan. Local planning authorities should ensure that sites in rural areas respect the scale of, and do not dominate the nearest settled community, and avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure."

And of course there's B&NES' Site Allocation Development Plan Document, paragraph 4.12, saying: "Locations in or near existing settlements are prioritised... Such locations are generally more sustainable than those in remote areas, with better access to health and education services, shopping facilities, transport networks and employment opportunities. They are also more likely to reduce the need for car travel."

All of this is contrary to the Stanton Wick site

The DPD goes on to recommend: "An optimum distance of no more than 1,000m from key amenities via a safe walking route is recommended. This has been extended to 1,500m in the scoring matrix to reflect the rurality of Bath and North East Somerset and guidance on locating Traveller sites in rural areas"

There is no safe walking route to key amenities. Children would have to walk 1,500 metres down an unlit, steep, single track road, and across a very busy main road to get to the nearest school.

Also it notes: "Developments should respect the scale of the environment and not dominate the nearest settled community" and "Where possible the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites should seek to reduce reliance on the car" It would clearly dominate the nearest settled community, increasing the population by around 300%, and could only increase reliance on the car.

Situated, as it is, in the greenbelt, and with Pensford a Conservation Area, I was unsurprised to discover that it even piqued

the interest of The Telegraph when the adjoining house was being marketed (by the current owner of the proposed traveller site). The interview's available here: <http://tgr.ph/lkBgsa>

Said owner Tom Smart: "The mine opened in 1908 and is an important piece of our regional heritage so I felt it deserved a new future," he said. "It's made a wonderful home..."

I don't know the very recent new owners, but presumably that house is currently feeling slightly less wonderful for them - given that their view may soon radically change from the description originally given on Knight Frank's details (available here: <http://bit.ly/KscTbD>) and which quoted: "A fascinating conversion of a former winding house taking full advantage of its spectacular views..." "The property occupies an elevated position and provides fantastic views across the Chew Valley" Having also recently found the Statement of Consultation from February 2012, there are several pertinent concerns raised in this document too. Question 7, point 4.29 (rural exception policies), returned a six to four majority of comments against employing such a policy and highlighted possible concerns over "resentment and conflict."

In question 9, point 4.34, a distance no nearer than 1.5km from a Conservation Area was recommended. The site entrance to Pensford's historic Conservation Area centre is 1.2km (source: www.googlemaps.com)

It would be laughable – if it wasn't so concerning - that it's being considered at all given the weight of evidence showing how inappropriate it is. I consider myself an empathetic family man, and as such I applaud proactive work to identify safe, suitable, sustainable sites that promote economical, efficient, integrated living, as well as employment opportunities and amenities for any vulnerable communities – families of young children in particular..

Sadly, this site is none of those.

As a resident of B&NES, I'm appalled at the realisation that this situation can have arisen from only one of two events: either a remarkably shoddy approach to the analysis and scoring exercise which could have been prevented through cheap, quick consultation at a local level, or worse still, a deliberately disingenuous tactic to the scoring exercise – one that disregards the facts in order to ensure that a dangerous and completely unsuitable site has remained on the shortlist.

The proposal of this site serves neither the best interests of the existing local communities, nor the vulnerable traveller community.

The only beneficiaries would be the landowner, and of course B&NES which - without this scale of site on the list - realistically have little hope of delivering the number of sites it has identified a need for, (or of receiving the financial government incentives it must be hoping for).

I hope B&NES can ultimately see how erroneous the scoring, how illogical the site's inclusion, and how unsuitable the idea of this site being used for any such plan is.

And I urge them to remove it now to prevent months of valuable Council and local residents' time being wasted; not to mention saving taxpayers' money, and preventing the inexorable flood of petitions, protests, press coverage, community ill-will, legal advice, etc, that will inevitably follow if this proposal continues..

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2991 / 1 Name: Mr Alan Ford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I wish to register my objection to the proposed allocation of 15 permanent and 5 transit pitches at the Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick.

The site is entirely unsuitable to be short listed for the proposed residency, or any residency of this scale, as it fails on many of the criteria set out in the Site Selection Scoring Matrix. It was ranked 17th of the sites investigated for good reason and to subsequently rank the site as the top of the list of preferred sites seriously calls into question the basis of original identification of prospective sites and your approach to the selection process.

Green Belt: The proposed site is located wholly within the existing green belt and as such the selection of such a site does not comply with government guidelines published alongside the new National Planning Policy Framework, which states that the establishment of Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate developments. Question: Why are you proposing a site which does not conform with government Planning Policy?

Contaminated Land: As the proposed site of the Old Colliery was once a mine working I understand that the ground is hazardous because of the old mine workings and its previous use as a rubbish tip. There is also some question of arsenic contamination due to its previous industrial use. Question: What actions are you proposing to take to quantify and address the hazards found on the site and what will this cost the taxpayer?

Access: The proposed site is located on a road which is mainly single track and currently experiences limited traffic making vehicular access inadequate and potentially unsafe. The increase of vehicular access as a result of these proposals would be significant. Proximity to the 376 bus service is greater than 1,500m along the unpaved, unsafe roads over in part steep hilly conditions making this entirely unsuitable for pedestrian access, especially with children or shopping. Question: What actions are you proposing to make access for pedestrians and vehicles safe and what will this cost the taxpayer?

Infrastructure: The site does not have an adequate supply of clean water nor is there provision for the treatment of sewage without a major investment in infrastructure. Similarly, the electricity capacity is not geared to the proposed increased usage and would need a major upgrade to the district not only to supply the dwellings but to provide adequate street lighting. Question: What actions are you proposing to upgrade the water, sewage and power supplies for the district to create capacity to meet significant increases in demand and what will this cost the taxpayer?

Furthermore, local amenities such as proximity to a doctors surgery, to schools and shopping fall far short of requirements. Capacity of local primary schools in Stanton Drew and Pensford, and senior school in Chew Magna are unlikely to be able to absorb the potential increased numbers of pupils and consequently would prove unacceptable to future residents. Question: What action are you proposing to increase the capacity of the local schools and what will be the ongoing cost to the taxpayer?

Impact on local community: Indications are that the permanent pitches may provide for c.45 caravans and an estimated 200 people dwarfing the nearest village Stanton Wick which has only 25 houses. There is likely to be a knock on effect that will also impact other villages nearby such as Pensford, Chelwood and Stanton Drew. Such a large influx is likely to have an adverse impact on the legitimate rights of the occupants to reasonably enjoy their own property and community life. Question: Is it appropriate to locate such a significant proportion (68%) of the target number of permanent pitches in one location?

Usage: The proposals disregard the views of the Travelling community as expressed in the West of England Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment which indicates a preference to sites comprising smaller family sized sites of 5 pitches or less and on recognised traveller routes. Question: What evidence do you have that the proposed site will in fact meet the needs of the Travelling community and how will this take into account the addressing the health needs of the Gypsies and Travellers across the district?

My initial reaction to the proposed Travellers site at Stanton Wick and the lack of consultation with the local communities is that the approach taken to arrive at the short list is seriously flawed and needs to be reconsidered immediately, and certainly prior to submission to the Secretary of State.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2992 / 1 Name: Mrs Caroline Allen Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We the undersigned petition the Bath & North East Somerset Council to withdraw the proposal of an authorised Travellers site at Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick, we oppose the proposal as wholly unsustainable.

The site is, in our opinion entirely unsuitable for the following reasons:

- Ground contamination
- Ground unsafe (mineshafths)
- Insufficient road access and capacity
- Insufficient walking access and capacity
- Public transport access
- Water supply
- Drainage capability
- No shopping within recommended distance
- No Doctor within recommended distance
- No school capacity
- Site is in the Green Belt
- Occupation of the site would dwarf the local community
- Site is not on a recognised traveller route

Road Safety

Our main concern however, is the road safety of the local residents and visitors to the area due to the insufficient road capacity and nature of the roads/lanes. The increased volume of traffic and size of vehicles being used by the travellers would make these lanes hazardous to local residents and visitors alike. The lanes are very narrow and there is barely enough room for a cyclist or walker to pass a small car, never mind a caravan or trailer. There are many horse riders, cyclists, walkers, joggers and children using the lanes which would make these roads unusable if caravans and trailers were using them. The lanes would become very dangerous to use. I believe this would change the way in which people use the area for leisure activities and for health and well being.

The roads around Stanton Drew especially are already quite dangerous due to the speed of traffic and as some properties lead straight onto the road, the increased volume of traffic would add to this problem. Bath and North East Somerset Council surely have a duty to maintain a safe environment for its residents and it should do everything possible not to add to the dangers on its roads.

The increased volume of traffic would also have an impact to Chew Magna High Street which is already congested.

Moral / Health / Happiness

Due to the strong opposition to the proposals by local residents, we believe if the plans were to go ahead, there will be a lot of bitterness towards the travellers and there will be a 'them and us' mentality. This is not fair on either the residents or the travellers. It will also have an adverse effect on the local residents overall happiness and well being due to the obvious problems that come along with travellers sites.

Property

We also believe the presence of gypsies and travellers will reduce the property value on the houses within the area, putting local residents out of pocket and possible problems selling properties if they wish to move.

Education

As parents, it is also a major concern to us that the increased volume of pupils in the local schools will have an adverse effect on our children's education. Stanton Drew Primary School is very small and do not have the capacity to hold many more children. The children that already attend would not get the quality education if the number of pupils increased dramatically. Isn't it the duty of Bath & North East Somerset Council to provide the best education that it can offer to its residents without adding undue stress to its pupils. From a personal point of view, our children have already expressed their concerns about a significant number of travellers attending their schools for this reason.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2993 / 1 Name: Mrs Heather Fegan Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

My family and I are residents of Pensford, and we are angry and astonished at your proposed travellers site at Pensford Colliery Buildings at Stanton Wick. BaNES council have been very underhanded and NO consultation has taken place with any residents of Pensford, Stanton Wick and Stanton Drew. In fact the information has emerged very quietly and my family and I are totally amazed this proposal can be rushed through council WITHOUT PLANNING PERMISSION AND I STRESS NO CONSOLATION WITH RESIDENTS.

Stanton Wick consists of 25 houses, and this site would engulf the whole area. The Pensford Colliery is basically a slagheap, with mineshafts and chemicals in the ground making it inhabitable for humans (Health and Safety), has only a single track road to enter it, insufficient walking access, no drainage capability, no doctor within the recommended distance, no school capacity, the site is on green belt and the wildlife there includes adders, lizards, bats and badgers.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

This proposal should therefore be retracted forthwith.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2993 / 2 Name: Mrs Heather Fegan Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Re. Development of the Old Colliery site at Stanton Wick

Reasons why this site is not suitable for a permanent gypsy site:-

- 1/ The site is in the greenbelt.
- 2/ It would disturb a site of nature conservation.
- 3/ The site is potentially dangerous with redundant mine shafts and the possibility of subsidence.
- 4/ The site is probably contaminated.

- 5/ There is not adequate water supply and no means of drainage and too large for septic tanks.
- 6/ The access roads are not suitable for the increase in traffic.
- 7/ The site would be far larger than the local population of Stanton Wick.
- 8/ The site would put too much pressure on local schools and doctors surgeries.
- 9/ There is no public footpath or pavement suitable.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2994 / 1 Name: Mr Duncan & Aitken Organisation:
Sandra

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2994 / 2 Name: Mr Duncan & Aitken Organisation:
Sandra

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

the top of a short list of 7 sites with a recommendation that it could accommodate 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches, which would possibly mean around 40 vans, over 80 vehicles and up to 200 people on the site of the Old Colliery!

We would like to register our complete opposition to the use of this site on the following grounds:-

1. The site as a former colliery is unsuitable for safety reasons ie. ground unsafe due to mineshafts, moreover we understand one of the mineshafts actually collapsed recently. In addition we believe there have been findings of arsenic in the ground and asbestos on the site.
2. Road access and capacity is not suitable for large numbers of caravans and vehicles etc.
3. Problems already in Stanton Wick with water supply which will only be made worse.
4. Site is in the Green Belt. Apparently previous planning permissions in that location have already been refused because it would detract from the 'openness' of the area.
5. No shopping within recommended distance.
6. No doctors within recommended distance.
7. No school capacity within the local area.
8. Occupation of the site would dwarf the local community.
9. Site is not on a recognised traveller route.

Therefore we believe that after consideration of the above this proposed site is totally unsuitable and inappropriate as a potential Gypsy and Traveller Site.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2995 / 1 Name: Robert Stark Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

MOD Bath

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Site in 'Green Belt'. Access to site. Other residents have had planning refusals. Junction on A368 will not support massive increase in traffic. No local facilities. No local transport. No mains water / sewerage. Site just too expensive to sort with taxpayers money!

Respondent: 2995 / 2 Name: Robert Stark Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Concerning the above matter that has 'suddenly raised its head' through BANES I thought it was only right to inform you of my extremely strong opposition, concerns and worries that if this proposed site achieves planning permission, the affect it would put on our small rural community. I and my families have lived in Stanton Drew for the best part of our lives 65-40 years and have built up our business here, this year 60 years trading.

This proposal is totally out of context and in keeping with the site, the area , the facilities at the location, the facilities of the small rural surrounding villages, transport links as well as health, education and environment issues. Also there are the important issues of control, policing and security for the surrounding residents and businesses, of which we are most certainly one, as we can see the site from our location.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2996 / 1 Name: Miss Lisa Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Travelling Community have already expressed an interest in staying in the 'Twerton' area. Is there any reason why this cannot become a permanent pitch? This is where they have chosen to live so why not base assessment criteria on this site ie. Small number of pitches, close to amenities, infrastructures already in place, access to public transport etc.

The only thing BANES have had to supply is a skip costing £180.

All the sites need re-assessing as the process that has been used is deeply flawed. Many of them are not suitable and would involve extensive infrastructures being put in place, require decontamination, and present many safety issues.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

It seems BANES have ignored just how unsuitable this site is. It was rated 17th out of 23 sites. How can it possibly be deemed suitable as a 'Preferred Site'? The site contradicts the Councils and National policies on:-

- 1) Greenbelt location
- 2) Scale of proposal dominating nearest community
- 3) Inadequate access road
- 4) Site contaminated
- 5) No regard to prior planning decisions on site or neighbouring properties
- 6) Poor access to local amenities.

It appears no assessment of safety regarding potential open mineshafts below the site have been made and no regard has been made to the fact the site has been designated SNCI by BANES which should protect it from inappropriate development! - see attached article

Cited from JULY's Chew Valley Gazette, Page 62

" PARISH COMMEMORATES PENSFORD MINER'S DEATH.

Pensford has commemorated the death of Charles Henry Whittock on 7th June 1914 - the only miner known to have died in the mineshaft of the old Pensford Colliery. The 39 year old worked as a Sinker at the Colliery which operated between 1909 and 1955, and is situated between the small Conservation village of Pensford and the hamlet of Stanton Wick, in the parish of Publow with Pensford. During the 19th and 20th centuries, Pensford and the surrounding area formed a major part of the Somerset coalfield. The remaining beautiful, red-brick Colliery buildings are an imposing sight, and the area is now home to European Protected Species of wildlife; accordingly, it has been designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) by Bath & North East Somerset Council, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Tony Heaford, Chairman of Publow with Pensford Parish Council, said 'in Pensford, we have rare, large scale remains of the 20th Century mining industry. The industrial heritage of the village, and the architectural and landscape remains of its legacy are crucial to the Parish. It's appropriate to commemorate those who lost their lives working in the industry, and so

we remember Charles Whittock, as well as thinking of the scores of other mine workers - often very old and young - who endured awful conditions to work these historic coal-fields'

Coal was mined from pre-medieval times in Pensford for the first shaft was not sunk until 1911, and regular flooding of the shafts meant that conditions for a Sinker such as Charles Whittock were dreadfully dangerous and prevented any winding of coal for a further six years. Pensford's mining past is evident throughout the village: many of the brown Pennant sandstone houses that date from the 18th and 19th Centuries were built for miners, and cottages from the coal mining era still from the High Street. The old coal spoil heap just south of the village has modified the local landform in a dramatic way. In May 1988, Bath & North East Somerset (B&NES) Council further recognised the importance of this industrial legacy, identifying Pensford as being of special architectural and historic interest and designating it as a Conservation Area. In its Character Appraisal document, special mention is made of 'Evidence of the former mining industry including miners' cottages, the miners welfare and abandoned mineworks in the surrounding area"

In his paper, 'The Collieries of North Somerset', author Shane Gould concludes that 'Public interest in North Somerset Coalfield has never been greater, and it is hoped that through the combined efforts of the community together with local and national agencies, these important remains can be protected, conserved and appropriately displayed.

" The sites are a major educational asset and a careful examination of their remains will provide new information on the buildings, technology and development of the colliery. In Somerset coalmining has been confined to the history books, but the field monuments act as a physical link to a period when our forefathers and their children toiled endlessly in often pitiful conditions beneath the ground." Local resident Rosie Pierce said: "In remembering Charles Whittock's tragic death, we also remember the vital importance of mining to the area. We're hopeful that this historic site can be protected by the Council in order to ensure that this important mining legacy is never lost. Thankfully, B&NES' Conservation Document for Pensford notes that 'its inclusion within the Bristol-Bath Green Belt helps prevent development which would be harmful to the area.' "

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

This site is clearly unsuitable.

The proposed 20 pitches on this site is larger than the Governments stated maximum and would therefore make it difficult to manage. It has the potential to accommodate more than the above which could lead to uncontrolled expansion.

Travellers have stated they prefer small family sized pitches. Is there a real need in this area for a large site? BANES have based the need on 2007's statistics - are they accurate now?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

It would appear that the 'Preferred Options' paper has been a costly exercise for the local taxpayer as it has not appropriately or accurately assessed the sites involved and has ignored many planning issues, national and local policies, government guidance and best practice for Gypsy and Traveller sites - as detailed above.

Respondent: 2996 / 1 Name: Miss Lisa Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We are writing to oppose the above proposal, reasons for which are outlined below:-

Site is in the Greenbelt.

Previous planning applications for dwellings have been rejected. Why should "Travellers Pitches" be treated any differently?

The site is contaminated with Arsenic - metallic element that is highly poisonous.

Site is unstable - underlying mine shafts.

The very narrow lane which provides access to the site is completely inadequate for the amount of traffic the site would generate (local coach firm located next door to the site have been denied permission to expand their fleet of buses by only 2). The lane has no pavements or lighting.

The site community would dwarf the very small community of Stanton Wick.
 The local amenities are not within recommended walking distance and would struggle to cope with this sudden large increase in numbers. This undisturbed site is home to a variety of important wildlife, whose habitat is rapidly diminishing. Bats, Adders and Slow worms to name a few - some of these 'Protected species'.
 The site also has 'Historical Importance'. It was an important site in the Mining Industry and should be preserved to educate future generations of our local ancestry.
 Site is not on a recognised 'Traveller Route'. Travellers according to Government Survey prefer to live on small family size pitches close to motorways and 'Traveller Routes'
 We cannot understand how this site can be recommended as 'suitable' for anyone to live on. As Government is now placing Local Agenda decisions in the hands of the people who live there, we would strongly disagree with the above proposal and demand that the site be re-evaluated before it goes to a Cabinet meeting as a 'recommended site'.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2997 / 1 Name: Mr Darryl Whitcher Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

- 1) Site is in green belt
- 2) Lanes around site unsuitable for increased traffic - walking unsafe
- 3) Land contaminated
- 4) Large development would overwhelm local community

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Use of Filer coaches for more parking refused by planning. Same reasons apply to proposed Travellers site at Stanton Wick!

Respondent: 2998 / 1 Name: Mr Rob & Mary Taylor Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes - This site fails to meet the criteria and guidelines for Gypsy and Travellers sites as set out within the Councils own documentation - namely:

1. In a Greenbelt
2. Will overwhelm the Stanton Wick existing community.
3. Highway issues with unsafe pedestrian routes to nearest school and shop.
4. No public transport in close proximity.
5. The land is contaminated and as a former mine, unsafe.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No - as stated overleaf. The site is completely unsuitable. It is hard to understand what assessment, if any, the council have actually undertaken.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Not at all for are the about reasons.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

It is hard to see why anyone would even consider living on this site. There have been several instances of ground collapses, fires from coal deposits/waste, poisonous contamination and I believe snakes are prevalent.

On the question of planning, I believe there is a history of refusals with inappropriate development in a Greenbelt being cited.

I fail to see how despite this site reaching a very low score under YOUR criteria that all of a sudden it is top of the priority list. Seems to be a bit too contrived and handy as it is not within the city of Bath.

Respondent: 2999 / 1 Name: Rupert & Robinson Organisation:
Ros

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

As a resident of Stanton Drew we wish to register my strong objections to the proposed inclusion of the Stanton Wick location as a suitable site for allocation for 15 permanent and 5 transit pitches. The location is wholly inappropriate for a number of reasons:-

- The site is within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for such use – this is evidenced by the refusal to allow expansion of the adjoining Filer's site on the grounds of Green Belt protection
 - The site comprises old mine workings which would pose a major health and safety risk particularly to wandering children
 - The site is contaminated – whilst the contamination could be removed (at considerable cost) there is no guarantee that no contamination remains – again placing residents at risk
 - There is inadequate mains water and electricity supply and existing drainage systems barely cope with current requirements
 - Highways access to the site is inappropriate for such an intensified use – access to Pensford down Wick Lane is little more than a single track road with sharp turns and restricted vision over a bridge, and no footpath. During winter this Lane is extremely dangerous and an intensification of use would mean that BaNES are knowingly placing users at risk.
 - There is inadequate provision of facilities within the immediate area to support the anticipated additional numbers – there is no shop within safe walking distance, there is no Doctor within safe walking distance and there is inadequate school capacity to cope with additional numbers
 - The existing community of Stanton Wick would be dwarfed by gypsies and travellers threatening their existing way of life.
- In addition to the above, I believe the proposed inclusion of this site is contrary to the Government's "Planning Policy for traveller's Sites 2012" in particular paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and Policy E.

In proposing this site for consideration I believe BaNES are at risk of serving no useful purpose to either the residents of Stanton Wick or the Gypsy and traveller community. Potentially they run the risk of destroying a vibrant and established local community whilst at the same time providing a site that is inappropriate for the needs of another community – indeed so inappropriate that it places the gypsy community at risk in terms of the overall health and safety of the site, inappropriate access, dangerous roads and so on.

In the circumstances we urge you to do all you can to ensure this site is withdrawn from any further consideration as a Gypsy and Traveller site.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 2999 / 1 Name: Rupert & Robinson Organisation:
 Ros

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The location is wholly inappropriate for a number of reasons:-

- The site is within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for such use – this is evidenced by the refusal to allow expansion of the adjoining Filer's site on the grounds of Green Belt protection
- The site comprises old mine workings which would pose a major health and safety risk particularly to wandering children
- The site is contaminated – whilst the contamination could be removed (at considerable cost) there is no guarantee that no contamination remains – again placing residents at risk
- There is inadequate mains water and electricity supply and existing drainage systems barely cope with current requirements
- Highways access to the site is inappropriate for such an intensified use – access to Pensford down Wick Lane is little more than a single track road with sharp turns and restricted vision over a bridge, and no footpath. During winter this Lane is extremely dangerous and an intensification of use would mean that BaNES are knowingly placing users at risk.
- There is inadequate provision of facilities within the immediate area to support the anticipated additional numbers – there is no shop within safe walking distance, there is no Doctor within safe walking distance and there is inadequate school capacity to cope with additional numbers
- The existing community of Stanton Wick would be dwarfed by gypsies and travellers threatening their existing way of life.

In addition to the above, I believe the proposed inclusion of this site is contrary to the Government's "Planning Policy for traveller's Sites 2012" in particular paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and Policy E.

In proposing this site for consideration I believe BaNES are at risk of serving no useful purpose to either the residents of Stanton Wick or the Gypsy and traveller community. Potentially they run the risk of destroying a vibrant and established local community whilst at the same time providing a site that is inappropriate for the needs of another community – indeed so inappropriate that it places the gypsy community at risk in terms of the overall health and safety of the site, inappropriate access, dangerous roads and so on.

In the circumstances we urge you to do all you can to ensure this site is withdrawn from any further consideration as a Gypsy and Traveller site.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No – this site is totally inappropriate

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The preferred Options Paper is a shallow document that clearly has little attention to reality and is written by someone who has little grasp of practicality, nor any grasp of the needs of the travelling community.

By excluding Bath itself from this process, on the grounds of its World Heritage status many eminently suitable sites are being missed. This is short-sighted and potentially costly – there are many existing sites within the Bath boundary that would be suitable for use and are clearly attractive to the travelling community – since the community is already in these sites

Respondent: 2999 / 2 Name: Rupert & Robinson Organisation:
 Ros

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The location is wholly inappropriate for a number of reasons:-

- The site is within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for such use – this is evidenced by the refusal to allow expansion of the adjoining Filer's site on the grounds of Green Belt protection
- The site comprises old mine workings which would pose a major health and safety risk particularly to wandering children
- The site is contaminated – whilst the contamination could be removed (at considerable cost) there is no guarantee that no contamination remains – again placing residents at risk
- There is inadequate mains water and electricity supply and existing drainage systems barely cope with current requirements
- Highways access to the site is inappropriate for such an intensified use – access to Pensford down Wick Lane is little more than a single track road with sharp turns and restricted vision over a bridge, and no footpath. During winter this Lane is extremely dangerous and an intensification of use would mean that BaNES are knowingly placing users at risk.
- There is inadequate provision of facilities within the immediate area to support the anticipated additional numbers – there is no shop within safe walking distance, there is no Doctor within safe walking distance and there is inadequate school capacity to cope with additional numbers
- The existing community of Stanton Wick would be dwarfed by gypsies and travellers threatening their existing way of life.

In addition to the above, I believe the proposed inclusion of this site is contrary to the Government's "Planning Policy for traveller's Sites 2012" in particular paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and Policy E.

In proposing this site for consideration I believe BaNES are at risk of serving no useful purpose to either the residents of Stanton Wick or the Gypsy and traveller community. Potentially they run the risk of destroying a vibrant and established local community whilst at the same time providing a site that is inappropriate for the needs of another community – indeed so inappropriate that it places the gypsy community at risk in terms of the overall health and safety of the site, inappropriate access, dangerous roads and so on.

In the circumstances we urge you to do all you can to ensure this site is withdrawn from any further consideration as a Gypsy and Traveller site.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No – this site is totally inappropriate

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The preferred Options Paper is a shallow document that clearly has little attention to reality and is written by someone who has little grasp of practicality, nor any grasp of the needs of the travelling community.

By excluding Bath itself from this process, on the grounds of its World Heritage status many eminently suitable sites are being missed. This is short-sighted and potentially costly – there are many existing sites within the Bath boundary that would be suitable for use and are clearly attractive to the travelling community – since the community is already in these sites

Respondent: 3000 / 1 Name: Karen Abolkheir Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I live on Wick Lane in the Parish of Stanton Drew and I wish to object to the proposal to develop the Old Colliery Buildings, Wick Lane, Stanton Wick as a Gypsy & Traveller site.

I agree with the concept of authorised Gypsy/traveller sites, especially as a permanent site will significantly benefit Gypsy & Travellers' health and welfare, however, I do not believe that the proposed site in Wick Lane is appropriate. I would like to make it absolutely clear that I would be objecting to a development of traditional homes and not just because this proposal is for Gypsy/traveller pitches. This is not a case of 'Nimbyism'.

This is not an exhaustive list but some of my objections to the development are on the following grounds:

1. Lack of communication and consultation - I don't believe that this site would be on the short list if local residents had been consulted earlier in the process due to the site's unsuitability.
2. Green Belt- This is contrary to the government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites published in March 2012, Introduction point 4 ... 'protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.' & Policy E point 14. I do not believe that the site is 'brown field', there are old buildings on the land but it is still in Green Belt which is protected.
3. Green Belt & very special circumstances - I don't believe that development in this case falls under 'Very Special Circumstances'. Going on the Council's own documentation the whole process of publishing the PDP and identifying sites, including short listing, took no more than 4 months (October 2011- February 2012). Whilst it may be difficult to find areas outside the green belt, it may not be impossible if more time is spent identifying sites. Could the Council consider any part of the 3 MoD sites in BANES for inclusion in the process for example?
4. Scale of the site - The size of the development will dominate the local community by as much as 3 or 4 to 1 local resident, contrary to the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites March 2012 Policy C point 12.
5. Pressure on Local infrastructure- the local road network is already congested especially at peak times; utilities are hard pressed or non-existent; local schools are filled to capacity; GP surgeries are miles away and not on bus routes; and supermarkets are at least 4 miles away and not on public transport routes. Reliance on private cars will increase in the area contrary to your own DPD, the Criteria Matrix.
6. Access- This is wholly unsuitable for any minor increase in traffic, as Wick Lane is substantially a single track with few passing places; the lane is unsuitable in many places for large vehicles, let alone large towing cars and caravans; there are three 90 degree bends with extremely reduced visibility; there is already pressure with buses, cars, cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians which inconveniences local residents
7. Planning Permission for local residents - This is persistently and consistently turned down due to the Green Belt, even the 'brown field' site of Tia Filers Coach Depot next door to the Old Colliery Buildings. Surely a huge development next door to the Coach Depot cannot be considered in light of this.
8. Selection criteria and Stanton Wick on the short list- I do not understand why the Old Colliery Buildings are on the short list after scoring 10 and coming 17th out of 23 when some sites scored two or three times more but were dismissed for reasons that cannot outrank the constraints of our site.
9. Hazardous Site- The site has been contaminated with arsenic, has mine shafts (one of which has recently fallen in and required recapping) and potentially unstable slag heaps, in addition the land is of poor quality. I find it difficult to believe that The Old Colliery Buildings will benefit gypsy/travellers' health and wellbeing and make a suitable site for them. The mineshafts alone will be a hazard.
10. Traveller Routes- in the last 10 years I believe that the vast majority of the 18 unauthorised sites in BANES have been around the Bath area, in order to take advantage of the proximity to the motorway network. The Stanton Wick site is far removed from the motorway networks.

Based on the above objections to a wholly unsuitable site, I would respectfully ask the Council Cabinet to withdraw the Old Colliery Buildings from the short list after the meeting on 9 May 2012 and not follow the recommendation to go into the 8 week consultation process.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3000 / 2 Name: Karen Abolkheir Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes- please also refer to attached letter.

Green Belt- This is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to national and local guidelines.

Highways- The roads are inappropriate due to their alignment, junctions, visibility, narrow width, unlit and no pathways, as per planning refusals in the area. The roads cannot sustain an increase in traffic and I estimate that 20 pitches will produce 60 - 80 cars. One exit through Pensford to the A37 crosses 2 old narrow bridges that will require a survey.

Unsustainable location - There is poor access to amenities including schools, employment, shops, GP and transport. Heavy reliance on private vehicles which is contrary to national guidelines and BaNES own DPD.

Overwhelming development - The size and scale of the development will dominate the nearest settlement of Stanton Wick, which consists of 26 houses and approximately 60 people. The proposed development will consist of up to 200 people, 60-80 cars and 60 caravans. Contamination/Hazardous- The site is contaminated with arsenic (please see Sanctus report filed with the current approved Planning Permission 10/03029/REN) and is hazardous due to it is an ex-mining site. –

Achievable -the roads are substandard for an increase in any type of traffic, let alone large towing vehicles; there is no mains sewerage or gas and the water and electricity supplies will need to be upgraded. A cost has been estimated at anything between £2-4 million, including mains sewerage; remediation; upgrade to highways and utilities costing between £100k£ 200k per pitch. This is not affordable unless the number of pitches is expanded considerably which is totally inappropriate.

Site of Nature Conservation-A large proportion of the site is designated SNCI, which has been ignored in this process. There is evidence that the area is the habitat of a European Protected Species and there are tree preservation orders in the area of woodland. This is a precious environment for the local wildlife and any large development will impact upon it.

Pensford Conservation Area - One of the exits of Wick Lane is through this designated Conservation Area which will undoubtedly be impacted with an increase in traffic. SocialIntegration/Cohension - This can never be achieved because residents persistently and consistently have planning refused for minor developments/extensions that would be far less intrusive than this proposed development. Planning permission granted to one section of the community when it is denied to others will cause resentment within the community.

Planning Policy for Travellers - Equality Impact Assessment March 2012 states: 'The Government's overarching policy aim is fair and effective provision of authorised sites for travellers to facilitate the traditional and nomadic way of life of these groups whilst respecting the interests of the settled community.' The suggestion of converting the buildings to educational facilities and for business use is unfair when the settled community does not have access to such educational facilities in Stanton Wick and the Coach Depot next door has been consistently refused planning permission to expand. This approach is hardly likely to foster good relations within the community.

Brownfield - There is some dispute as to whether this is indeed a brownfield site and how much of the site is brownfield. I believe that 82 was not granted for the concrete works after mining was abandoned on the site and that only the buildings can be considered brownfield. Any development in between the buildings will not protect the openness of Green Belt.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. I do not agree with the Council's assessment of the opportunities and constraints on this site because 1) the data published by the Council contains numerous basic errors regarding the site (please see attached letter). and 2) I am still unsure of the full assessment of the opportunities & constraints, because the consultation is based on misleading data:

- The criteria scoring matrix is inappropriate and the scores have been inappropriately applied.
- Information that was available to the Senior Planning Officer in February and March via your Internal Consultation Process was ignored (Highways, contamination, Ecology) and led to inappropriate scoring.
- Public Consultation was not a proper consultation and I am still waiting for answers to questions which will help me understand what the opportunities and constraints are.
- Staff from Planning Services were contradicting each other

- I still don't know how many people, children, cars, caravans will be on the site
- I still don't know which part of the site will be used
- I do not think that the Council or its officers know what the constraints are because this site shouldn't have been considered as a Gypsy Traveller site after the first stage as it is totally inappropriate.
- The site has been made to fit the scoring matrix, not the other way around

The Council is working from figures stated in the GTAA 2007. These figures need updating in order to work from a sound basis.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I do not agree that this potential pitch provision should be taken forward as a formal allocation.

- There are far too many constraints on this site as pointed out above and in my very detailed letter.
- Other sites were rejected earlier on in the process for far fewer constraints than the rejected sites.
- This site is only achievable if the highways infrastructure is upgraded and this would mean changing the whole rural character of the area, which would be unacceptable in Green Belt and would impact negatively on the settled communities of Stanton Wick, Stanton Drew and Pensford, who chose a rural area to live.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am deeply concerned that the process has been so flawed. Planning issues have been ignored as have both the national and local policies.

- Planning Policy for Travellers March 2012 - states clearly that it is important to include early consultation with both Gypsy Travellers and the local community. In addition it states that Gypsy Traveller sites are inappropriate development in Green Belt.
- Very Special Circumstances through lack of sites in non-Green Belt cannot be argued. There are 3 MoD sites and further sites coming forward that are not in Green Belt. This negates your argument as sites are available to be put forward. In addition other sites were rejected for less substantial constraints than the Stanton Wick site.
- The Equality Impact Assessment March 2012 states that Gypsy Traveller sites should not be granted planning permission where the settled community is refused permission because of the perception of unfairness. Residents consistently and persistently have planning permission refused. Please refer to the site's own planning history and that of Tia Filer Coach Depot next door.
- The proposal is contrary to national and local policy because of its size, its location, its inappropriateness and its unsustainable location.
- The process is not robustly evidence-based contrary to national & local guidelines.
- It is highly unlikely that the proposal would be granted planning permission due to its constraints and therefore should not have been considered as a Gypsy Traveller site.

Respondent: 3000 / 3 Name: Karen Abolkheir Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

My letter is long and there are duplications but this is necessary in order to fully document as many of the flaws in the process and the documentation, which has led to a decision to include the Stanton Wick site in a list of 'Preferred Options' when it should have been rejected in the early stages of the process to allocate development sites for Gypsy Travellers.

I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the above proposal due to the total unsuitability of the site for a large Gypsy and Traveller site and for the deeply flawed process.

I wish to confirm that I am in favour of authorised gypsy traveller sites in appropriate locations and my objections are on the following grounds:

- a flawed and less than transparent process;
- a substantial number of fundamental errors within your documentation, which contrary to National guidelines was not robustly evidence-based; and
- the substantial and valid planning grounds.

I am concerned by the phrasing - 'Preferred Options' in the 'consultation' documentation, which also includes a picture of the Stanton Wick site in the DPD and the Call for Sites Leaflet. Someone made a 'preferred' choice which, together with the photograph of our site, suggests pre-determination and I note that without all these preferred 6 sites the Council is unable to fulfil its commitment for the provision of the total number of Gypsy & Traveller sites.

In addition the Council is working on the presumption that the GT AA 2007 figures are appropriate and these should be reassessed at the earliest opportunity to ensure that they are robust figures. If they are not then the Council has an opportunity to either lower the number of required pitches or increase the number of pitches in order to fulfil Gypsy Traveller needs.

Council's documentation

There are a number of fundamental errors within the documentation and some of these errors should not have occurred as the information was known to the Senior Planning Officer in March, according to your internal consultation which appeared to begin in February 2012. Indeed in March 2012 the following departments pointed out the significant constraints with the site: Highways, Contamination & Ecology. Highways even pointed out that "The only site that would be rejected at this stage on highway and sustainability grounds is the Old Collier (sic) Buildings, Stanton Wick."

Criteria Matrix Scoring

Your criteria matrix should have been robust enough to objectively compare the sites enabling you to take the top scoring sites onto the 2nd stage. Instead you have a subjective matrix that you have made the Stanton Wick site fit within, in addition there is a photograph of the Stanton Wick site in the DPD and the Call for Sites leaflets. This begs the question from many residents 'is this site predetermined?'

You state in the DPD Criteria Matrix that: "Note: This scoring system is for comparative purposes and will not be decisive in selecting preferred sites". Why bother having objective scoring criteria? Meghan Rossiter stated at the Stanton Drew Public Meeting that the criteria matrix did not produce the result required, which result was that?

I also understand that a second phase of selection was undertaken but if so:

- Why was this not mentioned when the validity of a site coming 1st out of 23 but on a short list of 7 was questioned?
- The second stage selection process only came out in early June at the Council's public meetings. Apparently the selection criteria matrix was a 'desk top exercise' according to Cllr Ball.
- When was the second level of criteria devised?
 - When will the criteria be made available for residents to assess themselves?
 - There was an opportunity to publish the other criteria within the DPD why was this not published?

Your scoring matrix is deeply flawed and instead of scoring 10 points the site should score -9 points (minus 9) as per the table and explanation added as Appendix 1.

Three of the errors in the matrix were known through the original Internal Consultation process:

- Food shop is identified as a Post office in the original Internal Consultation Detailed Assessment table which I believe was issued by the Senior Planning Officer.
- Hazardous (potential risks identified from mining).
- A member of staff commented on the ecological issues including the fact that the site is SNCI designated: "Big issues here! Site designated and significant records for European species. Would be a difficult site to develop without significant ecological impacts." Food shop should be 0 not 1, SNCI should be -5 not 0, hazardous should be 0 not 5. This is a difference of 11 points and the issues were known in March 2012. I do not consider this to be high quality work.

I do not believe that the site is brownfield. Mining is designated sui generis and we are unable to find any evidence that B2 use was permitted for the concrete works. The spoil heap and disused tip are now grown over and provide a wildlife habitat; the site is not a large derelict area ripe for development, it is a site within the Green Belt it is only the buildings that can be developed, which is confirmed by the restrictions on the current single

dwelling planning permission. Therefore it is possible that only a small part of the site could be designated as brownfield and no development could be permitted outside the current footprint of the buildings, which would make the current proposal of 20 pitches unachievable.

If the site is not brownfield then the scoring matrix would be further reduced by 5 points to -14.

Preferred Options Document

This document is undated but forms part of the Council Cabinet papers for the meeting on 9 May 2012.

The document states that "The Council is only seeking views on the seven identified sites, and not the principle of allocating sites".

The Council also claim that the "preferred sites identified in this document as being suitable, available and achievable for development".

I object to both these statements as the principle of allocating sites is deeply flawed (otherwise how could such an unsuitable site be on the short list together with two other inappropriate sites - Radstock and Keynsham?) and residents have an extremely strong case that the site is NOT suitable and any development will only be achievable at a considerable cost, both in terms of money and impact on the local area and on the local community.

GT.2- potential pitch provision- states that the site benefits from extant planning permission (05/02227/FUL & 10/03029/REN)- this is correct but I would like to point out that it is only the buildings that have planning permission NOT the whole site and that even the permission granted is restricted and conditional. It would be highly inappropriate if the Planning Department suddenly removed those restrictions for the proposed development of a Gypsy Traveller site. In addition the only part of the site that can be considered to be previously developed are the buildings. The greater part of the site is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. The site is also within the Green Belt.

The site is not well screened from its neighbours- The Winding House is a structure of three floors, is one metre from the north boundary of the site, and is bordered on two sides. It will be impossible to screen the site effectively, and the proposed residents will not enjoy privacy.

I note that the existing buildings on-site present an opportunity for reuse as utility blocks and community space including educational facilities and space for business. I am extremely concerned about the use of buildings for these purposes given that current local residents do not enjoy the same facilities. I feel it unjust that one section of the community obtain facilities not available to others, this will not aid social integration and is more likely to increase divisions between the communities. Indeed the Planning Policy for Travellers- Equality Impact Assessment March 2012 states:

'The Government's overarching policy aim is fair and effective provision of authorised sites for travellers to facilitate the traditional and nomadic way of life of these groups whilst respecting the interests of the settled community.' I note that the site would require remediation works and there is evidence in the Sanctus Report, which is available with the current planning permission documentation on the BaNES website that this is due to arsenic contamination on the site, which will be costly to rectify and must be subject to proper scrutiny by an expert in this field .

The document also states that "The site is heavily constrained by its access which is single-track in parts. Your statement is incorrect- the lane is not just single-track 'in parts' - it is substantially single track with few passing places.

The Highways agency has refused far smaller developments on the basis of BaNES Local Plan Policy T24 as well as the inappropriate "width, alignment and junctions".

Preferred Options Stage - Detailed Site Assessments

The Council could not have assessed the site's suitability, nor was it assessed "taking into account policy requirements, physical site constraints and potential impacts arising from development of sites" as stated in point 2.9 of the document. I note that "this removed a number of sites from consideration due to incompatibility with national planning guidance". The Stanton Wick site is incompatible with national planning guidance - Green Belt, size, unsustainable location due to reliance

on cars, no facilities, no amenities, local residents refused planning permission persistently and consistently, impact on Conservation Area etc, etc.

Point 2.12 of the assessment also states that "to assess achievability all known constraints were identified to draw out site delivery costs such as infrastructure and remediation works".

Had the Council assessed the Stanton Wick site objectively this site would have been removed from the list due to incompatibility with national planning guidance, Green Belt, size, appropriateness in the rural environment, strain on the infrastructure, physical site constraints - not to mention contamination, and costs of remediation. Taking all this into account the site is NOT achievable.

Detailed Site Assessment Tables

There appear to be a number of inaccuracies in the table as well as in some of the statements. have asked where the information contained in the table came from but I understand from S de Beer that site specific questions will be incorporated into the report to the Cabinet in September and residents' questions will not be answered.

You state in the Detailed Site Assessment Table that the "site benefits from existing on-site services and utilities" which is incorrect. Some utilities are non-existent (mains sewerage & gas); some are overstretched already (mains water & electricity) and septic tanks in that area will pose a serious threat to Salters Brook at the bottom of the hill, which in turn flows into The Chew River in the Conservation Area of Pensford.

I have already pointed out that the current planning permission for one dwelling is subject to conditions and restrictions and I trust that the Council will adhere to these, whatever the development.

You have acknowledged that the development of the site would not directly assist the aim of social integration and I strongly agree. You state that it provides "a site capable of accommodating several families and, potentially, future household growth" (my italics). As I object to 20 pitches naturally I would object to any further development. The only sensible number of pitches is one as there is currently planning permission for the one dwelling, however the pitch would need to be contained within the building granted approval for the dwelling and any other use of the subsequent buildings should be ancillary as per the current planning permission.

I am concerned that you believe that the introduction of caravans or mobile homes behind a well designed boundary scheme (please refer to the current planning permission 05/02227/FUL & renewal 10/03029/REN for conditions on landscaping) "will have little impact." On the contrary it will impact on The Winding House which is a three storey residential building and it will be impossible to screen the site so as to give the site residents privacy, or the site from the house.

Impact in the area will not just be visual- there will also be noise in what is an extremely quiet rural area.

I was extremely surprised that you believed that "the landscape to the immediate North of Wick Lane is not particularly sensitive and could possibly accommodate such a development". I refer you to the BaNES Planning Services Brochure - Pensford Character Report - containing a map of the area to the North of Wick Lane which is a designated Conservation Area with sixteen structures on the statutory list of Buildings of Special Architectural and Historic Interest in Pensford and one scheduled ancient monument. Surely this is a gross error.

In the section on Highways you recognise that "the reduction of the traffic generation from the former industrial site would be of benefit, whilst recognising that the site is not in a sustainable location" and that "use of this site would be unlikely to reduce reliance on the use of private vehicles" and that "a full highways assessment should be conducted to assess this need and assess the level of development that the site and surrounding highway network could accommodate".

I would like to point out that:

- traffic movement is significant in the lane;
- planning permission for Tia Filer Coaches has been refused

- one of the reasons being traffic; - that you state that this is NOT a sustainable location;
- in the DPD you state that "Reducing reliance on car travel is an important objective of local and national policy"

Given the above why is the site on the short list, let alone in the 8 week consultation process? Surely if a highways assessment was required for a severely constrained site, wouldn't it have been better to get an idea of what the approximate needs were and whether they could be accommodated? Or does the Council propose to compulsorily purchase land to widen the road to accommodate the development? Such a move would be highly inappropriate in the Green Belt, not to mention changing the rural character of the area and impacting on Pensford's Conservation Area.

In the Site Constraints section you point out that remediation works are required and a land contamination survey is required and available from the land owner. There is a survey on the BaNES website which accompanies the planning application number 10/03029/REN. Contamination of the site will be covered in a later section.

Sustainability Appraisal

This document is dated April 2012 but was not available to the public until after 15 May 2012. It would have been helpful to have had access to this document before the Cabinet meeting on 9 May and the Scrutiny Panel Meeting on 15 May.

Objective 3:

"Would provide a large site as well as potentially permanent and transit needs". Large sites are contrary to National guidelines, please refer to the Government's EIA March 2012 and I understand that Gypsy Traveller communities do not like a mix of permanent and transit pitches because the permanent residents cannot be sure who is on the transit pitches. You also state that 'Condition of allocation to make provision for affordable accommodation to meet identified need'. Local residents have estimated the cost of providing the site at anything between £2-4 million, including mains sewerage; remediation; upgrade to highways and utilities costing between £100k - £200k per pitch. This is not affordable unless the number of pitches is expanded considerably which would be totally inappropriate.

Objective 4:

Promote safer stronger and more vibrant and cohesive communities. You state "Not in a sustainable location due to lack of facilities and access to local settlements. Would be isolated from local settlement which may give rise to tension with local communities due to allocation of site in rural location and adjacent to residential properties" -you have no recommendations to mitigate. You also state that the "existing site does suffer vandalism so occupation of the site could be beneficial" - I have spoken to residents who have lived in the vicinity for a long period and no one that I have spoken to remembers any vandalism, apart from some graffiti on the Dabro sign by the entrance to the site.

You also acknowledge that the allocation of the site "may give rise to criminal offenses regarding protected habitats". The site at the rear of Churchlands in Glutton was next door to an SNCI and this was one of the reasons that the site was rejected, yet you acknowledge that the Stanton Wick site is the habitat of a protected species which could be impacted so how will this environment be safeguarded?

Objective 5:

You state that there is ample provision of primary and secondary education in the area but I dispute that the sort of numbers that are estimated - up to 80 primary school age children cannot be accommodated in the nearby schools. There is little employment in the Chew Valley and permitting business use on the site would be unfair especially as Tia Filer coaches next door has been refused planning permission to park 8 extra buses.

Objective 6:

Whilst I totally agree with sustainable construction principles I believe that only the buildings are 'brownfield' not the whole of the slag heap and tip. The current planning permission restricts the use of the 'ancillary buildings' to prevent over intensive use of the site. This suggests that only the buildings/footprint of the buildings can be developed, this does not including the spaces in between the buildings nor the rest of the site be developed.

Objective 7:

You state that the site is "not sustainably located for access to public transport" and you have no recommendations to

mitigate. I do not believe that there is a public footpath from the site to Pensford. There is a public footpath on the land owned by the Winding House next door but this is a challenging walk, muddy, steep, unpaved and unlit. There would be an increase in the reliance on fossil fuels arising from the use of private vehicles.

Objective 8:

This is a historically sensitive site being the last red brick colliery in England and should be treated with the sensitivity that the site and the local community deserve. There are numerous restrictions with the current planning permission which must be adhered to. Whilst redevelopment of existing buildings may well improve the existing setting, siting caravans amongst historic buildings will surely detract from the character of the area as an old colliery? Surely a single dwelling would be a far more sensitive development?

Objective 9:

Protect habitat and biodiversity- there is a real risk that the habitat of the greater and lesser horseshoe bat could be diminished, the TPOs compromised and the SNCI ignored. There has been no attempt to survey the area to ascertain the extent of the habitat of the horseshoe bat. This area is of real importance to the local wildlife and the local community.

Objective 10:

A large development on a quiet rural lane will have a real impact on the air and noise pollution even in the short term. On Wick Lane there are houses very close to and even right on the very narrow lane. The significant increase in traffic (60 cars plus) will produce air pollution and increase the level of traffic noise for the settled community. In addition, the increase in population including a significant number of children playing outside will increase the amount for noise for the residents of Wick Lane who chose to live in a quiet rural area, away from built up areas. This will significantly impact on our quality of life.

In summary, the Sustainability Appraisal is based on unfair mitigation/enhancement (education and business facilities on-site that would not be permitted for the settled community) and does not seek to maximise the protection of the historical setting not the ecological habitat which are of great importance to the settled community. In addition there is no mitigation for the unsustainable location and the reliance on private vehicles which is contrary to both your own and national guidelines.

Consultation

I have been extremely frustrated by the whole process thus far and, after speaking to numerous residents, including those in Radstock, Keynsham and Whitchurch, they appear to have the same view.

Development of any nature in Green Belt is a particularly difficult balancing act and the development of Gypsy Traveller sites can be emotive. I would have thought that B&NES would have sensibly recognised this and behaved accordingly. There was no reason for the process to be so fraught and to have piled huge amounts of stress onto the local populations in Stanton Wick (including Stanton Drew & Pensford & Publow), Ellsbridge House & Snapdragons Nursery and Radstock.

I feel that the consultation has been barely addressed, both in the pre-planning stages, when the government's March 2012 guidance included early consultation with the settled communities, and up until now.

Consultation Documentation

The DPD and call for sites has a picture of the Stanton Wick site taken from the next door field showing the telephone mast and the top of one of the buildings in Filers Coaches - this seems to suggest that the site was pre-determined.

The consultation documentation is of extremely poor quality with numerous errors as detailed above. How can proper consultation take place when it is based on erroneous material?

The claim by the Council with regard to consultation is disingenuous. I understand that there were no advertisements in local papers but there were press releases which were picked up by the Bath Chronicle & the North Somerset Guardian, two papers that are not that widely available within the Chew Valley- the area of the largest site. It is also claimed that

Parish Councils were consulted. Again, disingenuous as they were only consulted on the DPD not the individual sites until 17/18 April 2012.

I cannot understand why there wasn't any proper pre-consultation on each site -at least with the Parish Councils- for such a sensitive issue and to at least check the validity of the data to be used. The Parish Councils would have been able to point out missed data (impact on Pensford Conservation Area) and incorrect data. Early and effective consultation is clearly advocated within the March 2012 government guidelines.

It is not acceptable to hide behind the phrase 'this consultation is in addition to the statutory consultation'. I reiterate that the subject is sensitive and has impacted negatively on numerous families and caused great harm. The Council has not adhered to the spirit of a proper consultation process. This has led to mistrust of the Council.

It is clear that the March 2012 government guidelines were not included in the process as there are considerations that have not been referenced by B&NES:

Planning Policy for Travellers Sites- Equality Impact Assessment, March 2012:

- that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development
- :A more permissive policy for traveller sites in relation to Green Belt can create perceptions of unfairness amongst people, which can in turn lead to community tensions. Aligning the policy, where effective, with those for general housing may help decrease the view that traveller sites receive favourable treatment in the planning system and thus reduce the community tension this view can cause. Ensuring consistency between policy for traveller and settled communities should help to address views about unfairness in the planning system. This will help to promote community cohesion which will have benefits for both the settled and traveller communities.'
- There is a potential risk that local planning authorities will only bring forward large parcels of land for sites rather than the small ones that are desired by travellers.

Council Meetings

The Cabinet meeting on 9 May to discuss the 7 preferred sites picked from a shortlist of 23, was a picture of flawed democracy. I was expecting the Cabinet to be properly briefed and to actually listen to the representations that were made by local residents. What I was not expecting was for the Councillor responsible to read from a prepared statement which must have been printed before the meeting, nor was I expecting a lecture on equality or being labelled as anti-gypsy. I was absolutely appalled, especially when Councillor Ball also stated that the sites on the original shortlist which had been discounted would not be revisited.

I was also appalled that the Scrutiny Panel's recommendation was completely ignored by Cabinet and that not one member of Cabinet attended the meeting. Roger Symonds claimed on 13 June meeting that he did attend but this is disingenuous. Attending 15 minutes of a long meeting with representations from residents and Councillors is not attending a meeting.

At the Cabinet meeting on 13 June and again after representations from the public and Councillors, Councillor Ball read from a prepared statement that the Council was listening and would take the statements into consideration when making the decisions in the September Cabinet meeting. How can the Cabinet have listened when evidence that the Stanton Wick site was so inappropriate had already been put before the Cabinet on numerous occasions, only to have our valid and substantial planning issues dismissed?

The Special Council Meeting on 18 June again the decision was pre-determined and the Liberal Democrats gave a pre-printed statement which was available before the meeting. This is in response to valid planning concerns of residents and the legal concerns made by Richard Harwood, which makes a mockery of a democratic process. This makes it quite clear that the Council are not listening

Public Consultation Meetings

I was particularly unimpressed with the quality of the information available at the Public meetings and the lack of knowledge of the officers.

Hardly any questions were answered in the meetings and those that were are open to challenge. The issue of brownfield site provoked a number of different answers:

- Meghan Rossiter stated that we have classified the site as brownfield. When challenged as to how much was brownfield Meghan stated that the 'shale' was brownfield.
- Simon de Beer stated that only the area within the developed boundary (ie the buildings and yard) will be developed and that the caravans will fit in between the buildings.
- Tim Ball stated (after a challenge on the legalities by Clarke Osborne) that the caravans would only fit within the current building footprints. Most of the residents found it difficult to obtain any useful information from your officers. In fact Meghan Rossiter was challenged on the Selection Criteria Matrix - why was the SNCI ignored on the scoring matrix and she replied that she didn't see it on 'her computer' when it is clearly marked on the Local Plan - a copy of which we brought along to the meetings. I subsequently learnt that the SNCI was brought to the Senior Planning Officer's attention in March 2012. In addition when challenged on the 'landscape to the North of Wick Lane not being particularly sensitive' when it is Pensford Conservation Area - Meghan replied that it was the Landscape Department and I was more than welcome to contact them.

I came away finding it very difficult to understand why our site had been chosen as a 'Preferred Option'.

Had this been a proper meaningful consultation process the officers would have made every effort to take notes and listen to the substantial and valid concerns and errors that were pointed out to them.

Green Belt

The proposed site of the development is well within the Green Belt. Even though there are buildings on part of the site, this does not make the whole site (or even 2.5 hectares) 'brownfield'.

Development of the site contradicts the government guidelines (Planning Policy for Travellers March 2012 & National Policy Framework March 2012); local guidelines (BaNES Local Plan) and BaNES own Planning Department (Planning Permission refusals for Tia Filer coaches.)

Some of the relevant policies are as follows:

B&NES Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007:

- Policy GB1 : the proposed development of this area would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt
- Policy GB2: the proposed development of this area would detract from the openness and rural character of this area within the designated Green Belt. (This is irrespective of how the site looks at present)

National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012

Core planning principles, item 17: the proposed development does not protect the Green Belt or recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside or support the rural community around this site.

Green Belt. item 87: this proposed development is inappropriate and will be harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved.

Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012

Introduction. Protect the Green Belt. item 4: this states that the Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development. This proposed development is inappropriate development

Policy E. traveller sites in Green Belt. item 14: "inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

Planning Policy for Travellers Sites- Equality Impact Assessment, March 2012

that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development
 And

'A more permissive policy for traveller sites in relation to Green Belt can create perceptions of unfairness amongst people, which can in turn lead to community tensions. Aligning the policy, where effective, with those for general housing may help decrease the view that traveller sites receive favourable treatment in the planning system and thus reduce the community tension this view can cause. Ensuring consistency between policy for traveller and settled communities should help to address views about unfairness in the planning system. This will help to promote community cohesion which will have benefits for both the settled and traveller communities.'

We have plenty of evidence that there have been Planning Refusals for the settled community, the reason given is Green Belt:

11/03051/FUL 13/07/11: Extend area of coach/bus stationing for an additional 10 vehicles (resubmission).

1. The proposed expansion of the area to be used for coach parking would represent 'inappropriate development' in the Green Belt, and without any very special circumstances applying, and the proposal is contrary to Policy GB1 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007.
2. The proposed expansion of the area used for coach parking and the increase in the number of vehicles parked at the site would detract from the openness and rural character of this area within the designated Green Belt, contrary to Policy GB2 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007.

09/02418/FUL 30/09/10: Extend area of coach/bus stationing for an additional 10 vehicles (resubmission)

1. The proposed expansion of the area to be used for coach parking would amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would harm the openness of the Green Belt and encroach into the countryside. All of this would be contrary to Policy GB.1 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including waste and minerals policies) adopted October 2007.
2. The proposed expansion of the area used for coach parking and the increase in the number of vehicles parked at the site would detract from the openness and rural character of this area within the designated Green Belt, contrary to Policy GB2 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007.

09/2418/QUASH 14/07/2012: High Court Judgement Quashing permitting stationing for an additional 10 vehicles.

A recent pre-planning enquiry from my next-door neighbour has been deemed by your Planning Department as 'harmful to Green Belt' (June 2011).

Green Belt & Very Special Circumstances

The Council claim that the proposed development in this case falls under 'Very Special Circumstances' in the government's Planning Policy March 2012. Policy E. traveller sites in Green Belt, item 14: "inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

The use of the word 'very' and the removal of the word 'normally' from the latest issue of this guidance means that it is to be interpreted narrowly and will only be found to apply in extremely restricted circumstances.

The council asserts that the lack of traveller sites in BaNES, the need for sites to be provided and the relative scarcity of non green belt land, which is approximately 1/3'd of the Council area, constitutes "very special circumstances." I am strongly opposed to this interpretation as I believe that this does not constitute "very special circumstances." The Council are not legally obliged to provide traveller pitches and in addition I have calculated from the Council's documentation that the whole process from 'consultation' to the publishing of the short listed sites took no more than four months (October 2011 to February 2012). There are 3 substantial MoD sites that are earmarked for housing. The reasons for not including pitches in these developments, that social housing is required and more houses can be supplied than pitches, is a choice rather than a necessity. This contradicts the fact that the Former Canteen in Radstock is proposed for 2 pitches when a

housing project was turned down as it was of poor quality.

There are also a number of tolerated unauthorised sites, why were these sites not included in the process? I understand that 3 sites have been put forward in Radstock and there were sites rejected for less substantial reasons than Stanton Wick.

This proves that there are sites available outside Green Belt therefore Very Special Circumstances cannot apply.

It cannot be claimed that the Stanton Wick site is so good that it contributes to very special circumstances. It contravenes too many guidelines on the provision of traveller sites. It is too large, too remote, the infrastructure cannot cope and it is contaminated. The costs of remediation work; providing utilities etc, will be prohibitive and therefore will not lead to affordable pitches. Any widening of the highways would be prohibitively expensive and would impact on the rural character of the area.

Brown field sites in Green Belt

I would like to comment on the Council's preference for building on land where there are/have been old buildings. There will be some locations where this is entirely appropriate, however this does not make it appropriate in all locations. On the contrary the site is still in Green Belt and again I draw the Cabinet's attention to the fact that only a very small part of the site consists of old buildings.

I refer you to planning application 10/03029/REN dated 18 March 2011, point 7. 'The guest accommodation, spa and stable shall only be used for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the main dwelling. Reason: To prevent an over intensive use of the site.'

Planning Department also acknowledge in the conditions and restrictions laid down, that the site is of special interest with regard to the materials to be used; the hard & soft landscaping required; the archaeological programme to be undertaken; the Protected Species Survey (for Bat protection); and to provide lighting that ensures the preservation of the bats natural habitat. The Council must adhere to these restrictions for any type of development on the site otherwise this will surely be inequitable.

Scale of the site & Social Integration

Stanton Wick is a small hamlet of approximately 26 houses with 60 residents. The hamlet is spread out and starts a few hundred metres from the A368 finishing at Broadoak Cottage. On Wick Lane from the proposed site to The Lilacs (after the Old Railway Bridge) there are 6 residences with approximately 21 residents using approximately 15/16 cars.

Size & Scale of the site

The size of the site planned is 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches on 2.5 hectares (approximately 6 acres- similar in size to Dale Farm in Essex which ended up with 1000 residents). Using the GT AA 2007 the average pitch is approximately 3 caravans and anything from 200m² to 500 m². Despite asking the question I have no indications of actual numbers so I have calculated the headcount as approximately 200+ people with approximately 60 vehicles and 60 caravans.

I also note that the Council's documentation states that 2.5 hectares are available for development - enough for 50 pitches or 500+ people, 150 vehicles plus and your own Detailed Site Assessment (Appendix 5 of your Preferred Options Stage) explicitly states that:

"However, the site's location outside the main settlement would also limit the impact on neighbouring residents and facilitate the Gypsy way of life by providing a site capable of accommodating several families and, potentially, future household growth."

The size of the proposed development of 20 pitches will dominate the local community by as much as 3 new residents to 1 local resident, contrary to the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites March 2012 Policy C point 12. In terms of the immediate residents, the proposed community will overwhelm them. Even 4 families, irrespective of their ethnicity, will have an impact on the current immediate residents and their rural lifestyle due to increase in noise and traffic.

In addition to ignoring the impact that the size of the proposed community will have on local residents, the Council are ignoring the fact that the recommended maximum size of site is 15 pitches which is deemed to be manageable.

horse owners driving to their paddocks; visitors - especially to the very popular Carpenters Arms.

- If a vehicle gets stuck on the lane it can be hours before the road is passable. In November 2011 a Downton Logistics Lorry got stuck on the Old Railway Bridge. It took 10 hours to get it to a safe area where it could turn around.
- Congestion in the Conservation area of Pensford is already high at peak periods.
- A Coach depot adjacent to the site already places a heavy traffic burden through to the A368. This has been previously recognised by your Planning Department. Indeed the Coach depot has had 2 planning applications turned down in the last 2 years and one is still pending, please see more details below. One of the reasons for refusal was given as "due to an increase in vehicle movements on the road system which is unsuitable to accept additional traffic by reason of its inadequate width, alignment & junction". It was also deemed to add to congestion and inconvenience for road users contrary to Policy T24 of the BaNES Local Plan.

In January the owner of the proposed site formally objected to the recent Coach Depot's application to extend this Depot to park 8 additional coaches retrospectively quoting increased traffic movements as one of his reasons.

Your own documentation states that the site is heavily constrained by its access and that 'reducing reliance on car travel is an important objective of local and national planning'.

This site is not in a sustainable area for development as all residents in Stanton Wick rely on their cars to access shops and healthcare. Any significant increase in the existing traffic on Wick Lane cannot be accommodated.

We have plenty of evidence that the settled community has been refused Planning Permission for the reason of inadequate Highways:

11/03051/FUL 13/07/11: 3. The proposal would be likely to increase vehicle movements, including those of large vehicles, on the local road system which is unsuitable to accept additional traffic by reason of its inadequate width, alignment and junctions. The proposal would therefore be likely to result in congestion and inconvenience to other road users, contrary to Policy T24 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007. 4. The proposal is in a location remote from services and public transport facilities to enable staff to access the site, and would be likely to increase the vehicle journeys to and from the site both by coaches and other vehicles. This is contrary to Government Guidance in Planning Policy Guidance. Note No 13 and the objectives in respect of reducing the adverse impact of travel on the environment, set out in Policy T1 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007.

A recent pre-planning enquiry for infill the railway cutting was deemed unsuitable by your own Planning Department. The letter stated that 'the proposed access and highway network from the A368 to the site is wholly unsuitable for the type of traffic this development would generate' (4 May 2012).

These examples are only two of a number of applications that have been refused due to poor highways .

Pressure on Local infrastructure

In your document Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) you state:

- a) Local Planning Policy Context, item 2. 7: the proposed site does not have good access to local services, facilities and public transport, it does not have safe and convenient access to the road network (Stanton Wick junction is notoriously dangerous), it will not blend in as the proposed site is on an elevated position, there are not services for foul and surface water drainage and there will be a harmful impact to local residents and local businesses due to the close proximity of this site. There are no local services within easy walking distance or served by public transport.

B&NES Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007

a) Policy T1: the proposed location is remote from services and public transport facilities. Therefore there will be an increase in vehicle journeys (not a reduction) to and from the site which will have an impact on travel journeys and the environment in this area.

Utilities

There is no mains sewage or gas. Water pressure is extremely low already impacting on the hamlet of Stanton Wick. The electricity is subject to power outages and would need to be upgraded.

Public Transport

As mentioned above the public transport network consists of two buses per hour along the A37. It would be possible to reach a bus network to Bath but only on a road with no footpath.

Schools

An influx of 50-80 children would negatively impact on the local primary schools of Pensford and Stanton Drew, increasing class size. I understand that there may technically be spaces available in the schools but reaching those capacity levels may not actually be possible due to restricted playground space in Stanton Drew and on Health & Safety grounds (fire regulations) in Pensford. This is something that you will need to investigate further rather than relying on statistics.

Healthcare

The closest GP in Chew Stoke is approximately 5 miles away from the site and there are no direct buses. In addition it is already difficult for locals to obtain appointments. Any further impact on the current facilities will require in depth investigation and resolution. Your documentation states that the surgery is in Chew Magna which is incorrect.

Shops

The closest supermarket is probably the Asda in Whitchurch which is approximately 4.5 miles away and not on a direct bus route. There is a Tesco express on the A37 on a bus route but this is not likely to be sufficient for a weekly shop for a family.

Planning Permission for local residents

As mentioned earlier, planning permission for local residents is persistently and consistently turned down due to the Green Belt and inadequate highways. This includes the pre-developed site of Tia Filers Coach Depot next door to the Old Colliery Buildings. Surely a huge development next door to the Coach Depot cannot be considered in light of this? In addition the government's Equality Impact Assessment (March 2012) recommends that Planning permission for Gypsy Traveller sites should not be given where local residents are denied permission.

Table of Local Resident Planning Permission & Outcomes

DATE: 03/01/12

APPLICATION PROPERTY OR NUMBER: 12/00239/FUL DESCRIPTION: Erection of extensions, removal of Withdrawn on advice lean-to store to barn, internal of Planning Dept alterations and extension of accommodation into attached barn
OUTCOME: Withdrawn on advice of Planning Dept

DATE: 03/01/12

APPLICATION PROPERTY OR NUMBER: 12/00240/LBA

DESCRIPTION: Internal and external alterations for the erection of extensions, removal of lean-to store to barn, internal alterations and extension of accommodation into attached barn
OUTCOME: Withdrawn on advice of Planning Dept

DATE: 25/11/11

APPLICATION PROPERTY OR NUMBER: 11/05078NAR

DESCRIPTION: Variation of condition 4 of application WC 6174/E to increase number of coaches kept on site from 12 to 20
OUTCOME: Still pending

DATE: 30/07/11

APPLICATION PROPERTY OR NUMBER:11/03051/FUL

DESCRIPTION: Extend area of coach/bus stationing for an additional 10 vehicles

OUTCOME: Refused – Green Belt - highways

DATE: 30/12/10

APPLICATION PROPERTY OR NUMBER: *10/01429/FUL

DESCRIPTION: Change of use and conversion of ancillary accommodation to self-contained dwelling and variation of condition 7 of PP 05/02227/FUL

OUTCOME: Refused – Policy ET9, Green Belt, fails to demonstrate that bats won't be affected

DATE: 30/09/10

APPLICATION PROPERTY OR NUMBER: 09/02418/FUL

DESCRIPTION: Extend area of coach/bus stationing for an additional 10 vehicles

OUTCOME: Refused – Green Belt - highways

DATE:14/12/07

APPLICATION PROPERTY OR NUMBER: 07/03172

DESCRIPTION: Change of use of land from B2 to parking and storage of vehicles

OUTCOME: Green Belt, Highways, remote from services, employment

Hazardous Site

The site is hazardous there is evidence that it is contaminated with arsenic, has mine shafts (one of which has recently fallen in and required recapping) and potentially unstable slag heaps, in addition the land is of poor quality. I find it difficult to believe that The Old Colliery Buildings will benefit gypsy/travellers' health and wellbeing and make a suitable site for them.

Contamination

There is a Sanctus report, commissioned by the current owner of the site, which is on the B&NES planning area of the website. This report accompanies the current planning permission of 10/03029/REN. It appears that this report was not taken into consideration in the early stages of the process.

Mining Hazards

There is known to be one mine shaft on the site and it is possible that there are other shafts. A full investigation will need to be undertaken.

Remediation Costs

The remediation costs have been estimated at in excess of £1 million to remove the arsenic contamination from the whole site (to a depth of 600mm as per the recommendation in the Sanctus report). The site will require a full survey and possible remediation, not only of the contamination but of other hazards such as the mineshafts and any vertical and horizontal tunnels, to ensure that the site can be made safe.

This surely will impact on the 'affordable housing' claims within your documentation.

Traveller Requirements

Sites & Best Practice

I refer you to the Government Guidance- Designing Gypsy Traveller Sites. I do not believe that the site will adhere to the Government's Best Practice Guidelines, especially in relation to the Health & Safety aspects. There will need to be an efficient water supply and good access for Fire vehicles to comply with fire regulations.

I also believe that the restrictions on the development of the small 'brownfield' area will not allow Best Practice layouts and turning areas.

Routes

in the last 10 years I believe that the vast majority of the 18 unauthorised sites in BaNES have been around the Bath area, in order to take advantage of the proximity to the motorway network. The Stanton Wick site is remote and far removed from the motorway networks.

Gypsy Travellers needs within BaNES

The GTTA 2007 states that the majority of the Travellers within BaNES are New Age Travellers, with some smaller numbers of Irish Travellers

. I would like to understand which group of Gypsy Travellers would be allocated to the Stanton Wick site, as the different groups are unlikely to share sites. I know that the Irish and Roma Gypsies have protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010.

The Senior Planning Officer responsible for this project has stated that the individual who brought forward the site in November 2011 was Maggie Smith-Bendall.

I would like to understand whether the site is likely to be allocated to either New Age Travellers or Irish Travellers- the two Groups identified with needs in the GT AA 2007, or whether the site will be allocated to the Roma Gypsy community - a group that has not been identified with needs in the BaNES area. If the latter is the case then what impact will this have on the former groups who will still have a requirement for settled and transit pitches?

Summary

[Reference from site scoring matrix set out in the council's detailed site assessment report]

- Proximity to Food shop via a safe walking route. Not a food shop - a post office with small grocery shop - not a safe walking route. Should score 0.
- Proximity to Primary School via a safe walking route. Not a safe walking route. Should score 0.
- Proximity to a public transport node via a safe walking route. Not a safe walking route. Should score 0. The public footpath identified in some of your documentation is not from the site itself and is challenging for a twice a day walk. It is steep, muddy, unpaved and unlit and is on private land, in addition it passes close by a possible nesting/hibernation site for a European protected species. There are buses from Pensford but they are only 2 an hour and do not directly connect with supermarkets or the GP surgery.
- Site Screening - Impossible to completely screen from The Winding House - 3 storey building 1 metre from the north boundary and overlooks site. Should score 0.
- Wildlife or landscape designation - Site of Nature Conservation interest covering a large proportion of site excludes built area. Acknowledged in Sustainability Appraisal Report, therefore should score -5.
- It is a hazardous place, arsenic contamination, unstable slag heap and disused mines. Should score 0.
- Safe Access to Public Highway- issues accessing the main roads A37 & A368. Should score 0.
- Noise Issues. The site is in a quiet rural area and an increase in residents will come with an increase in noise - both from people and traffic, which will have a real negative impact on residents. Should therefore score -5. My house windows are directly on the lane therefore any increase in traffic will have a detrimental impact on my family's life.

Other Issues

- The criteria matrix was barely amended from original in DPD after 39 pages of responses from Consultation 21 November 2011 to 16 January 2012. This was acknowledged by Meghan Rossiter during questioning in the Scrutiny Panel meeting on 15 May 2012.
- One access to & from site leads straight into Pensford Conservation Area. This was one of the reasons that the Queen Charlton site was not short listed. There should have been an actual score for the impact on Conservation Areas. This could

easily have been accommodated by -1 0 = impact upon Conservation Area within 1 mile. Within Conservation Area= -20. Proximity to public transport - public transport is sporadic therefore there will be a reliance on car travel - site will increase car travel contrary to comments 'reducing reliance on car travel is an important objective of local and national policy.' How can a site that depends on car travel be in the top 6 preferred sites?

- Your own Preferred Options Stage- Detailed Site Assessment Table (Appendix 5) states: Highways -Previous Planning Permission 05/02227/FUL accepted that "the reduction in traffic generation from the former industrial use of the site would be of benefit, whilst recognising that the site is not in a sustainable location".
- There is a real possibility that this site cannot be properly designated as 'brownfield' and therefore 5 more points may need to be removed

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3000 / 4 Name: Karen Abolkheir Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Communication and Consultation

- 1.Can you please explain why the communities of Stanton Wick, Stanton Drew & Pensford were not contacted in November/December 2011 in order for them to be consulted on issues such as the proposed scoring criteria?
- 2.I understand that there was media coverage in the Somerset Guardian and the Bath Chronicle, can you please let me know when the same announcement was placed in the Chew Valley Gazette, the local paper that covers the Stanton Wick area?
- 3.As no one in the local area found out about the proposals for the Old Colliery Buildings in mid-April 2012, including local residents, the Parish Councils, the Lib Dem Councillor for Clutton & Stanton Wick, does the Council consider that their communication & consultation strategy in this case was fit for purpose?
- 4.Can you please explain why the communities of Stanton Wick, Stanton Drew & Pensford were not contacted prior to the confirmation of the site on the short list in order for some local consultation as per the recommendations in the government's Planning Policy for Travellers March 2012?
- 5.Can you please confirm that the local Parish Councils in this area were invited to the Local Parish Group meeting on 19 October 2012 and:
 - a)who was invited
 - b)who attended
- 6.Can you please confirm that you sent posters and leaflets to publicise the matter and to whom were they sent? Please may I have copies of the same?
- 7.Can you please explain why the local Parish Councils were not engaged in the process before the short list was published?
- 8.Can you please confirm how the site came to the attention of the Council and
 - a) Who spoke to the Council regarding the site and
 - b)on which date?

DPD

- 9.There is no date on the DPD, could you please confirm the date the document was issued?
- 10.Can you please confirm the date that the DPD was sent to Publow & Pensford and Stanton Drew Parish Councils?
 - a)To whom was it sent and
 - b)what was the method of delivery
- 11.Can you please confirm the date that the DPD local councillors such as Jeremy Sparkes (for Clutton & Stanton Wick)

were sent a copy?

Criteria Table

12. Can you please let me know how you have defined 'food shop'?

13. Can you please let me know how you have defined 'a safe walking route'?

14. Can you please let me know if you set a minimum number of points to be scored using the criteria table which sites had to score if they were to be put forward for the short list? What was the minimum number that had to be scored?

Planning Policy for Travellers March 2012

15. Policy E, paragraph 14 - Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Can you please explain why the Council have chosen to ignore this especially when other planning applications by local residents have been refused on the grounds of Green Belt?

16. Very Special Circumstances should be so unique, making any replication of the circumstances almost negligible. Please can the Council explain how they justify this approach, especially when it appears from the documentation that the whole process has taken only 4 months?

17. Plan-making Policy B: states the following:

a) Point 9d: relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density; Policy C - Sites in rural areas and the countryside: When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community.

Can you please explain how the Council can justify placing this site of 20 pitches on the short list when it will dwarf the local community by a scale of between 3 or 4 gypsy travellers to 1 local resident by our own calculations?

b) Point 9e: protect local amenity and environment

The amenities in the local area are insufficient to cope with even a small increase in population so can you please explain why the Council have not taken this into account when drawing up the short list?

18. 'Local planning authorities should ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally. Local planning authorities should, therefore, ensure that their policies:'

o promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community

o avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services

As the proposed population will dwarf the local community and the local infrastructure is inadequate to deal with even a small increase in population, due to poor accessibility; lack of adequate utilities etc, can you please explain how this will:

a) promote peaceful and integrated co-existence and

b) avoid placing pressure on the local infrastructure?

Site Assessment Report – Appendix 5 Preferred Options Stage

19. Can you please confirm the source of the information detailed in the table, especially in relation to utilities and on-site services?

20. Can you confirm that you believe the site benefits from existing on-site services and utilities and what these are?

21. Can you confirm whether or not the Council is aware that there is no mains sewerage (we have septic tanks) no mains gas, an inadequate water supply and electricity supply that is susceptible to outages?

22. Please can you confirm how many residences you believe are in the immediate area – only the Winding House is identified?

23. The assessment has noted that the development of the site would not directly assist the aim of social integration which I believe is key to the success of a site. Please can you explain why it is believed that this will promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community as laid out in the Planning Policy for Travellers?

24. The local community has already established that the proposed development of 20 pitches would dwarf the current settlement. Please can you explain why the assessment states that the site can potentially accommodate future household growth?

25. Please can you give me the evidence that Children's Services provided that indicates that it would be easier to obtain a primary school place in this area than near other sites?

26. Please can you explain why the Council believe that the landscape to the immediate north of Wick Lane is not

particularly sensitive, given that it is in Green Belt?

27. Can you please explain why the site is on the short list if access to the site is constrained for the following reasons:

- a) Wick Lane is a C road and a substantially single track with few passing places especially on the way into Pensford
- b) reduced visibility on three 90o bends
- c) the congestion at the bottom of the road in Pensford from the bridge to the post office
- d) reduced visibility on the exit to the A368 which has a 60 mph speed limit
- e) potential conflict between road users due to the nature of the single track
- f) Two old narrow bridges (one on Wick Lane near The Lilacs and one in Pensford)

28. Please can you justify why the site is on the short list when we believe it can be demonstrated that there is a reliance on the use of private vehicles in order to access supermarkets and GP surgeries?

29. Can you please explain why the Council believe that there is a local food shop within walking distance as the small shop in Pensford would not be appropriate for the weekly shop nor could the walk to the shop be considered to be safe, especially if there is an increase in traffic?

30. Please can the Council justify that the context of the site reduces the harm which would be caused by the development and the conclusion that the conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt designation would be of moderate weight when far smaller developments in the area have been turned down?

31. If the Council believes that the development of the site is achievable and affordable budgetary costing must have been considered. Can you please give me these budgetary costs?

32. Can the Council please confirm how many caravans/cars/people are anticipated on 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches as we believe that this could be as many as 200 people?

Site Score Matrix

33. Can you please clarify why the site is on the short list when it scored 10 points, ranked 17th out of a possible 23?

34. Can you please explain why potential sites which ranked (far) higher are not on the short list for reasons that appear to be insignificant when compared to the constraints on the Stanton Wick site?

35. Can you please explain why the score is 1 and not 0 for Proximity to a food shop; Primary School and Public Transport when:

- a) the shop isn't sufficient for a weekly shop
- b) The Primary School is almost at capacity
- c) None of these facilities are accessible via a safe walking route (single track, frequently muddy, steep, no pavement, no lights, reduced visibility on two 90o degree bends)

36. Can you please explain why there is a score of 5 and not 0 for a Hazardous Place when the site is above disused mines and mine shafts (one of which has recently collapsed and is being recapped); the slag heap may not be stable and there has been known to be arsenic contamination which may well still be present?

37. Please can you explain why there is a score of 5 and not 0 for Safe Access to the Public Highway when there are constraints on Wick Lane as described in point 27. above and at both ends of the road in Pensford and Stanton Wick to access the A37 and the A368 respectively?

38. Please can you explain why there is a score of 5 and not 0 for Brownfield site as it is not a 'brownfield site' it is in the Green Belt?

Preferred Options documents

39. Please can you confirm the date the short list was completed?

40. Please can you confirm who made the final decision on the short list and what advice did they receive when compiling it?

41. Buildings could be used for education and health facilities – please can the Council explain how they can justify this?

42. Please can you confirm how and when the Council informed the local communities closest to the site that it was on the short list?

General

43. Please can you confirm whether or not the landowner has already sold the site? If he has, please can you confirm who bought it?

44. Who will ensure that the ground is safe with regard to the arsenic contamination, the mine shafts and the potentially unstable slag heap?

45. One of your documents state that there is Case Law in relation to gypsy sites on Greenbelt? Can you please give me the relevant case numbers?

46. Can you please confirm the cost of those issues relating to unauthorised gypsy/traveller sites in BANES in the past year?

47. Can you please explain why there is £1.8 million in the budget for 15 transit pitches for this year when the consultation period appears to go on until the end of 2013?

48. Can you please clarify why this site has been chosen when it appears that the vast majority of the 18 unauthorised gypsy/traveller sites in the past 10 years have been around Bath where there is far better access to major road networks?

49. Can you please confirm that the Council will ensure that any unauthorised development is dealt with swiftly and with the full force of the law?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3001 / 1 Name: Mr Kenneth Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I wish to formally lodge my objection against the proposed permanent traveller site at the above address.

Herein are my main points of objection:

1. The proposed site is as I understand contaminated land.
2. Wick Lane is a single track road which is extremely narrow bordered by hedgerow. It is unsuitable for regular traffic and contains no passing areas and no footpath. It is a popular cyclist route between Pensford, Stanton Wick and beyond.
3. The site has no utility services and therefore there would be major works needed that would affect the current road system in the vicinity.
4. The site would generate additional traffic both in Wick Lane and the surrounding network.
5. I also believe that the disused mine shafts are unsafe with NCB recently carrying out works to make safe open mines.
6. Historically, these sorts of sites have expanded from their original allocations of dwellings without any control from local authorities. Dale Farm is a very recent example of this.
7. The local vicinity does not have sufficient schools or amenities to accommodate additional dwellings. This would also apply if the site was to be developed for housing.
8. The Draft Core Strategy has identified the need for 22 permanent pitches, 20 transit and 1 yard for showmen. There is no limit to how many people can live in each pitch therefore there is the potential for the area to be overwhelmed by additional people. It is likely that each pitch would contain at least 4 people together with the additional vehicles and animals that would accompany them.
9. Currently the area is popular with tourists due to the unspoilt nature and large green belt. Further development would be detrimental to the local economy as it may deter tourism and businesses.
10. If the occupants are intending to work then it is likely that they would have to make commuter journeys into Bath or Bristol adding to already congested areas.
11. Historically these sorts of sites have attracted undesirable activity. This has the potential to increase crime, putting additional strain on already stretched Police resources.
12. Other sites in other areas of the country become unkempt after a relatively short space of time and this leads to health and safety issues to the occupants and neighbours.
- 13.1 refer to planning application ref 10/01429/FUL which was refused on the following grounds: "that the site is in a location remote from public services and community facilities. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policy ET.9 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) Adopted October 2007 and given that the

application fails to satisfy the requirements of Policy ET.9 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) Adopted October 2007, the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and is therefore harmful to the Green Belt by definition. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policy GB.1 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) Adopted October 2007."

14. In regard to the above point, it would also appear that bats are present in the vicinity and therefore as a protected species this would be contrary to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.

I also note that the application ref 11/05078NAR appears to have to consider constraints in regard to Greenbelt, Agricultural Land and Airport Safeguarding Zones. Surely this applies to all surrounding areas of Wick Lane.

I moved to the village of Pensford in August 2010. I was attracted by the village community setting but I am now worried that my quality of life will be affected by development. I wish to make it clear that I would oppose any further development of the village and the surrounding areas whether that is residential or commercial.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3001 / 1 Name: Mr Kenneth Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

None other than the site in Pensford is totally unsuitable for the following reasons:

- 1) access (single lane track totally unsuitable)
- 2) Local amenities access by walking single lane track
- 3) No gas or electric, sewers/water to site

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO The Pensford site is totally unsuitable

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO I strongly disagree that the site in Pensford is suitable. I also suggest all other sites are also unsuitable.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I believe the site proposed at Pensford fails to meet most if not all of the governments recommendations for Travellers sites

Respondent: 3002 / 1 Name: David & Karen Cross Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No I do not have any evidence as to whether any of the sites put forward are suitable for this type of provision. I have information as to why the Old Colliery site at Stanton Wick is not suitable:

Green belt land.

Site of nature conservation interest.

No safe walking routes

Distance to facilities

Poor road network in immediate area

The site has not been supported for residential development in recent years.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I believe many of the constraints have not been properly considered by the council including that it is in the green belt and therefore inappropriate development, that it is a site for nature conservation, that the road infrastructure cannot cope with a large increase in traffic movements as the lane down to Pensford is very steep and narrow and in the other direction the lane to Stanton Drew is narrow with several very sharp corners while the junction out from Stanton Wick onto the

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I disagree in taking this forward as a formal allocation, particularly as I believe the number of pitches suggested for this site is far too many considering the population of the adjacent hamlet of Stanton Wick, that it is on Green Belt land, is isolated from services and facilities and not served by a road network that can accommodate a significant increase in traffic volumes.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The preferred options paper did not fully explain why the Old Colliery site had been included in the first place given that it is in Green belt, has access constraints and is not adjacent to any local services. The potential pitch provision of 15 permanent and 5 transit is stated on the option paper with no explanation as to why it is felt such a large provision should or could be accommodated on the site. The option paper appeared to give no consideration to the size of the existing adjacent hamlet and the impact the proposed development would have on this hamlet so I feel the option paper was inadequate.

Respondent: 3003 / 1 Name: Sam & Ann Budd Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I wish to comment on the Old Colliery site at Stanton Wick where the proposed large development would completely overwhelm the existing community. There is an unreliable water supply in Stanton Wick & no mains drains, the use of septic tanks would be unacceptable for such a large development. As planning applications for Filers Coaches have been refused in teh past & only permission for a single dwelling granted, how can you even contemplate such a major development?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3003 / 2 Name: Sam & Ann Budd Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

There is concrete evidence that the proposed site @ Stanton Wick Colliery is in the Green Belt & any development here would be inappropriate to this conservation. Its locality in Wick Lane cannot support any real increase in traffic volume without substantial alterations to the road network, which BaNES have previous refused. As there is no public transport within safe walking distance & the nearest Doctors Surgery is 5 miles away this makes the site most unsuitable for inhabitation.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

As a community of travellers seem settled at Twerton as their chosen site, why is this not being developed as a permanent site?

Respondent: 3003 / 3 Name: Sam & Ann Budd Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We are writing to state our strong objection to the proposal of a Travellers & Gypsy site at The Old Colliery, Stanton Wick. We are astounded that this site was even considered by Banes as it does not match any points of their criteria for a suitable location. i.e.: In the green belt. Approach by single track road. Arsenic & asbestos found on site. Collapsing mine shafts. Difficulty in obtaining water (local residents use header tanks). No mains drains., & swamping the population , - to name but a few!

We also think it is ludicrous that a site which was listed 17th out of 22 originally, suddenly became the preferred choice on a short list of seven, & why have we, the residents, only just heard of this proposal when it has been bubbling since 2010? We appreciate the beauty of Bath & consider ourselves fortunate to live in the close proximity of the Chew Valley - an area of outstanding natural beauty which the bureaucrats of Banes are trying to desecrate by allowing planning for asbestos to be dumped at Stowey Quarry & Gypsies & Travellers to reside in Stanton Wick - what next one wonders? How can you justify your actions?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3004 / 1 Name: Mr Derek Ezekiel Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Anything spilt or dumped on the site leeches into Salters Brook. A number of years ago a fertiliser pit leaked on site.

The result was ALL the wildlife living in or on the brook was wiped out.

This spillage can be verified by the local farmer and should not be confused with a subsequent fertiliser leak further upstream beyond Wick Lane.

The site has been levelled and trees pulled down (previous planning to regrade and level refused, tree preservation order on the whole site). So why should someone who has illegally made the site appealing be rewarded for his activities.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO!!!!!!!!

There has only been an "opportunity" on this site since the misguided idea of giving Banes the opportunity to move travellers from BATH. They probably do not want to come. Before this 'opportunity' arose, there was always great resistance from your own planning to literally anything happening.

Constraints

Has anybody costed the infrastructure required to support the proposed and inevitably expanded site. Take sewerage, septic tanks would not be suitable for the proposed number of people. Take water, where can it be sourced from in the quantity required and it goes on!

The slopes around the site to the North and East are very steep and would be dangerous for children.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO!!!!!!!!

The 'potential' number of pitches is enormous. The ones proposed are a starting point and is already beyond government guidelines. As the owner of the site has been quoted as saying "this could be the biggest site in the country".

Locally BANES PLANNING ENFORCEMENT have recently reported being intimidated by one old man in a caravan. He was allowed to stay "as a result of time lapse since a CLEU was applied for and refused". In other words Enforcement have not done their job and as it has taken such a long time he can stay!!

SO, if Enforcement cannot deal with one illegal caravan what happens when this site expands without planning, I think we all know the answer!

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

1. It is BANES duty to protect the Green Belt
2. The vast majority of illegal sites are near Bath. That's where they want to be, not on a windswept spoil tip far from their source of income.
3. This site would be more like a concentration camp "STALAG STANTON WICK".
4. The size, as we know, is against guidelines, overwhelms the nearby hamlet and will cause a situation between them and the settled community.
5. Locals cannot get low cost housing and need to leave the area yet money is available to bring in travellers who would prefer to be near BATH. Imagine the resentment this will cause!
6. Previous reasons for refusal of Planning on the site,

"The application will destroy a local landscape of proven and recognised nature conservation interest"

"Contrary to numerous policies of Avon County Structure Plan and Local Plans"

"Pensford Colliery Tip is remembered by many people as the remains of a way of life and must be retained"

Respondent: 3004 / 2 Name: Mr Derek Ezekiel Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

It has recently come to my attention that there is a proposal to provide a gypsy/traveller site in Stanton Wick using what was the Old Colliery area. My initial reaction was that I must have heard wrongly but I was assured that this was so.

Firstly I would think the cost of setting up this site would be phenomenal as there is no obvious infrastructure available.

The roads to and from consist of old, narrow, windy lanes and rickety bridges. Even the famous viaduct in Pensford is now not suitable for use. The only main Road A3 7 to access the smaller roads is already a very busy and congested well used main route.

Secondly, Stanton Wick is a typical hamlet and as such itself provides no modern basic family requirements such as Doctor, Dentist, Schools, Post Office, Shops and certainly no Supermarkets and to find any, means a trek of some distance. Most people around this area are on septic tanks, no main sewerage, a lot of the water supply is certainly not up to new standards, the telephone supply is subjected to accidents of nature and tall objects and of course there are no gas or cable laid. It is a typical sleepy backwater and the sort of place that no modern living young family would really choose to live in.

Usually when new housing developments are planned I thought that amenities had to be considered. Essentially a site, the size intended, would completely swamp the hamlet in numbers and integration wouldn't come into it. I believed that gypsy/traveller sites were supposed to be provided in areas where they could integrate and live with the community in harmony. Facilities should be provided which are considered to be modern by today's standards of living and therefore provide the gypsy/traveller with a better standard of living, especially for the younger generation as in providing education

In conclusion I would suggest that the proposal to situate the gypsy/traveller community in the hamlet of Stanton Wick on the Old Colliery site is probably not in their best

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3004 / 3 Name: Mr Derek Ezekiel Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Please can you explain why you are wasting, mine and other tax payer's money on progressing this site for gypsies and travellers at Stanton Wick.

Having examined Government rules relating to site selection, it fails on practically all counts.

Furthermore the gypsy community have already indicated that their preferred site would be somewhere near or in Bath. A move not readily liked by your Councillors but backed up by the fact that by far the majority of illegal sites are in close proximity to Bath.

The traveller community, backed up by Government surveys, need and want to be near large settlements and major roads. They do not want to be placed on a remote windswept colliery tip, where vegetation stills finds it difficult to grow after 40 years. It would be more like a concentration camp, sending out the wrong message.

The Government's desire is to integrate not ostracise.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3004 / 4 Name: Mr Derek Ezekiel Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

1. Could you tell me if your department was approached by the Council, to ensure it was a viable option, prior to it recommending that it be a Preferred Option and subject to the current Consultation process?
 - 1.1 If you were approached what were your recommendations?
 - 1.2 Have your department, at any time told the council that this site is inappropriate?
 2. Most of the issues/concerns regarding this site seem to fall in your area of responsibility, if it gets as far as a Planning Approval,
 - 2.1 What issues would make you turn it down?
 - 2.2. What issues would make it a special case that overwhelms your normal rulings?
 - 2.3 As you work for the Council can they tell you to ignore normal practices?
 - 2.4 Is a Gypsy/Traveller site appropriate development in Green Belt?
 3. In previous Refusals on this site, amongst others, planning have cited from the Local Plan, the Keynsham and Chew Valley namely:-
 - 3.1 KCV22
 - 3.2 KCV24
 - 3.3 KCV25
 - 3.4 KCV27
- Can you point out where these have been migrated to in the BANES Local Plan which I assume supercedes it, ensuring these items are still relevant?
4. Can you tell me if this is still a County C4, C4B and C7 classified site?
 5. Similarly is BE4 and BE4A of the Third Alteration still in force?
 6. Similarly is ASMR 2246 of the Avon Sites and Monuments still in force?
 7. What steps need to be taken to ensure compliance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act cited in previous applications?
 8. In previous applications on this site planning have stated :-
 "The application will destroy a local landscape of proven and recognised nature conservation interest"
 "Contrary to numerous policies of Avon County Structure Plan and Local Plans"
 "Pensford Colliery Tip is remembered by many people as the remains of a way of life and must be retained"
- 8.1 Is this view still applicable?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3005 / 1 Name: Mrs Markina Filer Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No – I disagree. This site is on green belt. It has no facilities inc. drainage/services. The roads/lanes are totally inadequate,

will over power the village of Stanton Wick and I believe the site is toxic.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No – disagree. This site must not be taken forward. It does not have any positive aspects and does not comply with planning regulations.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

As above - :
 Green belt
 Poor access
 No services, drainage etc.
 Toxic and dangerous land – mine shafts.
 Road access will not support this application.
 Overwhelm local community.
 No public transport/doctors nearby.
 Endangered species inhabit site.

Respondent: 3005 / 1 Name: Mrs Markina Filer Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I wish to strongly object to the above proposal for the following reasons

1. Site in green belt and a local landmark
2. Very exposed
3. Site unsuitable as mine refuse tip area, toxic and with underground mineshafts
3. Single winding track lanes will not support additional traffic, already struggles with current local traffic
4. Very dangerous walking access, no pavements, very narrow windy track like lanes.
4. No mains drainage, gas or adequate water supply and electricity
5. No local amenities nearby, shops or doctors' surgery
6. Proposed new traveller population would outnumber local villagers massively.
7. Contravenes local planning regulations
8. Matrix system used for scoring site very unjust should be evaluated on the same basis as a proposed residential development/ static holiday units.

Why should Travellers be offered a site that would be strongly objected to under current planning regulations for anyone else!

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3006 / 1 Name: Dr Chris Ree Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

As a resident of Stanton wick for 14 yrs I wish to register my opinion that this proposal is very ill advised for many reasons and I would urge you to consider withdrawing the Stanton wick option from the list under consideration.

There are multiple reasons for this and I will state them simply as no doubt you will be aware of all the details.

1. It contravenes recent government guidance on green belt development and fundamentally breaches the clause which states that such development should only be considered in 'very special' circumstances. I have not seen any convincing justification for disregarding this very clear instruction. It seems to me that given that the inclusion of this site has been decided over a period of a mere four months that there is not the remotest possibility that this instruction has been considered properly.
2. I understand other applications for other uses have been made on this land have been rejected for various reasons. The impact of the current proposal on the area and its infrastructure is likely to be far greater and so it is hard to see why this proposal is sustainable given the precedents of previous applications. The reasons given for previous rejections still stand.
3. The size of the development is such that it will overwhelm the local hamlet and constitute a major change to the make up of a quiet rural hamlet and local small village. It is hard to see how this proposal promotes social integration as espoused in Planning Policy for Travellers. ('When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community').
4. I fail to see why it is on the short list when according to your own scoring matrix it scored 10 points and so was ranked 17th out of a total of 23. This suggests some form of arbitrary decision making has occurred and it only seems fair to know the basis for this. It is as if the decision is pre-determined by higher powers; the justification for this needs to be made known to others so that comment can be offered. Some of the points allocation of the scoring matrix are highly dubious and so the true score may be substantially lower with consequent lower ranking.
5. Local amenities are poor: there is no local doctor, the local shop is small and unsuitable for regular family shopping, there are no jobs and the immediate school is full. Large numbers of children at other local schools would massively overwhelm these schools and fundamentally change their character. In the face of such numbers 'integration' will be very hard.
6. Access is poor to Pensford with a steep hill, several blind corners, very slippery in winter and dangerous for people travelling by foot. There is no 'safe walking route'.
7. Road access is poor in all directions with single track road, several blind bends and dangerous T junctions. In icy weather the roads are particularly dangerous. The traffic implications of this proposal are massive and far outweigh those of previous applications for other uses.
8. Issues of site contamination (arsenic) and mineworkings constitute significant health hazard which is likely to be hard to measure. Any costs to remedy these problems are likely to be high and these costs are unlikely to be applicable to other potential sites.

Finally the communication of these proposals to the local community has been non existent given that they were initially considered in Nov/ Dec and the community (including parish councils) only becoming aware of it in mid April, a matter of a few weeks before important decisions being made in the Cabinet meeting 9/5/12. This is does not in any way reflect the localism and transparency rhetoric of Banes and there is clearly a yawning gap between this rhetoric and actual events of which Banes should be ashamed.

I do appreciate that decisions in this area of planning are never easy and the pros and cons of each proposal must be weighed carefully. But I would submit that the scale of this proposal is totally inappropriate for all the reasons above. As ever politics plays a part in these things and I would urge you not to let political considerations obscure the considerable weight of evidence that the Stanton Wick site would be an untenable and unsustainable option.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3006 / 2 Name: Dr Chris Ree Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I have read the BANES documentation. I do not understand how using its own matrix that the Stanton wick site which scored 20th on the BANES matrix ended up in the list of 6 preferred sites. This suggests to me that the result was predetermined in discussions which have not been made public.

My main focus is on the Stanton Wick site. I have some knowledge of the others. As it states in its own matrix the site is contaminated, has poor access to primary schools, poor road access, no mains drainage, poor water supply, poor walking access, few local amenities and poor employment prospects.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. The Stanton Wick site is plainly unsuitable. It is in the green belt as such constitutes inappropriate development, it has appalling access as there is no safe walking route to schools, there are no substantial local food shops, the vehicular access whichever way you go is poor. There are no employment opportunities. Most importantly the size of the proposal means that it will overwhelm the local community and fundamentally alter the character of that community. There is very poor access to doctors which is important for a group known to have high health needs. There is no mention of proximity to Pensford conservation area and its substantial historic significance. I do not understand how the issue of arsenic contamination is being taken so lightly. Government guidance states that this should be dealt with (by the owner) BEFORE the site is considered and this is being completely ignored. I am informed that the water supply is poor and would be difficult to correct

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

- The size of the Stanton Wick proposal will overwhelm and dwarf the local community.
- Importantly, it will be impossible to limit expansion (legal or otherwise) and the Banes document acknowledges openly that there is capacity for 50 sites. It is inevitable that such expansion will occur as has happened in so many other parts of the country and it will be impossible for BANES to control. This strengthens all the arguments above and further overwhelms local amenities, infrastructure, schools etc etc.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

- Best practice says the site should be decontaminated before consideration. Furthermore the site is potentially dangerous
- It is in the green belt and the arguments for siting a G&T site in Stanton Wick do not constitute special circumstances particularly when there are so many arguments against it.
- Previous Banes decisions on other planning applications nearby have cited inappropriate development in the green belt and inability to support increases in traffic volume. The impact of a G&T site at the Stanton wick location would be vastly greater by several orders of magnitude than any previous proposal.
- The cost of work to water supply, sewage, roads and decontamination to the taxpayer would be massive.

Respondent: Name: Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes, I do have information about the site at Stanton Wick.

My information is that the site is entirely unsuitable for the proposed gypsy and traveller site in both location and capacity planned, for a large number of reasons:

- It is inappropriate development in green belt
- A site of this size would overwhelm the existing settled community (up to 3 to 1)
- How can BaNES provide a guarantee that unauthorised and uncontrolled expansion of the site would be prevented, given that the actual site is much larger than the area earmarked?
- How can this development suddenly be appropriate when planning applications have been refused in the past, with

inappropriate green belt development being cited as the reason for refusal?

-The roads to the site can't support any real increase in traffic volume without considerable alteration. (Traffic volume has also been cited by BaNES in previous refusals)

-No safe walking route along the roads to either local schools

-Nearest Doctor's surgery is in Chew Stoke, 5 miles away, with no public transport. I am married to a village agent for the Chew Valley, and the biggest issue for her is isolation and lack of transport, particularly to medical appointments. The voluntary community transport is already under considerable strain just serving the existing communities in the Chew Valley.

-No public transport within safe walking distance

-Limited employment in the area

-The only shop in Pensford not within safe walking distance

-The land at the site is contaminated, and unsafe with uncapped mineshafts liable to subsidence and would require significant financial funding from the council to make it safe.

-In effect the council would be creating a ghetto, which would not be in the interests of the travellers community nor the existing settled community

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO, I don't agree with the Council's assessment that this site represents a viable location to establish a gypsy and traveller site, for all the reasons I have stated in the previous question.

I think that the constraints far outweigh any perceived opportunity, and the council seems to have underplayed the constraints.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO I don't agree that this Stanton Wick site should be taken forward as a formal allocation.

This is a remote and isolated site, which would require a huge amount of money spent on it to make it in any way fit the government recommendations for these sites, but even if this money was spent, that does not change the fact that it is not close enough to schools, transport, doctors, and with insufficient transport. The effect of putting this site here would be to create a ghetto, with no social integration into the local existing community, and perpetuate the health and education issues for the travellers community.

This is a very bad idea, not thought through at all.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I do agree with and accept that there is a need for proper provision for gypsy and traveller sites, and that this is a section of our society whose needs are not currently met. I support BaNES in their stated intention to further this aim, but I don't believe that putting them into sites that are not at all suitable will help the gypsy and traveller community. Quite the opposite. And at the same time, create a negative impact on the local settled community here.

The selection of this site seems to fly in the face of the government guidelines for provision of gypsy and traveller sites, as it runs contrary to all the guidance given. It is difficult to understand why this site was identified as an opportunity at all.

Respondent: 3007 / 1 Name: Mr Jim & Diane Farmer

Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We would like to register our disapproval of the above. Occupation on this site would dwarf the hamlet of Stanton Wick. The site is in Green Belt and therefore planning should not be approved. There are no shops or doctor within the recommended distance, insufficient walking, road and public transport access. There is also contamination on the site. The Governments localised agenda place decisions on neighbourhoods in the hands of the people who live in them. The gypsy who spoke at the May 9th meeting said they wished to live near Bath. Maybe it is because the cabinet members all live in or around Bath that no site has been chosen there? Although the cabinet have said they wish to consult and have dialogue with the electorate how can this happen if the cabinet refuse to answer questions via e mail?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3007 / 1 Name: Mr Jim & Diane Farmer Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

We would like to register our disapproval of the above. Occupation on this site would dwarf the hamlet of Stanton Wick. The site is in Green Belt and therefore planning should not be approved. There are no shops or doctor within the recommended distance, insufficient walking, road and public transport access. There is also contamination on the site. The Governments localised agenda place decisions on neighbourhoods in the hands of the people who live in them. The gypsy who. spoke at the May 9th meeting said they wished to live near Bath. Maybe it is because the cabinet members all live in or around Bath that no site has_ been chosen there? Although the cabinet have said they wish to consult and have dialogue with the electorate how--can- this happen if the cabinet refuse to answer questions via email?

Respondent: 3007 / 1 Name: Mr Jim & Diane Farmer Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I understand that the gypsies are happy on their illegal sites - so why not make them legal?
 I also understand that land has been offered near Keynsham? Is this not suitable?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree with the proposed site at Stanton Wick. The most obvious reason being that it is Greenbelt. Planning has been previously turned down here because of this and contaminated land - what has changed? It also has several old mineshafts. Has this been investigated as to the fact they could subside in the future? It would practically double the Stanton Wick community which has no mains sewage, no public transport and very narrow lanes to reach Pensford or Stanton Drew.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3008 / 1 Name: Stuart Bradbury Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing this e-mail with regard to the proposal by Bath and North East Somerset Council to locate a gypsy and travellers site at the Old Colliery Buildings at Stanton Wick.

Whilst I understand that BANES has a responsibility to provide suitable sites for the travelling community I find it very hard to understand the reasoning behind planning a site at Stanton Wick and I'll outline my reasons below.

Stanton Wick is a very small hamlet and a site of the size proposed would more than double the local population. The road infrastructure is clearly inadequate especially as there are no pavements. There are no local facilities nearby at all (no doctor, no shop and no public transport links etc..). There is little or no capacity in the locals schools. I would imagine that if an environmental study was carried out at the old colliery there is sure to be soil contamination and old mineshafts present. I wonder if you fell that this would be a suitable enviroment for children?

Stanton Wick has no mains drainage so I suspect there would need to be very special consideration to waste management too not to mention the need for large water header tanks to deal with the low flow rate.

Lastly the gypsy and traveller communities like to live close to larger populated areas which recent history shows to be the case with unauthorized sites around Bath and Keynsham.

Whilst I understand the Old Colliery itself is designated 'Brown Field' it is very clearly within the 'Green Belt' and should not be used for such a development and I would urge you to assist in removing the Old Colliery at Stanton Wick from the proposed sites for Gypsies and Travellers.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3009 / 1 Name: Karen & Lyne Mark Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing concerning the proposal by BANES for The Old Colliery at Stanton Wick to become a Gypsy and Traveller site. Whilst I fully appreciate the urgent need to provide suitable sites for this community, I oppose the selection of Stanton

Wick in this case, and there are many reasons to do so.

The key question is why do BANES consider this site to be at all suitable. In BANES own document, Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) Issues and Options Paper, the criteria for the selection of sites are set out. Stanton Wick presents the direct opposite of nearly all the identified criteria, such as development on Green Belt, proximity to local amenities, such as schools, doctors and transport.

In addition, the land being on the site of an old colliery, has caused contamination of the soil, which must surely be inappropriate on health grounds.

I am employed as a Village Agent for the Chew Valley, particularly covering Pensford, Stanton Drew and Stanton Wick. In my experience the inadequate local transport already impacts on the community, in that it is virtually impossible for people to get to medical appointments amongst other things, and the isolation that follows for many without their own transport. I cannot see how this will be any different for the travellers.

Last, and by no means least, the sheer scale and size of the proposed development will completely overwhelm the local community, which again runs against your own criteria both in visual and social terms.

What is extremely disturbing here is that whilst no decisions have been made, for the council to have considered this site in any way suitable suggests that either there have been major errors made, in which case, I question the competence of the people making these decisions. Or that there is a willingness to dump this thorny problem as far away as possible from where the majority of the counsellors themselves live, and to ignore the potentially disastrous impact on both the local community and the travellers themselves.

This also follows hard on the heels of the mistakes made in the case of the planning application for Stowey Quarry, so I am beginning to suspect that BANES really do not wish to protect and promote this very beautiful environment and protect the community.

Sadly I am too late to register a question for the cabinet meeting on the 9th May, but my husband has requested, under the freedom of information, the criteria for the shortlist, which may shed some light on what is a completely inexplicable course of action by BANES.

If in spite of all the objections to this proposal, BANES persist in pursuing this, I will be doing my utmost to oppose it, as I suspect will the majority of the local community.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3009 / 2 Name: Karen & Lyne Organisation:
Mark

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing this email as I understand that you are in the Bath & North East Somerset Council cabinet that is gathering for a meeting on 9th May 2012 to discuss the options for the siting of new Gypsy and Traveller permanent sites in the BATHNES area. I am resident in Stanton Drew. I recently became aware of the council's proposals in relation to the Old Colliery in Stanton Wick and I wish you to take note of concerns that I have.

My concerns are that on the basis of the evidence that I have seen, both from BATHNES itself and from information provided by relevant parish councils and opposition groups it would seem that the Old Colliery in Stanton Wick is a wholly inappropriate place for such a site. I understand that it is ranked 18th out of 25 possible sites in the area, calculated on the council's own criteria and yet it has somehow found itself close to the top of the shortlist of sites being considered. The proposal as it stands would create a site that, alone, provides 70% of the requirement for such sites in the whole area and would be the biggest site by some margin.

On the other hand, the site itself is clearly a difficult one in terms of the infrastructure and local amenities that would be required to provide properly for the occupants of up to 200 caravans. There are no relevant amenities within 1500m of the site. The access to and from the site is from a tiny road above Pensford. The site itself is unsuitable as a former colliery. I understand that there are considerable planning issues and health and safety issues involved.

I do not know how many, if any, of the members of the cabinet actually live in the area of the proposed site but it does seem to me that any measured consideration of such a proposal would be bound to lead to the conclusion that, on the very criteria set by the council itself, it should be rejected as an option for such a Gypsy and Traveller site.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3010 / 1 Name: David Williams Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I wish to OBJECT in the strongest possible terms against the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Stanton Wick.

I understand that the old Colliery at Stanton Wick is now top of BaNES 7 site shortlist for proposed permanent traveller sites. I find this incredible given that it came a lowly 17th on your own scoring matrix out of the original 20 sites being considered.

Access to the site, in which ever direction you travel, is via a single track country lane. This lane will not support any increase in traffic especially as there are very few passing places. There are no facilities nearby, certainly nothing within walking distance, therefore absolutely everything will need to be obtained by car.

The size of the site is not commensurate with the immediate surroundings. Stanton Wick is a small hamlet and would be completely engulfed by a site of this size.

There are no schools, doctors or public transport links within the recommended distance as set out in the government guidelines. I would certainly not want my children to walk to and from school along a single track lane in winter with no footpath or lighting and very few passing places for traffic. This would surely be a very nasty accident waiting to happen.

I would ask that the council withdraw the proposed use of the Old Colliery site as a permanent traveller and gypsy site as completely unsustainable.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3010 / 1 Name: David Williams Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I believe the whole process is flawed. The selection process for the preferred sites was contrary to the councils own policies.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No, I whole heartedly disagree with the Council's assessment of the site. This site is firmly in the Greenbelt and does not comply with National Planning Guidelines.

The site, if approved would dwarf the existing settlement of Stanton Wick and would require a considerable amount of tax payers money to create the infrastructure required to support the site.

The site scored very poorly in the Council's own selection process and scoring matrix – why has the Council ignored it's own suitability assessment process and continued to push this site forward?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, The proposed site is too large for the immediate established settlement area and is larger than the governments own recommendations and guidelines.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

- This site is in the Greenbelt and should be excluded from the process.
- The proposed site is too large and will dwarf the existing settlement.
- Access to the site is restricted due to the single track nature of the highway.
- The site is contaminated and no account of this appears to have been taken in the Preferred Options Paper.
- The site itself is inherently dangerous and no consideration to the cost or practicality of making it safe has been taken.
- How is the cost of putting in the required infrastructure to support a site of this size being funded?
- There are no amenities in close proximity, no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors etc. This will simply increase the weight of traffic on a track not able to cope.
- What consideration has been made to the existing wildlife, Flora and fauna on the site. What protected species are resident and how will they be protected?
- Why is the proposed site larger than the maximum recommended size as indicated in the Governments own guidelines.
- Why has the council ignored the findings of it's own scrutiny committee.
- No-one appears able to answer the question as to why this particular site is on the preferred list given that it was rated 17th out of 23 sites reviewed. Why have other sites that had higher scores in the council's own scoring matrix been ignored? What is it that the council and the hired consultant like so much about the colliery?? A more cynical person might even suggest it's because of it's size.
- This site is contrary to the councils own policies and the national policy set out in March 2012.

Respondent: 3011 / 1 Name: Hugo & Jane Pike Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

YES – SEE BELOW

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO – SEE BELOW

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO – SEE BELOW

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Our objections to the proposal are as follows:

1. The site is within the designated Green Belt and as such is inappropriate for a new gypsy and traveller site. Please refer to paragraph 49 of ODPM Circular 01/2006 issued on 2 February, 2006

“There is a general presumption against inappropriate development within Green Belts. New gypsy and traveller sites in the Green Belt are normally inappropriate development as defined in Planning Policy Guidance 2: ‘Green Belts’ (PPG2). National planning policy on Green Belts applies equally to applications for planning permission from gypsies and travellers, and the settled population.”

2. The site proposal is inappropriate in that it ignores the requirement for “the availability, or likely availability, of alternatives to the car in accessing local services. “ para 54 idem. The single track road would not realistically allow for a bus service (even ignoring commercial considerations) and previous planning applications (eg Filer’s Coaches) have been turned down on the grounds of the assessed increase in traffic movements.

3. The site proposal is also inappropriate on the grounds of the number of permanent and transit sites to be provided. The numbers of people to be accommodated would dominate the nearest settled community of Stanton Wick.

“Sites should respect the scale of, and not dominate the nearest settled community” para 54 idem.

4. As the Circular points out at para 50 “The presence of Green Belt will constrain and limit opportunities for identifying gypsy and traveller sites in some areas”.

The impression created is that the Council is determined to exclude gypsies and travellers from the World Heritage City of Bath (with the exception of the one existing site at Twerton) and is prepared to ride roughshod over the Government’s policies designed to protect the Green Belt. It is also deeply concerning that, on an issue that could potentially have a significant adverse impact on our local community, the dominant political party seems determined to plough on regardless of all the evidence that should by now have led to the abandonment of this particular proposal. This is anti-democratic and flies in the face of the principles of the Localism Act.

5. The Localism Act was intended to ‘make the planning system more democratic and more effective’ and to involve a ‘huge shift in power – from central Whitehall, to local public servant, and from bureaucrats to communities and individuals.’ (Foreword to A Plain English Guide to the Localism Act – published by Department for Communities and Local Government – Crown copyright, 2011).

We can only hope that the current Consultation process will be genuine and not ignored by those politicians who are ultimately responsible to the electorate and that this proposal will be abandoned at the next earliest opportunity.

Respondent: 3011 / 1 Name: Hugo & Jane Pike Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Last evening I attended a public meeting at the Stanton Drew Village Hall called by the Stanton Wick Action Group (SWAG). Some 150 plus people crowded into the hall and heard details of the proposal to designate some 27 acres on the site of the Old Colliery as a future site for 17 static and 7 transit pitches for caravans. It was explained that this was to be considered by the B&NES Planning Committee on 9 May in the context of a number of other sites within the District so as to meet the current Government’s target for such sites within their area of jurisdiction.

Our property is approximately 300 yards from the southern boundary of the site as outlined on a map supplied by SWAG and yet the first I knew of the proposal was by way of a flyer delivered to the house last weekend. This seems not to accord with the Council’s responsibility to notify residents of such proposals in good time and so as to allow them to make their own representations. As at today’s date we have still not received any official notification of this proposal.

Irrespective of the disproportionate number of pitches proposed given the grand total the Council is seeking to provide this site is entirely unsuitable on the following grounds:

- 1☐The access road is entirely inadequate for the number and type of vehicles that would need to use it to reach the site and for the substantial increase in road traffic that would be generated
- 2☐The site is within the designated Green Belt
- 3☐The local infrastructure would be inadequate to provide for the basic requirements of a new population of some 200 people
- 4☐Essential services including potable water, adequate sewerage, public transport, medical facilities, primary and secondary school places, etc, would all need to be provided
- 5☐The site is unsafe by virtue of its past history as a working mine with mineshafts etc, and, we were advised the ground is contaminated with arsenic

We are therefore writing to express the strongest objection to the planned proposal and wish this letter to be given proper consideration by the Planning Committee on 9 May and any subsequent occasion to which this case may be deferred.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3012 / 1 Name: Mr Steve Filer Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree with this site being developed. Being green belt with no drainage provision, poor road access, will overwhelm the local villages.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. Totally inappropriate development within a green belt area and a rural setting.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This proposal has no positive aspects and will detract from existing residents enjoyment of the rural and open nature of their community. It will overwhelm the local village and this is contrary to your own planning policy. I strongly object.

Respondent: 3012 / 2 Name: Mr Steve Filer Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The proposed area is a local landmark and being a hill top/ raised area, multi occupancy would detract from the rural openness of the area.

The site is surrounded by green belt and not suitable for a large scale development of the proposed nature.

The site has no mains drainage and the proposed project would require substantial ground works and disruption with the risk of pollution to the adjacent waterways

Ground works on this tip area would likely promote further pollution due to the toxic nature of the currently enclosed tip waste.

The proposal would create a very substantial increase in traffic on single track roads which already struggle to cope. Thus obviously increasing the hazards encountered by existing occupants along with vehicular and pedestrian users.

The local amenities would be submitted to a very significant increase in demand. The amenities you require in accordance with your statements are not available within walking distance and therefore would add greatly to vehicle movements on these unsuitable lanes.

The local population of Pensford and Stanton Drew would be overwhelmed by such a settlement which is contrary to your own planning statement.

The scale and nature of this proposal is contrary to your normal planning regulations and I would suggest if a proposal for a small holiday caravan site where to be submitted it would be turned down as unsuitable with a long list of reasons why. I therefore demand that this existing proposal meets with the same outcome – REFUSED

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3013 / 1 Name: Mrs J Tibbs Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I would like to raise objections to this development on the following grounds:-

Schools:-

The two primary schools in the Stanton Wick area (Pensford & Stanton Drew) are very small rural schools, whilst there are some spaces at these schools the impact of a large intake of children at all year levels would have a detrimental effect on the quality of education provided to all children due to the amount of time and resource it would take to assess the abilities of the new intake children. The resources at these schools would be severely stretched.

Access to both these schools, which are more than 1.5km from the proposed site, is very poor and there is no suitable footpath making walking to school extremely hazardous. There is limited parking at both schools and additional vehicles would further increase this problem with the likelihood of an increase in illegal parking causing danger to children outside of schools.

Environment:-

A development of the size would have a detrimental effect on the environment. I believe there is no mains drainage in the village of Stanton Wick and therefore Septic tanks would need to be provided for all pitches.

There are bats and no doubt other rare species on this land which need protecting. Wildlife would be disturbed and

possibly destroyed during a development of this size. There is a danger of mine shafts collapsing. Please note bats are protected.

This is a green belt site - central government guidelines suggest that travellers sites should not be located in greenbelt. It is also interesting to note that Filer coaches who are a well respected local business located next door to the proposed travellers site made an application to extend their premises to accommodate an additional 10 coaches. This application was turned down due to "Inappropriate development in the Green Belt, detracting from openness and rural character of the area:- resulting in congestion and inconvenience to road users and unsustainable location of the site". A reapplication was made and rejected on 29 September 2011 (only 7 months ago) on the same grounds. It therefore seems amazing that a development of the size suggested and the amount of traffic it would create is now being considered.

I would therefore urge you to remove this site from your shortlist of potential sites at the meeting on 9 May 2012.

Respondent: 3013 / 1 Name: Mrs J Tibbs Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No, as a development of the size the council are talking about would have a detrimental effect on the environment, there is no mains drainage in the village of Stanton Wick.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, there are no satisfactory means of access, the existing highway network is in-adequate to service the site.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This is clearly an over development of site in greenbelt which would have a huge detrimental effect on the surrounding residents, and facilities including roads and schools.

Respondent: 3013 / 2 Name: Mrs J Tibbs Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing in response to the BANES council proposed development of The Old Colliery in Stanton Wick to provide 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches for travellers.

I would like to raise objections to this development on the following grounds:-

A development of this size would have a detrimental effect on the environment. There is no mains drainage in the village of Stanton Wick and therefore septic tanks would need to be provided for all the pitches.

It is in a greenbelt area. National guidelines say that a gypsy and traveller sites in green belt area are in appropriate development. That would mean that planning permission would not be available.

BaNES accept that the road access is incapable of coping with the increase in traffic but claim that the increase will be modest. I don't think 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches is modest.

BaNES have been refusing applications where there is a likely increase in traffic, how will the roads to the site cope and with people walking the road with no pavements ? The site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors, please can you explain where all the children will go to School.

In an expert report and survey the site was found to be contaminated with dangerous levels of arsenic that has not been removed.

I would therefore urge you to remove this site from your shortlist before the end of the consultation period of the 181h July 2012.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3013 / 2 Name: Mrs J Tibbs Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am writing in response to the BANES council proposed development of The Old Colliery in Stanton Wick to provide 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches for travellers.

I would like to raise objections to this development on the following grounds:-

BaNES have not explained who will be paying for any or all of the work required in order to make the site habitable, bring water, sewage and electricity. They have not explained what the cost is for any mine safety work or roadwork cost or the cost to enable children to be accommodated in the local Schools.

National guidelines state that the site should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement. Even at 20 pitches the travellers would outnumber the Stanton Wick's residents possibly 2 or 3 : 1.

The proposed 20 pitches is larger than the government's stated maximum making it difficult to manage. BaNES report boasts that the site has potential to expand to 50 pitches -more than three times the maximum.

This is clearly an over development of a greenbelt site which would have a huge detrimental effect on the surrounding residents and facilities including roads and schools. I would also mention that as the site is in greenbelt area, central government guidelines suggested that traveller's sites should not be located in greenbelt.

I would therefore urge you to remove this site from your shortlist before the end of the consultation period of the 18111 July 2012.

Respondent: 3014 / 1 Name: Audrey Reid Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I wish to record my disapproval of your decision to pursue the granting of permission to establish a gypsy/traveller site at Stanton Wick.

My reasons are:

1. The site is in the green belt and to argue that it is on a brown site within the green belt is contrary to the fundamental reason for establishing a green belt which was to prevent encroachment and development of these precious open spaces.
2. The establishment of pitches would totally change the balance of the present community as it would be swamped by the sheer number of new residents.
3. The access and ground sustainability is a major concern.
4. The size of the planned site well away from Bath strikes me as a politically driven proposal which would solve a problem that the Council has failed to address in the past and as such has no merit.

I would strongly advise the Cabinet to reconsider the issue and develop a plan that is more in touch with local sentiments.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3015 / 1 Name: Ms Sue Osborne Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

In considering this site as a serious option there is an obligation on BANES to consider the risks and threats to the social cohesion and peaceful and integrated co-existence between the travelling community and the local settled communities. (Policy B 11a refers).

If this site were to proceed, planning permission will not have been applied equally, the travellers benefitting from permissions never available to local landowners for residential development beyond the existing building footprint, or even a few extra coaches for Filers. It would be quite natural for any settled community to feel this is unjust and discriminatory.

The village C road cannot safely sustain any traffic increases. The consequence of burdening the road further will be heightened, when increases in traffic cause additional stress to road users and pedestrians. This will naturally result in angst, frustration and tensions as cars, other vehicles and sundry paraphernalia emerge from this segregated development.

Social cohesion cannot be fostered when any new community overwhelms the existing community, imposing an alternate culture and ethos, placing pressure on the amenities of the community; be it driving or walking safely around these tiny villages.

In addition there is concern about the natural consequences to the character and ethos of the small village schools endeavoring to cater for cultural shifts. Stanton Drew is particularly tiny.

These communities identify strongly with their mining heritage and agree with BANES own Pensford Conservation Area

Appraisal which acknowledges 'the council has a duty to pay special attention to preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in exercising planning powers'. The Appraisal recognises the special character of the area in which the local people live.

There was wholehearted support for the restoration of both substantial properties, The Winding House and The Bath House, part of Broadoak Colliery (Old Colliery as you refer to it).

This site is symbolic of our local history and heritage - it played a significant part in the North Somerset Coalfield operations.

How can social cohesion be encouraged and fostered if this site is handed over for the proposed development with complete disregard to BANES own assessment of its historical importance and their acknowledged responsibilities as an Authority.

Your report says 'the site would not directly assist the aim of social integration' We fully agree, and go further, in that we can see a high risk of tension emanating from the areas that I have briefly addressed.

Very special circumstances indeed.

On behalf of the settled communities who have voiced their objection through the petitions, we strongly urge you to remove this site from your short list.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3016 / 1 Name: Mr Graham Perry Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes – I believe the site at Stanton Wick is totally unsuitable for the following reasons:

- 1) Site is in the green belt
- 2) Insufficient road walking access
- 3) Contaminated site
- 4) Proposed site would overwhelm the nearest settlement
- 5) No public transport access

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No – The site is wholly unsuitable for the reasons given.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Certainly not

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

On planning issues alone the site is completely unsuitable

Respondent: 3016 / 2 Name: Mr Graham Perry Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

As we understand that the proposal is now open for Public Consultation we are writing again to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at the Old Colliery Buildings at Stanton Wick. We believe this proposal does not comply with planning guidelines and is wholly unsustainable for a number of reasons for example

- Site is in the Green Belt
- Insufficient road access
- Insufficient walking access
- No Public Transport access
- Insufficient school capacity
- Water/Drainage/Power supply and capacity
- No Doctor or Shopping within recommended distance
- Contaminated site
- The proposed site would overwhelm the nearest settlement

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3016 / 3 Name: Mr Graham Perry Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We are writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at the Old Colliery Buildings at Stanton Wick. We believe this proposal is wholly unsustainable for a number of reasons for example

- Site is in the Green Belt
- Insufficient road access
- Insufficient walking access
- No Public Transport access
- Insufficient school capacity
- Water/Drainage/Power supply and capacity
- No Doctor or Shopping within recommended distance

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3017 / 1 Name: Robert Fegan Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Reasons why this site is not suitable for a permanent gypsy site:-

- 1/ The site is in the greenbelt.
- 2/ It would disturb a site of nature conservation.
- 3/ The site is potentially dangerous with redundant mine shafts and the possibility of subsidence.
- 4/ The site is probably contaminated.
- 5/ There is not adequate water supply and no means of drainage and too large for septic tanks.
- 6/ The access roads are not suitable for the increase in traffic.
- 7/ The site would be far larger than the local population of Stanton Wick.
- 8/ The site would put too much pressure on local schools and doctors surgeries.
- 9/ There is no public footpath or pavement suitable.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do not believe this option should have ever been short listed.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I think the council is missing a golden opportunity with the three MOD sites which are coming up for development.

I do not understand when the combined housing proposal for Ensleigh, Foxhill, Warminster Road totals 1190 houses with 35% being affordable housing why has the option of integrating the necessary traveller allocation into these sites not been looked at. Yet a site in the green belt has been shortlisted.

The site is in the green belt and would swamp the local population of Stanton Wick.

No risk assessment to my knowledge has ever been undertaken to ascertain the suitability for any type of dwellings due to the possibility of heavy metals, cadmium ect.

(if the proposed site is safe for habilitation why is it not being considered for affordable housing?)

The access is unsuitable as it is only a single track line and particularly heading down into Pensford there are limited passing points.

There are no pedestrian footpaths.

All the local schools are fully subscribed.

This would put additional pressure on the local doctor's surgeries.

The local wildlife, which is protected, would be displaced, these include:

Adders, slow worms, lizards, bats, badgers.

It would be very difficult to find a suitable area to relocate the slow worms and adders as they do not thrive in agricultural farm land and to successfully move them would require them to be moved out of our area.

Respondent: 3017 / 2 Name: Robert Fegan Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am taking this opportunity to voice my concerns regarding the coal slag heap in Stanton Wick being short listed for a permanent gypsy camp for approx 15 pitches, a show ground storage yard and also temporary site for transit gypsies. You were democratically voted into local government by the residents of BANES yet once in power you act in an undemocratic way.

I understand you have a meeting regarding this matter on May the 9th, however you have not carried out any consultation with the local population prior to this meeting and the majority seem to have heard of these proposals second hand from other concerned residents.

I understand these proposals would increase the population by approx 200 people and that the council may even consider increasing the number of permanent pitches as the proposed site is so large.

Can you please confirm what guidelines you are using in short listing this site as from a local residents and tax payer I can see numerous reasons why this site should never have been considered let alone shortlisted.

Firstly the site is in the green belt and would swamp the local population of Stanton Wick.
 No risk assessment to my knowledge has ever been undertaken to ascertain the suitability for any type of dwellings due to the possibility of heavy metals, cadmium ect.
 (if the proposed site is safe for habitation why is it not being considered for affordable housing?)

The access is unsuitable as it is only a single track line and particularly heading down into Pensford there are limited passing points.

There are no pedestrian footpaths.

All the local schools are fully subscribed.

This would put additional pressure on the local doctor's surgeries.

The local wildlife, which is protected, would be displaced, these include:

Adders, slow worms, lizards, bats, badgers.

It would be very difficult to find a suitable area to relocate the slow worms and adders as they do not thrive in agricultural farm land and to successfully move them would require them to be moved out of our area.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3019 / 1 Name: Rosie Pierce Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes.

Three clear categories ('Near to a Hazardous place', 'Noise Issues', and Conservation Area') have been scored incorrectly. Taking these individually:

1/ Hazardous

The Pensford Colliery site received a '+5' score for the criteria 'Near to a hazardous place?' meaning that the scorer assuming there are "no hazards (including heavy industry, refuse sites, and electricity pylons) within a 1000m proximity". Since the site is a disused colliery situated on mineshafts- one of which collapsed this week, as well as being sited on a disused tip, clearly this scoring should now be altered to reflect the only other scoring option: a 'zero' rating.

2/ Noise issues

The Pensford Colliery site received a 'zero' score under 'Noise issues' meaning that the scorer assumes there are no "noise issues affecting proposed or neighbouring residents ... that may require mitigation" as the DPD puts it. This site is in very close proximity (a few metres) from a large detached house next to the land, and is also opposite a bungalow. Does the scorer believe that the rural road, Wick Lane, would remain just as quiet with 200 people on the adjoining land as well as their numerous caravans, cars and animals? A weighting of '-5' should clearly have been applied under this criterion for the adverse affect to these families. It's utterly preposterous (and insulting) to assume anyone would believe that screening

could mitigate this either.

3/ Wildlife Designation

Despite a 'tick' on the scoring matrix that designates that the site is 'On Land that Houses European Protected Species', the site receives no negative weighting in the Wildlife Designation category.

4/ Conservation Area

The Pensford Colliery site received no negative weighting in the Conservation Area category, despite the nearest amenities all being situated in the Conservation Area of Pensford, including school, shop and public transport. The scorer assumes no detrimental affect whatsoever to the Conservation Area despite the single track lane (Wick Lane) leading directly into the heart of the village, over a medieval bridge and directly past several listed buildings.

Correcting the original score of the site places it firmly at the bottom of this list of proposed sites.

And that's before taking into account the flagrant disregard of countless other criteria during the scoring process- any one of which would make the site entirely unsuitable for any development of this nature. ie:

- Situation in greenbelt land ("Traveller sites- temporary or permanent- in the Green Belt are inappropriate development"- Government Planning Policy for Traveller's Sites, March 2012) • A site that would dominate the nearest local community (a hamlet of 22 homes)- by approx 300%. (Planning Policy for Traveller's Sites: "When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community" ... "Local planning authorities should, in producing their Local Plan: relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density ... "Local planning authorities should strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan. Local planning authorities should ensure that sites in rural areas respect the scale of, and do not dominate the nearest settled community, and avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure." • A site which has no safe walking access to a shop, school, health service of any kind, or public transport, down a single-track, mile-long, steep, unlit path with a very busy main road at the Pensford end to cross to reach the school. (Planning Policy for Traveller's Sites) "Local planning authorities should ensure that their policies: promote ... access to appropriate health services ... ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis ... provide a settled base that reduces the need for long-distance travelling ... avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services ... do not locate sites in areas at high risk of flooding"
- A site situation on an existing road that the scoring matrix concedes "can not accommodate additional traffic movements" and that was a contributing factor to recent planning applications (Filer's Coaches) being turned down for being 'likely to increase vehicle movements' and being in general unsuitable for the width of the road and congestion caused
- A site that would increase the reliance on car use, worsening the environment and the local communities. (From B&NES' DPD: "Reducing reliance on car travel is an important objective of local and national policy." • A site of nature conservation, that houses protected species of wildlife • Situation on contaminated land (arsenic and asbestos)
- The site is next to a commercial business (Filer's coaches), that ensures a regular stream of fumes and traffic in the adjoining land to the proposed family dwellings.

Many of the above criteria were employed in order to remove higher-scoring sites from the list entirely. But were ignored vis a vis the Pensford Colliery site.

For example:

- Clutton site reason for rejection: "Green open space adjacent to existing housing boundary"
- Fosseyway Environment Park reason for rejection: "Green open space adjacent to existing commercial use. Significant health and well-being concerns"
- Midsomer Norton, Radstock and Keynsham sites reasons for rejection:: "Very poor residential amenity"
- Pennyquick Lane "significant incursion into open countryside"

Any and all of these reasons can clearly be applied to the Pensford Colliery site and should have caused its similar removal from the list.

I feel strongly that the health and well-being of local families should be considered too. I include those residents who chose to live in the area and who would be dealt a hugely detrimental impact on their way of life by this proposed site, as well as a traveller community who could end up being dumped by B&NES on a contaminated, hazardous site, isolated from amenities, next to a commercial coach park, and with further to travel for healthcare than in any other site on the list (the nearest surgery recently having moved from Chew Magna to Chew Stoke).

The proposed site would place an already vulnerable group of people who have a higher than average mortality rate, in an often-inaccessible, cut-off location with no realistic local employment prospects, and poor services (no mains drainage or gas). It would increase their reliance on travelling by vehicle to go anywhere, at a time when petrol prices are making it increasingly difficult to live rurally. And- given the overwhelmingly central locations of the illegal traveller sites that have previously been set up in the B&NES area- it is clearly not the type of location that the traveller community would themselves even choose to live in.

Taking this site further would merely serve to (at best) further highlight the demonstrably sloppy, ill-executed original scoring process and so-called 'public consultation', and (at worst), make the whole process look like a highly disingenuous, premeditated campaign to keep an unsuitable site on the list; one sufficiently remote to be out of sight and mind of the majority of B&NES' voters, yet large enough to deliver the biggest potential governmental financial incentives.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No, see above comments.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, see above comments.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Traveller Policy Guidelines issued by the government in March have been demonstrably ignored in order to have the Stanton Wick Colliery site on the list.

Best practice guidelines also highlight that local authorities should liaise with neighbouring authorities in order to determine whether regional targets can be delivered if the immediate area cannot. This has not been done as far as I can see.

BANES had an opportunity to pause this process at the recent special council meeting, and decided not to. This would have allowed the ability to properly assess the number of travellers in the area that need permanent sites- old data such as has been used to come to the existing process is out of date and not fit for purpose.

Respondent: 3021 / 1 Name: Mr Mike Newey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Evidence presented at local meetings as to the unsuitability of the site.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Stanton Lane and the approaches to this are not adequate to take vehicles and caravans and large vehicles of the type Showmen usually have. We also are aware that the council rejected an application by Filers Coaches to increase the number of vehicles to be kept at the adjacent site. The rejection as far as we are aware, was based on the inadequate road system and site facilities. On this basis, how can the council consider the above proposal which will increase the vehicle movement in Stanton Lane which is likely to involve much larger vehicles than coaches? The development will also increase

the number of people on site (possibly up to 200).

What is the considered impact on the A37 through Pensford, in particular, from the Bristol direction. We already have an overloaded road system at peak times due to the narrow restrictions of Pensford Hill, in both directions. We consider that most of the additional traffic created by this proposed development, should it go ahead, will be using this already inadequate route.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3021 / 2 Name: Mr Mike Newey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

My wife and I are residents of Pensford and would like to question the above proposal at Stanton Wick. We consider that the infrastructure of both Pensford and Stanton Wick are not up to taking a development which will impose strain of this magnitude on local road systems and schools. In particular, Stanton lane and the approaches to this are not adequate to take vehicles and caravans and large vehicles of the type Showmen usually have. We also are aware that the council rejected an application by Filers Coaches to increase the number of vehicles to be kept at the adjacent site. The rejection as far as we are aware, was based on the inadequate road system and site facilities. On this basis, how can the council consider the above proposal which will increase the vehicle movement in Stanton lane which is likely to involve much larger vehicles than coaches? The development will also increase the number of people on site (possibly up to 200). What impact will this have on Pensford and Stanton Wick?

We are also led to believe that the site is unsuitable due to contamination from the old mine workings, deeming it unsuitable for habitation. This is before even considering the lack of utilities required to sustain the number of people likely to be occupying the site.

We would also like to ask what the considered impact on the A37 through Pensford is likely to be, in particular, from the Bristol direction. We already have an overloaded road system at peak times due to the narrow restrictions of Pensford Hill, in both directions. We consider that most of the additional traffic created by this proposed development, should it go ahead, will be using this already inadequate route.

We are totally against this proposal and request that the council reconsider the location of this proposed site.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3023 / 1 Name: Mr Elliot Jay Stocks Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Old Colliery site, Stanton Wick, is completely unsuitable for a site of the size proposed. It is situated on a narrow, single-track lane that cannot support further traffic. The site itself and the surrounding area has a long history of planning application refusals; one primary reason being the narrow lane. The site sits atop former mine shafts on ground contaminated with arsenic. The proposed size of the site would require sewerage (septic tanks would not support this site) which is already at capacity in the area. As well as these health and safety concerns, there are no doctors in walking distance, no public transport in walking distance and only a very small shop in Pensford, which is unsuitable for such a large increase in resident. Importantly, the site is within the Greenbelt, a conservation area and a site of historic significance. These factors have led to numerous planning application refusals in the past.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

As detailed above, I believe this site to be wholly unsuitable for the proposed development.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This site has always scored poorly in suitability, yet has still made it to one of the final choices. In a meeting with local councillors they all admitted that the site was the size was the only factor. This highlights the flaws in the selection process. It is not only essential that the council rule out of this site, but that they re-evaluate the entire selection process.

Respondent: Name: Stocks Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

My fiancée and I - who live in the heart of Pensford village - feel strongly that the site is unsuitable. I'm sure you're already aware of the concerns raised by residents, but if not, please see <http://www.stantonwickactiongroup.org/our-objections/>

The route to and from the proposed site is a narrow, single-track lane, which is unsuitable for the increased traffic that will result from the creation of the site. The lane also leads into the one-way road of Church Street in Pensford village, which is already heavy in traffic and with very little room for parking. The site itself is also entirely unsuitable for any sort of dwelling from a safety point of view, with the ground contaminated with arsenic and built on top of mines.

Another point the list on the website does not cover is that the desirability of living in a peaceful rural area - such as the villages of Pensford and Stanton Wick - would be greatly decreased by such a large influx of people. It is not about those people being travellers; it is purely down to volume alone: potentially up to 200 people according to council guidelines. This number would dwarf the hamlet of Stanton Wick. Please note that the proposed site also sits within an area of outstanding natural beauty and the Green Belt.

One last point is that the coach station right next to the proposed site recently applied for planning permission for ground that would accommodate just two more coaches and yet the application was denied. It would be extremely hypocritical of the council to then approve the traveller site literally next door.

I'm sure you understand residents' reasons for objecting the creation of this site, and I know that we would all very much appreciate it if you could use your position to make sure our views are represented in the decision-making process.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3024 / 1 Name: Peter Walford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Having fully investigated and researched the quite ludicrous decision by BANES to shortlist the Old Colliery Works in Stanton Wick to be an Authorised Travellers Camp, I am writing as a local resident to voice my strong objection.

The decision falls down on many counts but principally:

- Proper consultation with the local residents of Stanton Wick, Stanton Drew and Pensford has been completely absent
- The Site Selection Scoring Matrix adopted by the Council, if followed properly, can in no way support the proposed use
- I understand the subject site did indeed score badly - but yet it appears to be one of the Council's favoured options - why/how?
- Various attempts by the current landowner to secure planning consent for residential use have fallen down on environmental and access issues

So hypocrisy prevails.

We have a local authority that has failed miserably to allocate proper travellers sites over many years, hoping the "problem" would go away and now finds itself under pressure to find a solution. A "desperate" and well informed landowner then presents his site as an option which happens to be in the far reaches of the Council's boundary and well away from their precious World Heritage City. With only a few local residents/constituents to upset, what an easy "win"?

Well, don't bank on such an easy ride. You will have already seen and heard the level of opposition to this proposal which is not just founded on nimbyism but justified on grounds of inappropriateness due to:

- Access - a steep, narrow, un-lit, country lane
- Green Belt - with views that will scar the whole of the Chew Valley
- Contamination - an old colliery
- Safety - disused mine shafts
- Services - completely inadequate supplies
- Lack of ANY Facilities - absolutely nothing within walking distance

The site is completely unsustainable for any form of residential occupation let alone more than 20 travellers "pitches" (and all the paraphernalia this brings) and, if pursued the Council can only find itself defending a Judicial Review at our further expense.

I would therefore urge you to review and withdraw this option NOW and seek to find a more appropriate site or sites (perhaps from within the Council's extensive land bank?).

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3024 / 2 Name: Peter Walford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Absolutely NOT

- Proper consultation with the local residents of Stanton Wick, Stanton Drew and Pensford has been completely absent
- The Site Selection Scoring Matrix adopted by the Council, if followed properly, can in no way support the proposed use
- I understand the subject site did indeed score badly - but yet it appears to be one of the Council's favoured options - why/how?
- Various attempts by the current landowner to secure planning consent for residential use have fallen down on environmental and access issues

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO - the site falls down on several obvious planning grounds:

- Dangerous/Unsuitable Access - a steep, narrow, un-lit, country lane
- Inappropriate development in the Green Belt - with views that will scar the whole of the Chew Valley
- Historic & Recent Contamination - an old colliery
- Safety - disused mine shafts
- Services - completely inadequate supplies
- Lack of ANY Facilities - absolutely nothing within walking distance

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

We have a local authority that has failed miserably to allocate proper travellers sites over many years, hoping the "problem" would go away and now finds itself under pressure to find a solution.

A "desperate" and well informed landowner then presents his site as an option which happens to be in the far reaches of the Council's boundary and well away from their precious World Heritage City. With only a few local residents/constituents to upset, what an easy "win"?

The site is completely unsustainable for any form of residential occupation let alone more than 20 travellers "pitches" (and all the paraphernalia this brings) and, if pursued the Council can only find itself defending a Judicial Review at our further expense.

Respondent: 3025 / 1 Name: Simon Whittle Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The proposed site is inappropriate for the following reasons:

- The potential population increase would double or triple number of residents in Stanton Wick.
- The site is in the Green Belt.
- Whilst the site is remote from most other housing, it is adjacent to two houses, one of which is also on the Old Colliery site. There would be a very detrimental impact on the amenity of the residents of the houses and, since one property

would overlook the proposed Gypsy and Traveller camp, there would be little privacy for the new families. The remoteness would not aid integration of the Gypsies and Travellers with the local community, which is stated aim.

- The land is heavily contaminated; I have checked with Stanton Drew Parish Council and it has a comprehensive contamination report in its possession, which was included in previous planning applications for the site in question. I would therefore assume that the BaNES Planning Team already has the report and has no need to ask the landowner for a copy of this important document. To my amazement, I actually found a copy online through a Google search, which shows that it is available on the BaNES document server . Failure to review the report at this stage is at best lazy, and at worst incompetent, as much time and taxpayer's money could be wasted on a futile activity.
- The ground is unsafe and there is a recently collapsed mineshaft.
- There is poor vehicular access: two of the three possible access roads, which would be the obvious choices to access the local primary schools and the shop in Pensford, are single-track.
- There is no nearby public transport: it is a 1.5km walk to Pensford down a narrow and flood-prone lane and walking to the bus stops at the top of Bromley Road or at Chelwood roundabout would entail travel along the A368, which has a high volume of fast-moving traffic, including heavy goods and farm traffic and has no footway.
- Stanton Wick has a marginal water supply and residents already suffer major pressure drops at certain times during the day. Doubling the population would take it beyond breaking point. Additionally, there are questions about the capacity for drainage and for sewage, which would need to be removed by tanker.
- The shop and schools are at the very limit of the recommended distance. The shop in Pensford is very small with a limited range of stock and the nearest supermarket is 7 miles away. Both schools are relatively small and a large influx of new students would have a disruptive effect.
- The main doctor's surgery is over 5.3 miles away. It should be noted that at the end of February 2102, the local surgery was relocated from Chew Magna to Chew Stoke increasing the travel distance by 1.3 miles with significantly reduced transport options (which were poor to start with).

Even if the matrix was correctly populated, then I have a strong concern about its usage as The Old Colliery site came 17th out of 20 possible sites, but was then placed on the shortlist of 7. How can this happen with a fair and reasonable process?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Whilst I accept the pressing need for BaNES to create official sites for the Gypsy and Traveller community, the selection must be made on fair and reasonable grounds, using accurate information. The assessment criteria must not be relaxed to ensure that sufficient sites can be definitely found, as this would inevitably result in unsuitable sites being chosen. The assessment criteria must be those stated in the assessment plans, not others added at the end of the process, as this is unreasonable and can lead to suspicions of a "hidden agenda".

Assessment Process

As a professional engineer, with 30 years' experience, many of them in senior management or company director roles, I have used scoring matrices on many occasions and found them to be a very powerful tool. The chief advantage is that a well-designed matrix permits the user to minimise subjective opinions and to create an objective result. The system does, however suffer from several potential flaws:

☐Potential Flaw☐Effect☐Result

- 1☐Failure to select appropriate "entry criteria"☐Options which are not feasible are considered and given weightings☐Unfeasible options appear in matrix and are selected
- 2☐Incomplete set of assessment criteria☐Matrix biased towards the selected criteria with important issues not considered.☐Result is not based on all relevant influences
- 3☐Inappropriate selection of "weightings"☐Result is biased towards certain criteria ☐Matrix output becomes highly subjective
- 4☐Inaccurate or erroneous data entered into the matrix:☐Results are wrong☐Incorrect conclusions drawn from matrix output

In my opinion the "Detailed Site Assessment Report" suffers from a fundamentally flawed matrix. Examples of this include:

1. Entry criteria: The World Heritage designation was used as Yes/No criterion, but Green Belt and contaminated land were not. If Green Belt is not appropriate for development (and BaNES has rejected applications both for the above site and for the adjacent site (Filer's Coaches)) on this basis in the past, then location in the Green Belt should be excluded, not just given a high negative weighting.
2. Incomplete criteria: Availability of utilities (water, gas, electricity, sewerage etc.) was not included in the matrix. A flow-limited water supply is a well-documented issue in Stanton Wick and residents already have to time their critical water usage (e.g. showers) with other residents in the hamlet and with guests at the Carpenter's Arms. There is no mains drainage or sewerage at the site. Additionally, proximity to secondary schools was not considered.
3. Inappropriate weightings: As well the incorrect use of weightings identified in Flaw 1, some weightings in the matrix are very subjective. For example, the capacity of the existing road network is given a very low weighting (1), although this criterion has frequently been cited by BaNES when rejecting planning applications in the immediate and adjacent areas.
4. Inaccurate / erroneous data: The Old Colliery site is not classed as having hazardous land nearby, whereas the site itself has a mineshaft, which has recently suffered from a collapse.

It is obvious that the matrix needs to be both re-constructed and re-scored to ensure that all relevant criteria are included and correctly weighted and that sites with significant potential issues should be excluded, not just given a heavy negative weighting.

From my comments above, it is obvious that the matrix needs to be both re-constructed and re-scored as it is very easy to reach the conclusion that not only was the matrix fundamentally flawed, but it gives the impression that the desired outcomes were decided in advance and that the matrix then was populated with a bias towards achieving the desired result. For example, the World Heritage designation was not included in the criteria in the Development Plan Document (DPD) - Issues and Options Paper, but was used to screen-out several sites in the final report.

The more cynical amongst us would conclude that the process has been unduly influenced to enable BaNES to solve it's longstanding problem with the lack of authorised sites (which will never be popular with voters) by creating a very large site well away from the City (and the majority of voters) in a rural location, where it was thought that the local populace would "go quietly". Could you please confirm that this is not the case?

Respondent: 3025 / 1 Name: Simon Whittle Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

YES: Whilst the site at The Old Colliery, Stanton Wick is potentially available (unless the owner withdraws his offer and re-submits alternative applications for residential development, using possible acceptance as a G&T site as tacit approval for other developments), it is wholly unsuitable and due to the practical, legal and planning-related constraints is not achievable. Reasons for unsuitability include the fact that it would be "inappropriate development in the Green Belt", the distance from schools, medical facilities and shops (compounded by lack of public transport and no safe walking routes), the hazardous nature of the site (including contamination and collapsed mineshafts), limited water supply, no mains drainage/sewerage, poor access along narrow winding roads and the fact that the local community (26 houses) would be swamped by the residents of 60 or more caravans.

Given the history of planning refusal at the Old Colliery and the adjacent Filer's Coaches site, it is difficult to see how, without hypocrisy on a grand scale, the Council could justify granting planning permission.

The Old Colliery, Stanton Wick should be removed permanently from the list of proposed sites as soon as possible.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO: In a fatally-flawed process, the scoring matrix, which was intended to be the main assessment tool, has been largely ignored, which presumably explains how the Stanton Wick site was elevated from 17th to one of the 6 preferred sites. The matrix itself also contains errors, as the proximity to schools (via safe walking route) is incorrect and should be -3, not 0;

the site is an SNCI and should be scored as -5, not 0; the site is hazardous and should be scored -5 instead of 0 and the potential for noise impact, either on existing settled community or on residents as the G&T site is high as it is directly overlooked by The Winding House, which should have resulted in a score of -5, not 0.

It is worrying that, at local consultation meetings, Cabinet members claimed that one of the attractions of the site was its size as the proposed site is much larger than the size recommended in the GTAA and additionally it is difficult to see how BaNES could prevent uncontrolled expansion across the rest of the Old Colliery, creating a "supersite".

The Old Colliery, Stanton Wick should be removed permanently from the list of proposed sites as soon as possible.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO: In order for this to proceed, BaNES would have to ignore a significant number of NPPF and planning related reasons and ride roughshod over the views the local settled community.

By continuing, BaNES would be irresponsible, continue to damage the health and quality of life of the settled community by maintaining elevated personal stress levels and, given the fact that the site would never receive planning consent, waste taxpayer's money and potentially leave itself open to a charge of maladministration.

The Old Colliery, Stanton Wick should be removed permanently from the list of proposed sites as soon as possible.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Preferred Options paper ignores the NPPF, uses out-of-date needs assessments for G&T, ignores the constraints of Green Belt and ignores the West of England GTAA recommendations for site size. Whilst I agree that there is a need for G&T sites, and that the fundamental BaNES policy is to be supported, the sites need to be of an appropriate size and positioned in an appropriate and safe location.

The process by which sites were transferred from the scoring matrix to the preferred sites list was not transparent and in the case of The Old Colliery, which jumped from 17th (even with several erroneous scores) to the top 6 is highly suspicious, suggesting that it was forced onto the preferred list for reasons which were not listed as requirements in the matrix (for example the attractiveness of the size referred to in section 2 above).

For the reasons stated above, the Preferred Options paper has ignored the available information, included erroneous conclusions, and neglected to apply known policy constraints. It is shocking to think that so much Taxpayer's money has been spent funding a contractor to create this flawed document and that both a Council Officer and a Cabinet Member have presumably approved it for public release.

The Preferred Options Paper, in its current form should be scrapped and a new document should be created using an up-to-date requirements and constraints and accurate information.

Respondent: 3025 / 2 Name: Simon Whittle Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I have strong objections both to the proposal and to the assessment process.

Whilst I accept the pressing need for BaNES to create official sites for the Gypsy and Traveller community, the selection must be made on fair and reasonable grounds, using accurate information. The assessment criteria must not be relaxed to ensure that sufficient sites can be definitely found, as this would inevitably result in unsuitable sites being chosen. The assessment criteria must be those stated in the assessment plans, not others added at the end of the process, as this is unreasonable and can lead to suspicions of a “hidden agenda”.

Assessment Process

As a professional engineer, with 30 years’ experience, many of them in senior management or company director roles, I have used scoring matrices on many occasions and found them to be a very powerful tool. The chief advantage is that a well-designed matrix permits the user to minimise subjective opinions and to create an objective result. The system does, however suffer from several potential flaws:

Potential Flaw: Failure to select appropriate “entry criteria”

Effect: Options which are not feasible are considered and given weightings

Result: Unfeasible options appear in matrix and are selected

Potential Flaw: Incomplete set of assessment criteria

Effect: Matrix biased towards the selected criteria with important issues not considered.

Result is not based on all relevant influences

Potential Flaw: Inappropriate selection of “weightings

Effect: Result is biased towards certain criteria

Result: Matrix output becomes highly subjective

Potential Flaw: Inaccurate or erroneous data entered into the matrix:

Effect: Results are wrong

Result: Incorrect conclusions drawn from matrix output

In my opinion the “Detailed Site Assessment Report” suffers from a fundamentally flawed matrix. Examples of this include:

1. Entry criteria: The World Heritage designation was used as Yes/No criterion, but Green Belt and contaminated land were not. If Green Belt is not appropriate for development (and BaNES has rejected applications both for the above site and for the adjacent site (Filer’s Coaches)) on this basis in the past, then location in the Green Belt should be excluded, not just given a high negative weighting.
2. Incomplete criteria: Availability of utilities (water, gas, electricity, sewerage etc.) was not included in the matrix. A flow-limited water supply is a well-documented issue in Stanton Wick and residents already have to time their critical water usage (e.g. showers) with other residents in the hamlet and with guests at the Carpenter’s Arms. There is no mains drainage or sewerage at the site. Additionally, proximity to secondary schools was not considered.
3. Inappropriate weightings: As well the incorrect use of weightings identified in Flaw 1, some weightings in the matrix are very subjective. For example, the capacity of the existing road network is given a very low weighting (1), although this criterion has frequently been cited by BaNES when rejecting planning applications in the immediate and adjacent areas.
4. Inaccurate / erroneous data: The Old Colliery site is not classed as having hazardous land nearby, whereas the site itself has a mineshaft, which has recently suffered from a collapse.

It is obvious that the matrix needs to be both re-constructed and re-scored to ensure that all relevant criteria are included and correctly weighted and that sites with significant potential issues should be excluded, not just given a heavy negative weighting.

Appropriateness of the site

The proposed site is inappropriate for the following reasons:

- The potential population increase would double or triple number of residents in Stanton Wick.
- The site is in the Green Belt.
- Whilst the site is remote from most other housing, it is adjacent to two houses, one of which is also on the Old Colliery

site. There would be a very detrimental impact on the amenity of the residents of the houses and, since one property would overlook the proposed Gypsy and Traveller camp, there would be little privacy for the new families. The remoteness would not aid integration of the Gypsies and Travellers with the local community, which is stated aim.

- The land is heavily contaminated; I have checked with Stanton Drew Parish Council and it has a comprehensive contamination report in its possession, which was included in previous planning applications for the site in question. I would therefore assume that the BaNES Planning Team already has the report and has no need to ask the landowner for a copy of this important document. To my amazement, I actually found a copy online through a Google search, which shows that it is available on the BaNES document server¹. Failure to review the report at this stage is at best lazy, and at worst incompetent, as much time and taxpayer's money could be wasted on a futile activity.
- The ground is unsafe and there is a recently collapsed mineshaft.
- There is poor vehicular access: two of the three possible access roads, which would be the obvious choices to access the local primary schools and the shop in Pensford, are single-track.
- There is no nearby public transport: it is a 1.5km walk to Pensford down a narrow and flood-prone lane and walking to the bus stops at the top of Bromley Road or at Chelwood roundabout would entail travel along the A368, which has a high volume of fast-moving traffic, including heavy goods and farm traffic and has no footway.
- Stanton Wick has a marginal water supply and residents already suffer major pressure drops at certain times during the day. Doubling the population would take it beyond breaking point. Additionally, there are questions about the capacity for drainage and for sewage, which would need to be removed by tanker.
- The shop and schools are at the very limit of the recommended distance. The shop in Pensford is very small with a limited range of stock and the nearest supermarket is 7 miles away. Both schools are relatively small and a large influx of new students would have a disruptive effect.
- The main doctor's surgery is over 5.3 miles away. It should be noted that at the end of February 2102, the local surgery was relocated from Chew Magna to Chew Stoke increasing the travel distance by 1.3 miles with significantly reduced transport options (which were poor to start with).

Summary

From my comments above, it is obvious that the matrix needs to be both re-constructed and re-scored as it is very easy to reach the conclusion that not only was the matrix fundamentally flawed, but it gives the impression that the desired outcomes were decided in advance and that the matrix then was populated with a bias towards achieving the desired result. For example, the World Heritage designation was not included in the criteria in the Development Plan Document (DPD) - Issues and Options Paper, but was used to screen-out several sites in the final report.

The more cynical amongst us would conclude that the process has been unduly influenced to enable BaNES to solve its longstanding problem with the lack of authorised sites (which will never be popular with voters) by creating a very large site well away from the City (and the majority of voters) in a rural location, where it was thought that the local populace would "go quietly". Could you please confirm that this is not the case?

Even if the matrix was correctly populated, then I have a strong concern about its usage as The Old Colliery site came 17th out of 20 possible sites, but was then placed on the shortlist of 7. How can this happen with a fair and reasonable process?

Respondent: 3025 / 2 Name: Simon Whittle Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am a resident of Stanton Drew Parish and a member of the Stanton Wick Action Group (SWAG).

My letter concerns the document control and quality of the above documents and response form, rather than the detailed content, and as such, request that you respond to my questions as soon as possible, rather than at the end of the consultation period for Gypsies and Travellers DPD Preferred Options, which is due to end on 18-July-2012.

Since my comments relate to basic document control, review and approval, I have copied my letter to the Chair of the Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development Scrutiny Panel.

My comments are based on my experience as the former chairman of a highly-respected mobile communications consultancy, which derived a significant proportion of its income of the delivery of detailed reports to a range of blue-chip multinational clients including Nokia Networks, Lucent Technologies and PA Consulting. As a condition of doing business, all of these clients insisted that we operated to an approved Quality Standard, which in our case was ISO 900. The "Control of Documents" is covered in Section 4.2.3 of the latest (2008) version of the standard. In my current job, I have prepared many reports for a major UK defence sub-contractor, and similar controls have been required.

In my opinion all of the documents exhibit poor document control and zero traceability, and this undermines the reader's confidence in the accuracy, reliability and consistency of the information contained therein. To my mind this renders them unfit for purpose.

Organisation Responsible for the Document

Two documents refer to BaNES on the first page and at various points in the text, but there is no consistent naming on each page. To my astonishment, the copy of the Site Selection document that I am reviewing does not mention BaNES until the third page, and then only in passing. In my experience, this information is normally located in the header or footer of every page of the document. Without it, it is not possible for the casual reader to be sure of the organisation responsible for the document or to identify if certain pages have been inserted by a third-party. Additionally, an official logo or similar, on each page provides a 'stamp of authority' on the document. I am also surprised that none of the documents includes a copyright symbol (©).

Q1. Could you please confirm that all three documents have been published by BaNES?

Page Numbering

Having printed and attempted to collate multiple paper copies of these documents for distribution to residents, I have been frustrated and at times appalled by the inconsistency in page numbering:

- The Consultation Document is only numbered on alternate pages, although it is good to note that the PDF page numbering is in step with the document numbering.
- The main body of the Sustainability Appraisal is numbered, although the numbering is totally out of step with the PDF page numbering and the numbering extends to page "44 of 42". To be frank, this is laughable, and highlights a rushed job and poor attention to detail; I would expect this to have been detected during peer review. Beyond this, the remaining 180 pages are not numbered at all.
- The Preferred Options document has no page numbering.

The above may be considered as a minor point, but having printed and attempted to sort, three uncollated copies, I can assure you that this is deeply irritating. Additionally, as some documents have no section numbering, cross referencing is very difficult.

Document Numbering

The most common method of identifying a document is with a unique document number, and this is normally located in the header or footer of every page of the document. None of the documents has document numbers: without this, it is easy for printed copies to be mixed up with other documents.

Q2. Could you please explain why none of these documents have unique identifiers?

Issue Date and Revision History

With any important document, it is essential that both the authors and the reader have a clear understanding of which version of the document they are reading (normally the latest), as any errors will result in misunderstandings, incorrect conclusions, and wasted time and effort. Only the Sustainability Appraisal has an Issue Date, but none of the documents has a revision number. Along with a revision number, professionally-produced documents normally include a revision history, which enables the reader to keep track of the changes in the document. Although I have been unable to re-locate the old version of the document, from memory I think that a previous version of the one of the related documents may have used a distance limit of 500 m for access to shops and schools, which subsequently changed to 1500 m. From my

perspective, this was an important change and I would like to be able to understand how and why this change occurred. With clear version control, my task and that of many others would be a lot easier.

Q3. Could you please explain why only one of these documents has an issue date and why issue dates are not repeated on each page? Why is there no revision history?

Document Authors

It is common practice for the authors of a document to be listed. The Sustainability Appraisal credits a "team of Council Officers", but I can find no evidence of authorship in the Preferred Options or Site Selection document. I am particularly concerned about the credit for a "team", rather than specific named officers, as my understanding (and please correct me if I am wrong) is that much of the work has been carried out by Ms Meghan Rossiter, who is an employee of Tetlow King Planning, and is assumed to be working for the Council on a contract basis.

Q4. Is it possible for you to identify the members of the team responsible for each document?

Q5. Could you please confirm the basis upon which Ms Rossiter is working for the Council and provide the name of the officer responsible for her work?

Document Review and Approval

A thorough review process is a key factor in the generation, and eventual public release, of a document and I am pleased to note that the Sustainability Appraisal was subject to a peer review by ENVIRON (Consultants), although there is no evidence of the other documents being subjected to peer review. However, I cannot find any evidence of any final approval for any of the documents. I find this very unusual for such important documents, the creation of which has obviously required a significant amount of time and money and as Divisional Director I would have expected to see your name on each document.

Q6. Could you please confirm whether the Site Assessment and Preferred Options documents were peer reviewed and if so, by whom.

Q7. Could you please confirm whether any of the three documents have been formally approved and if so, by whom.

I did find a section on the website devoted to 'External Inspections' and this included the Customer Service Excellence (CSE) standard. Although the website claims that "The Council has successfully achieved accreditation at a corporate level and for each of its customer facing services over the last four years", the CSE website (checked 03-Jun-2012) does not list Planning & Transport Development:

Q8. If you were not the approver for the documents, could you please confirm whether you have read all of the documents in their entirety and if not, how much of them you have read?

Quality

Returning to the Quality theme, I searched the BaNES website to find evidence of accreditation to ISO 9001 or similar, but could not find it.

- The search term "quality management system" resulted in no 'hits'
- The search term "9001" resulted in one 'hit' although this was a spurious result as it was just a number in table.
- The search term "ISO" resulted in 54 'hits' although none of these were directly relevant. It was interesting to note that one of the documents (PERMIT TO OPERATE A PRINTING INK MANUFACTURING PROCESS, from BaNES Environmental Services), did include references to other ISO standards (such as the Environmental Management System, ISO 14001), so BaNES as a whole is obviously familiar with a related standard. This document also included a clearly delineated document reference, page number and organisation name on each page.

Q9. Could you confirm whether Planning & Transport Development has applied for CSE accreditation and if so, whether the application was successful.

Q10. Could you confirm whether BaNES (and Planning & Transport Development in particular has any Quality accreditations), such as ISO9001:2008? If not, are there any plans to apply for accreditation?

It's possible that my searches were inappropriate and if so, I'd be keen to review any relevant information you could provide.

Response Form

The response form provides another example of poor document control, as the original form contained inappropriate sections, which were more suited to a "call for sites" from landowners and their agents than for a feedback form to be mainly be used by residents of affected locations. Meghan Rossiter conceded, in an e-mail that the form was confusing and updated it, but what is particularly frustrating is that the change was made on 07-Jun, which is 25% of the way through the consultation process. On 06-June, the day before the local consultation event, SWAG printed and hand-distributed 300 copies to all households in Stanton Drew, which are now useless.

If the form had been reviewed and approved by a full-time Council officer prior to release, I suspect that the error would have been detected and corrected. As with the documents, neither version of the form had an issue date or version number. One final comment is that the downloadable forms are in MS Word format, rather than PDF, which restricts access to users with a relatively expensive, rather than free, software package.

Summary

The three documents, plus the feedback form, exhibit, to varying degrees, poor attention to detail, lack of document control, little or no traceability and no evidence of official approval.

As someone attempting to use them to understand the process steps and decision making methodology of site requirements and selection, I have found my progress hampered at each step and I have wasted considerable time trying to cross-reference specific pages or sections in order to discuss them with my colleagues in SWAG or to provide feedback to BaNES Planning team. The lack of a named approver shows a complete disregard for accountability.

If, when I ran a design consultancy, I had submitted documents in this format, my clients would have returned them forthwith and quiet rightly so! The frustrating thing is that getting this right is trivial and only an organisation with no interest in producing high quality work would be so slack.

In my opinion, these documents are not fit for the purpose for which they were created.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3025 / 3 Name: Simon Whittle Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing to you to express my concerns regarding the proposed development and also to comment on the assessment process used to arrive at the shortlist of 7 proposed sites. I have strong objections both to the proposal and to the assessment process.

Whilst I accept the pressing need for BaNES to create official sites for the Gypsy and Traveller community, the selection must be made on fair and reasonable grounds, using accurate information. The assessment criteria must not be relaxed to ensure that sufficient sites can be definitely found, as this would inevitably result in unsuitable sites being chosen. The assessment criteria must be those stated in the assessment plans, not others added at the end of the process, as this is unreasonable and can lead to suspicions of a "hidden agenda".

Assessment Process

As a professional engineer, with 30 years' experience, many of them in senior management or company director roles, I

have used scoring matrices on many occasions and found them to be a very powerful tool. The chief advantage is that a well-designed matrix permits the user to minimise subjective opinions and to create an objective result. The system does, however suffer from several potential flaws:

Potential Flaw Effect Result

1. Failure to select appropriate "entry criteria" Options which are not feasible are considered and given weightings Unfeasible options appear in matrix and are selected
2. Incomplete set of assessment criteria Matrix biased towards the selected criteria with important issues not considered. Result is not based on all relevant influences
3. Inappropriate selection of "weightings" Result is biased towards certain criteria Matrix output becomes highly subjective
4. Inaccurate or erroneous data entered into the matrix: Results are wrong Incorrect conclusions drawn from matrix output

In my opinion the "Detailed Site Assessment Report" suffers from a fundamentally flawed matrix. Examples of this include:

1. Entry criteria: The World Heritage designation was used as Yes/No criterion, but Green Belt and contaminated land were not. If Green Belt is not appropriate for development (and BaNES has rejected applications both for the above site and for the adjacent site (Filer's Coaches)) on this basis in the past, then location in the Green Belt should be excluded, not just given a high negative weighting.
2. Incomplete criteria: Availability of utilities (water, gas, electricity, sewerage etc.) was not included in the matrix. A flow-limited water supply is a well-documented issue in Stanton Wick and residents already have to time their critical water usage (e.g. showers) with other residents in the hamlet and with guests at the Carpenter's Arms. There is no mains drainage or sewerage at the site. Additionally, proximity to secondary schools was not considered.
3. Inappropriate weightings: As well the incorrect use of weightings identified in Flaw 1, some weightings in the matrix are very subjective. For example, the capacity of the existing road network is given a very low weighting (1), although this criterion has frequently been cited by BaNES when rejecting planning applications in the immediate and adjacent areas.
4. Inaccurate / erroneous data: The Old Colliery site is not classed as having hazardous land nearby, whereas the site itself has a mineshaft, which has recently suffered from a collapse.

It is obvious that the matrix needs to be both re-constructed and re-scored to ensure that all relevant criteria are included and correctly weighted and that sites with significant potential issues should be excluded, not just given a heavy negative weighting.

Appropriateness of the site

The proposed site is inappropriate for the following reasons:

- The potential population increase would double or triple number of residents in Stanton Wick.
- The site is in the Green Belt.
- Whilst the site is remote from most other housing, it is adjacent to two houses, one of which is also on the Old Colliery site. There would be a very detrimental impact on the amenity of the residents of the houses and, since one property would overlook the proposed Gypsy and Traveller camp, there would be little privacy for the new families. The remoteness would not aid integration of the Gypsies and Travellers with the local community, which is stated aim.
- The land is heavily contaminated; I have checked with Stanton Drew Parish Council and it has a comprehensive contamination report in its possession, which was included in previous planning applications for the site in question. I would therefore assume that the BaNES Planning Team already has the report and has no need to ask the landowner for a copy of this important document. To my amazement, I actually found a copy online through a Google search, which shows that it is available on the BaNES document server . Failure to review the report at this stage is at best lazy, and at worst incompetent, as much time and taxpayer's money could be wasted on a futile activity.
- The ground is unsafe and there is a recently collapsed mineshaft.
- There is poor vehicular access: two of the three possible access roads, which would be the obvious choices to access the local primary schools and the shop in Pensford, are single-track.
- There is no nearby public transport: it is a 1.5km walk to Pensford down a narrow and flood-prone lane and walking to

the bus stops at the top of Bromley Road or at Chelwood roundabout would entail travel along the A368, which has a high volume of fast-moving traffic, including heavy goods and farm traffic and has no footway.

- Stanton Wick has a marginal water supply and residents already suffer major pressure drops at certain times during the day. Doubling the population would take it beyond breaking point. Additionally, there are questions about the capacity for drainage and for sewage, which would need to be removed by tanker.
- The shop and schools are at the very limit of the recommended distance. The shop in Pensford is very small with a limited range of stock and the nearest supermarket is 7 miles away. Both schools are relatively small and a large influx of new students would have a disruptive effect.
- The main doctor's surgery is over 5.3 miles away. It should be noted that at the end of February 2102, the local surgery was relocated from Chew Magna to Chew Stoke increasing the travel distance by 1.3 miles with significantly reduced transport options (which were poor to start with).

Summary

From my comments above, it is obvious that the matrix needs to be both re-constructed and re-scored as it is very easy to reach the conclusion that not only was the matrix fundamentally flawed, but it gives the impression that the desired outcomes were decided in advance and that the matrix then was populated with a bias towards achieving the desired result. For example, the World Heritage designation was not included in the criteria in the Development Plan Document (DPD) - Issues and Options Paper, but was used to screen-out several sites in the final report.

The more cynical amongst us would conclude that the process has been unduly influenced to enable BaNES to solve it's longstanding problem with the lack of authorised sites (which will never be popular with voters) by creating a very large site well away from the City (and the majority of voters) in a rural location, where it was thought that the local populace would "go quietly". Could you please confirm that this is not the case?

Even if the matrix was correctly populated, then I have a strong concern about its usage as The Old Colliery site came 17th out of 20 possible sites, but was then placed on the shortlist of 7. How can this happen with a fair and reasonable process?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3026 / 1 Name: Tim Richards Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I would like to register my objection to the proposed development of a Gypsies and Travellers site in Stanton Wick on the grounds that the site is unsuitable and that the local community has not been consulted. The specific reasons for my objection are:

- engagement with the local community has been neither early nor effective
- development of the site would not appropriately protect the Green Belt
- the site would dominate the existing local community of Stanton Wick
- access from the Pensford side of the site is over an unsuitable former railway bridge which appears to be in an unsafe condition
- the ground at the site is potentially unsafe because of former mine workings
- there is insufficient pedestrian access to the site
- there is insufficient public transport access to the site

- insufficient utility facilities including water, drainage and electricity supplies
- no shopping facilities
- no medical facilities
- no local school capacity
- the site is not on a registered traveller's route

As a local resident I look forward to hearing directly from the Council about the progression of the application.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3026 / 2 Name: Tim Richards Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I am a resident of Upper Stanton Drew in the same position as the proposed site at the Old Colliery Building at Stanton Wick. I know the area well and frequently walk the lanes and footpaths of the parish. My following comments on the suitability of the site are based on this local knowledge.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. The Council's assessment of the Old Colliery reviews the opportunities and constraints of the site but the recommendation for development relies almost entirely on meeting the identified need of providing a single large site, stating that this constitutes the necessary "very special circumstances" required to justify allocating land within the Green Belt. These very special circumstances are therefore defined by the Council's desire to identify one large site, rather than to specifically address the needs of either the Travellers or the existing Local Community. In my opinion the desire by the Council to identify one large site does not constitute the special circumstances necessary to allocate land in the Green Belt which as the Preferred Options paper states in paragraph 3.6 is "inappropriate development", nor does it address the other policy requirements, physical constraints or potential impacts.

The options paper states that the site is outside the housing settlement boundary of Stanton Wick and is "outside the main settlement", ignoring the fact that Stanton Wick is not a nucleated village and is strung out over a considerable distance. The site is perceived to be in Stanton Wick and would have a huge impact on the existing settlement and to a lesser extent its neighbours.

The options paper states that the site benefits from extant planning permission for a single residential dwelling, drawing a parallel between a single! residence and a 20 pitch site, but fails to mention that there is a history of planning application refusals at the site based on Green Belt considerations.

Access to local amenities, including schools, shops and public transport by pedestrians is very restricted and is awkward by car. The school and Post Office Store in Pensford is 1.5 km from the site entrance along Wick Lane. Wick Lane is narrow and crosses an old railway bridge with 90 degree bends on either side the parapet which has been damaged by long vehicles. Even with existing traffic levels the bridge is subsiding on either side of the arch and the parapet appears to be in danger of collapse with a 2 inch clear crack right though it on one side. Council workers were recently performing a survey on the bridge and joked that I should hurry across before it collapsed. What were the results of the survey? Beyond the bridge towards Pensford the lane has a gradient of approximately 1 in 10 and in places the road surface is not much more than 2m wide. Here the road surface is always slippery as the lane is deeply incised, damp and overhung by trees. The vertical difference in height between the Pensford School and the Old Colliery entrance is 70m or 230 feet. On this stretch there is no space for a parent with a buggy to pass a car, let alone two cars to pass each other. A regular pedestrian school run along this lane is frankly dangerous. A substantial increase in traffic will lead to accidents. Widening the lane would be difficult and would substantially alter its character. Access to Stanton Drew School down Stanton Wick Lane is 2.85 km along an equally narrow lane used by large farm vehicles and with few passing spaces. The vertical height difference

between Stanton Drew School and the Old Colliery entrance is 46m or 150 feet. Walking from the Old Colliery to either of these schools is a substantial hike by foot along muddy lanes with poor visibility. Most residents of Stanton Drew do not use either of these lanes on a regular basis by car because they are too dangerous because of restricted visibility, even in good weather. I have personally had a car written off on a blind bend on one of these lanes. Access to Stanton Drew School from the Old Colliery via the A368 and Bromley Road is 4 km and is also single width in places. Access to the Surgery in Chew Stoke is 7.9 km or 4.9 miles, there is no public transport. The location of the site does not provide adequate access to local amenities.

As a former industrial site I understand that the land is both contaminated and contains mine shafts.

The options paper may underestimate the visual impact of the site and states that the landscape character of the area is "generally of poor quality". This statement is disingenuous because the site is set within a context of proximity to the Chew Valley, Dundry, the Mendip Hills and the Stanton Drew Monument. The option paper does not consider increased traffic noise in what is a generally tranquil rural location. I understand that the location is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, for the reasons stated above.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The weights used in the site scoring matrix are not explained in the options paper. Travellers in B&NES deserve a site that meets their needs and requirements including a safe site and safe access to amenities. The residents of Stanton Wick and nearby villages deserve to have a say in how their local community develops particularly in the context of the Localism Act's community rights and neighbourhood planning aspects. The Council needs to identify a site which adequately meets the planning criteria rather than one whose benefit is largely providing one big site on the basis of a fanciful definition of "very special circumstances".

Respondent: 3027 / 1 Name: Miss Clare Watkins Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Please include the following questions and confirm the response in due course.

1. Please confirm the accepted level of traveller % to local resident % that has been agreed / approved in previous suggested sites. My understanding is that 25 people live in Stanton Wick against some proposed 200 travellers. Is there no % that is considered an unacceptable level of dwarfing on a local community ?
2. Please confirm how many children are expected within the travellers that are intended to use the site and what schooling they are being offered ? My understanding is that Pensford School had 14 places this year, all of which have been taken. I am unsure how many places would / could be available in Stanton Wick / Drew but cannot imagine there are many. How will the travelling children have the amenities they require if local schools do not have places available ?
3. Please confirm what steps have been taken and how additional teaching resources have been funded and made available for any additional children that will be attending local schools ? It is possible that children of a travelling community who have gaps in their education and / or move schools will need additional assistance in order to maintain acceptable / expected levels of attainment, what are the calculated projections of the learning needs of the traveller children and how have these needs been considered and addressed ? If this is the case how many additional teachers will be available to them and how are the costs of this being met ? Are there any plans to expand the local schools to accommodate ? And if not why not, if this is necessary ? If you are unaware of how many children will need placement - how can you consider it to be a suitable site without this information ?
4. Please confirm which GP surgeries will be expected to deal with the registration of an additional circa 200 people and how this will impact on abilities of the surgeries to deal with timely local appointments. Are additional GPs being brought

into the area and if so how many and how will this be funded ?

5. Please confirm the Highways responses to date regarding significant traffic on these currently infrequently used roads, if the highways are yet to comment please confirm when they will do so and where the responses can be accessed . Please confirm how the additional strain on these roads will be monitored and how the roads will be maintained and funded for this maintenance ? Please confirm what the thought process has been regarding access issues on these narrow roads and what systems are being put into place to deal with the same and how this is being funded ?

6. Please confirm the levels of ecology awareness that have been undertaken to date. Has the site being inspected for endangered species / flora / fauna etc How has the wildlife and countryside act been adhered to ? Are there any veteran trees on the site ? Has a bat survey been undertaken ? Please provide a copy of the ecological reports to date or advise where these may be viewed ?

8. Please confirm what refuse will be available to the travellers and how this will be funded ?

9. Please confirm what level of council tax banding the travellers will be expected to pay and what proof of payment will be available. Please also confirm what the penalty for non payment will be and how this will be enforced ?

10. Please confirm how you will deal with unauthorised expansion should this situation occur and how this will be monitored in order to stop such a situation from occurring ?

11. I have been advised that the site is a brown site in a green belt but that it has been previously rejected planning permission. Please confirm if this is accurate - why the previous planning was rejected and why this new planning / development differs and is being considered?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3028 / 1 Name: Mr Mike Woodward Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am sixty eight years old, have lived all my life in the Chew Valley, the last forty-four in Stanton Drew.

The proposed traveler's site is very obviously totally inappropriate

1. The direct routes to both Stanton Drew and Pensford are tiny lanes entirely unsuitable for increased traffic, particularly schoolchildren on foot.
2. The site history must surely make it especially costly to set up and maintain particularly in these times of necessary austerity.
3. The scale of the development, even if it were not to increase in the future, is wholly incompatible with sleepy Stanton Wick.

It seems that the whole project is driven by a central directive to provide travelers sites. I ask you to examine this aspect as follows:-

4. Surely any development aimed at a selected group of people must necessarily discriminate against everyone else?
5. There must be many young people in the village and the valley who do not stand a cat-in-hells chance of staying here. Would a proposal to develop the site as a caravan/mobile home park for their use get the same consideration?
6. It seems clear to me that the central directive is to blame and needs to be changed and soon. In the meantime why not take our lead from our European friends and ignore it?

Finally, I cannot believe that anyone from the local area, be they villagers, council officials or elected representatives – including you - can think this development is appropriate. Please do your best to stop it.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3029 / 1 Name: Joy Richards Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I am a local resident and a walker - I know the site well and my information comes directly from this knowledge. I have lived in the area for 25 years.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. This is a greenbelt land and unsuitable for such a large site. There are issues of access - to get to schools or the local postoffice, you would need to travel to wither Stanton Drew or pensford - both require travelling down very narrow, long lanes - very difficult by car or walking (which would be unsafe on a regular basis). The nearest Doctors surgery is 5 miles away- there is no public transport. There is no local shop nearby - for food shopping (other than the post office, one mile away).

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. The site is dangerous, has several old mine shafts, liable to subsidence - the land is also contaminated. There is limited employment in the area. It is close to the Pensford Conservation area. The water supply to Stanton Wick is unreliable, there is no mains sewerage and such a large development could not be supported by septic tanks. There is a long history of planning application refusals at this site - inappropriate dev. In the Greenbelt being the reason.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The councils assessment relies almost entirely on meeting the identified need of providing a single large site - stating that this constitutes 'very special circumstances' required to justify allocating land within the Greenbelt. It is not in the interests of the travellers or the local community for such a large site - and I believe such a site would constitute an 'inappropriate development' (preferred options paper paragraph 3.6).

Travellers in BANES deserve a safe site with access to local amenities and the residents of Stanton Wick deserve to have a say in the development of their local community/

Respondent: 3029 / 2 Name: Joy Richards Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I would like to register my objection to the proposed development of a Gypsies and Travellers site in Stanton Wick on the grounds that the site is unsuitable and that the local community has not been consulted. The specific reasons for my objection are:

- engagement with the local community has been neither early nor effective
- development of the site would not appropriately protect the Green Belt
- the site would dominate the existing local community of Stanton Wick
- access from the Pensford side of the site is over an unsuitable former railway bridge which appears to be in an unsafe condition
- the ground at the site is potentially unsafe because of former mine workings
- there is insufficient pedestrian access to the site
- there is insufficient public transport access to the site

- insufficient utility facilities including water, drainage and electricity supplies
- no shopping facilities
- no medical facilities
- no local school capacity
- the site is not on a registered traveller's route

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3031 / 1 Name: Andrew Lakeman Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

All reasonable people accept that travellers should be treated no differently from everybody else in the community. They have the same rights and responsibilities as everyone else, and should not be discriminated against, or ostracised.

In that context, it is legitimate to ask why the Council is proposing that families with young children should live on contaminated land; a former waste tip and slag heap, riddled with unstable mineshafts.

As part of a previous planning application, (Reference:10/01429FUL) a Contamination Report was prepared by Sanctus Ltd, on a small part (0.5 hectares) of the proposed site, near the road, and away from the main mine site and the refuse tip; i.e. in that part of the site least likely to be contaminated.

Even here Sanctus found significant arsenic contamination. Within its conclusion it wrote:

Chemical analysis returned levels of Arsenic exceeding the Residential SGV, which statistical analysis confirmed to be significant.

Earlier in the report, Sanctus wrote:

A local authority landfill...located approximately 130m to the east of the site. This is located within the boundary of the old colliery and was indicated on the historical maps as a refuse tip. No information is given on the type of waste deposited or the date of closure of the site.

This landfill site is right in the middle of the proposed travellers' site. Nobody knows what was dumped there, during a time when controls were virtually non-existent.

The mine itself was worked for some 50 years until 1958. The slag remains on site. What hazards it presents, again nobody knows.

In the 50 years since its closure, even during repeated property booms, there has been no serious attempt to develop the site for residential use; perhaps because the houses would be unsaleable on such a site?

Even if remedial work were to be undertaken on the 2.5 hectares to be developed, there is no proposal to clean up the remaining 7.5 hectares of the site.

Children would naturally roam all over it, unwittingly putting themselves at enormous risk.

Yet despite all this, the Council is proposing that people should live here; that children should play amongst the potentially lethal debris and detritus of heavy industry.

Would you want to live there, Mr Ball?

Would you be happy for your children or grandchildren to grow up there?

Can you guarantee the safety of every child on the site?

If you can answer "yes" to every question, then vote for the proposed site.

If not, then in all conscience, you must surely vote against it.

I hope this information will help you make your decision.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3032 / 1 Name: Mrs Jenny & Wall Organisation:
David

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Having written to a number of councillors and other interested parties, and attending many of the meetings held locally and in Bath, we find it extraordinary that the Stanton Wick site was carried forward for consultation and vast amounts of money are still being wasted consulting on its suitability.

We make the following points:

1)The new policy document, as published on 25 March 2012 by the Communities and Local Government Department, states that the Government is committed to the protection of the nation's green spaces and that the policy will protect Green Belt land and the countryside. The Planning Policy for Travellers Sites also clearly states that they are an inappropriate development on Green Belt land.

The new guidance makes clear that there should be due regard for the protection of the local environment and amenities when local authorities set out their criteria for allocating sites.

Not only does the Stanton Wick site fall in the Green Belt, it is also a site of historical and nature conservation interest. It is also very near the Pensford Conservation area.

2)The document also states, under Policy C, that when assessing suitable sites local authorities should ensure that the scale of any proposed site should not dominate the nearest settled community.

A travellers' site would fundamentally dwarf this very small rural hamlet at a ratio of approximately 3 to 1.

3) The Cabinet's procedure for consideration of the list of sites for consultation appear flawed.

How can a site which scored so poorly on the matrix assessment total which gave it a position 17th out of 23 sites be put forward as favoured? The position speaks for itself.

IT IS INAPPROPRIATE AS A SITE FOR TRAVELLERS.

SIXTEEN OTHER SITES WERE DEEMED TO BE MORE APPROPRIATE
BY THE COUNCIL'S OWN CALCULATIONS

4) The site is not close to doctors' surgeries, schools and employment opportunities and there is no public transport within safe walking distance.

5) There have already been a number of failed planning applications for the site and Filers' coach park near by, so how can it be justified to suggest that a larger number of people and vehicles should now be allowed to live there now.

6) The Highways department has already discovered that the local lanes are not able to support additional dwellings; I believe only one new dwelling was allowed when 5 had been applied for, so more people/vehicles are not appropriate.

7) The site is dangerous because of contamination and many old mine shafts.

8) The local water and lack of mains sewerage are already making these utilities barely serviceable for the existing community.

9) How could BANES justify the huge expenditure that would be required to overcome the problems of 7) +8) Altogether huge expenditure of millions of pounds would be required to meet this and highway solutions.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. The council's assessment is totally at odds with the Government's Policy recommendations published on 12th March 2012.

The matrix calculation is evidence that the site offers no opportunities for the travellers, which form the basis for recommending the suitability of a site.

We understand that there were already nationally recommended minimum distances for access to local services, but the document also reaffirms that traveller sites should be located to 'enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure'.

The Stanton Wick site just does not meet these needs. Schools, doctors surgeries and employment are far more distant than the prescribed parameters of accessibility

Furthermore there is very limited local employment and the vast majority of local residents of working age commute to work.

The site is also far from a regular bus service.

The other point of view, which should be represented, is that of the travellers. Stanton Wick and the Chew Valley in general are not on a recognised travellers' route.

It would also create an extremely isolated community with none of the basic required amenities within walking distance. Stanton Wick, together with Stanton Drew, has no doctor, dentist or shop.

If one compares the unofficial Twerton Wood site, anyone can recognise what made the travellers pitch their vehicles there.

New sites need to have all the benefits and local amenities that Twerton offers.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

We wish to convey to you our strongest opposition to Stanton Wick Colliery being considered as a proposed travellers site. We agree that there has to be provision for this sector of our population, but, with reference to the revised government guidelines on the positioning of such amenities, Stanton Wick appears to be the wrong location on practically every point. The site would require vast expenditure to be viable, which would seem inappropriate in the economic climate of this decade and probably the next.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This rural site, compared with one having advantages and facilities of bordering a small town or city as with Twerton, offers nothing for a travelling family.

No amenities and public transport and no safe pathways for reaching them.

IN CONCLUSION STANTON WICK IS NOT APPROPRIATE FOR A GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITE.
THE PHYSICAL CONDITION AND LOCALITY OF THIS SITE TOGETHER WITH THE COUNCIL'S OWN MATRIX CHART PROVE IT.

Respondent: 3036 / 1 Name: Mr Malcolm Jenkins Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

YES. I have information regarding the suitability of the "Old Colliery Site" at Stanton Wick

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO. This site is so utterly unsuitable I feel that elected members are being misled by the council officers, keen to tick a box.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

My view is that planning officers are not recognising the many negative aspects of this site and have invented a few very poor positives which they emphasize. This site falls short of central government guidance on several issues, none of them minor ones. It appears that the planning department is able to trot out fabricated "facts" with impunity and are determined to ignore local opinions whilst "going through the motions" of a consultation

Respondent: 3036 / 2 Name: Mr Malcolm Jenkins Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

It is with growing concern and alarm that I have become aware of B&NES intention to propose the site of the old Colliery at Stanton Wick, for use as a traveller and Gypsy site. Despite Cllr Ball's claim that the process is in it's initial stages, it would appear that a considerable amount of preparatory work has been carried out by B&NES, this would seem to have been done in secret, without the knowledge of residents or Parish Councillors.

The process has already become seriously flawed even at this early stage, with the scoring matrix having been completed in a blatantly biased and less than professional manner. Active opposition to the scheme has already come from both local residents and members of the travelling community. The Stanton Wick site came 17th on a list of potential sites, with a score of 10 fraudulent points, yet it is included in the final short-list of 7 sites. This is blatant manipulation, but by whom, or on whose instruction?

I include below a list of questions and observations. We are all very busy people, but I, would be very grateful if you could take the time to offer me your responses.

- 1) How were the sites selected and by whom? Is B&NES committed to a transparent and democratic, process of site selection?
- 2) Which criteria are uppermost in B&NES process, the most suitable site for residents and travellers, or the most convenient site for the residents of Bath?
- 3) Is there a legal requirement for B&NES to provide sites? If so, in which piece of current legislation can it be found?
- 4) Who is responsible for manipulating the scoring matrix figures, or at least, a less than professional and competent interpretation of the process?
- 5) How did a site that scored just 10 points, coming 17th in the overall list, make it on to a short-list of 7? Whose decision was it to override the process?

- 6) Is there a true system of quality assurance for the competence of council officers?
- 7) Will a true and honest re-evaluation of the site be carried out, in partnership with a local representative?
- 8) Have B&NES looked at potential sites in Bath? If so, was land at the end of Newton Road, in Mr Balls ward of Twerton, considered, if not why not? This land has shops, schools, public transport, pavements, street lighting, doctors, all within easy, safe, level, walking distance. It would appear to be perfect.
- 9) Why are the views of the travelling community relating to this site, not being recognised, will they be forced onto the site?
- 10) Has the supposed value of the land at Stanton Wick Colliery been investigated by B&NES to compare with the true value?
- 11) Is there any safeguard mechanism, to prevent the owner of the site pulling out of the deal when permission has been granted (thus, increasing the value of the land)?
- 12) The owner of the land was telling people of this scheme in December 2010. It was presented as revenge for a lack of social recognition locally. When was B&NES first approached?
- 13) How many times has B&NES been involved in legal actions with the current site owner? Are any of these actions current and on-going?
- 14) Is there a presumption within B&NES towards acceptance of this site? This is already taking on the appearance of a "shady, done deal"

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3037 / 1 Name: Mr Phil Townshend Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

REF Proposed Traveller Site, Old Colliery Buildings, Wick Lane,
Pensford

Further to my recent letter of 1/5/12 (regrettably letter undated) I would like to ask 2 further questions. As explained in my letter, several planning applications have been rejected by BANES to extend the usage of Filers coach yard to 20 vehicles, the land being immediately next door to the south of the proposed site. The rejections being for inappropriate use of the Green Belt which would detract from the openness and rural character of the area. Additional reasons in support of the rejections being congestion and inconvenience to other road users as well as the unsustainability of the location.

1) Can you explain to me how you can possibly see the two situations as being different. Both are Brown Field sites within Green Belt. One is rejected as being inappropriate development of Green Belt with the location being deemed unsustainable. The other is deemed appropriate use of Green Belt (at least enough to be put forward for consultation) with the location being considered sustainable. Please explain how this can be.

2) Filers coach yard reapplication 11/05078NAR was due for a decision 24/1/12. Can you explain why this decision has been delayed by 3 months so far.

Respondent: 3037 / 1 Name: Mr Phil Townshend Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We are now aware of BANES council's intention to carry out a consultation with regard the positioning of a travellers site at the above location.

We note, on reading various documents, that you carried out an informal consultation where you sought community engagement and communicated this via local media and a series of both direct mail and email. We further note that you had face to face meetings with the gypsy and traveller community and clearly must have had discussions with the landowner and/or his representative, yet you chose not to consult my partner nor I as the owners of the adjacent land and property!

Under the Freedom of Information Act would you please supply a list of all those individuals and organisations with whom you consulted, when and what form the consultation took.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3037 / 1 Name: Mr Phil Townshend Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Various planning requirements make this site unachievable, primarily:

The site is within the Green Belt. Government Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012, Paragraph 14 states "Travellers sites in Green Belt are inappropriate development." and "Inappropriate development is harmful to Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances." BaNES have not provided any reasoning as to why they might consider there to be very special circumstances. Government policy also states, "When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, the Local Planning Authority should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community." Stanton Wick is the nearest settled community, a very small Hamlet of just over 20 houses, which would be unacceptably dominated by the proposed site.

The site would be unsuitable for a number of additional reasons, including:

NPPF seeks sustainable development. Stanton Wick colliery is not sustainably located in that it is in a remote location away from all services (including schools, shops, doctors and public transport) and the roads from the site to the nearest villages (Stanton Drew and Pensford) are primarily unlit, unpaved single track lanes that cannot viably be upgraded. BaNES emerging CP11 includes criteria against which G and T proposals are to be assessed, one of the criteria states "Satisfactory means of access can be provided and an existing highway network is adequate to service the site.", it is not!! Another criteria states that "Use of this site must have no harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers". There are two adjacent residential properties (The Winding House and The Bath House, 2 families totalling 10 occupants) whose amenity would undoubtedly be compromised by the proposed scale of development

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The Council's assessment matrix is flawed, in that it has incorrect weightings/scores for proximity, nature conservation, contamination, highways accessibility, safety, noise, and Green Belt. If the evaluation matrix was properly scored, the Old Colliery Buildings Stanton Wick would not have been designated as a preferred site.

BaNES seems to under estimate the number of vans per pitch (1. 7) compared to the government's guidance of (3.2).

BaNES Issues and Options Report refers to: "The need for smaller sites in Bath & North East Somerset district is supported by the West of England GT AA which found that most surveyed respondents expressed a preference to live in smaller family-sized sites of no more than five pitches." Both local councillors and planning officers have on numerous occasions stated that in their opinion the major benefit for the Stanton Wick site is its "large size", they are clearly at odds with their own documentation!

The Preferred Options Stage: Detailed Site Assessment Report states that "All known constraints were identified to draw out site delivery costs such as infrastructure and remediation works." This is untrue, there has been no attempt to quantify the infrastructure costs, these include highways infrastructure, drainage and remediation works. Without this information the site ought not to have been included as a preferred site.

The most recent Government policy guidance for designating gypsy and travellers sites gives a range of plan making and decision-taking policy criteria. Since the site at Stanton Wick would fail to comply with most of these policies it would appear that BaNES have blatantly chosen to ignore recent Government policy.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No! The process employed has shown itself to be deeply flawed and with no the greenbelt should remain intact.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Throughout this process, the LibDem cabinet and BaNES officers have shown themselves to have been less than co-operative when addressing residents concerns. One might say evasive !

Initially we were labelled as "self appointed experts", quite flattering really but almost in the same breath, accused of using "anti gypsy rhetoric". The minutes of the cabinet meeting gth May will prove that claim to be untrue. I wasn't aware that bullying and intimidation represented government guidance and best practice for gypsy and traveller sites !!

During the "road shows" held in both Pensford and Stanton Drew, cabinet members and planning officers showed great contempt when answering residents genuine planning concerns, continually referring to documents contained within the BaNES website rather than giving straight forward answers.

There has clearly been an attempt by the LibDem cabinet to bully through these proposed traveller sites, particularly when recently issued National guidelines give contrary opinion with regard traveller sites within greenbelt. They have shown themselves to be ill advised to have ignored local opinion and ill informed when that local opinion was better informed than they and their advisors, with regard planning law. It will be proved that they will ultimately be responsible for a complete waste of taxpayers money !

Respondent: 3037 / 2 Name: Mr Phil Townshend Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Further to my recent letter of 1/5/12 (regrettably letter undated) I would like to ask 2 further questions.

As explained in my letter, several planning applications have been rejected by BANES to extend the usage of Filers coach yard to 20 vehicles, the land being immediately next door to the south of the proposed site. The rejections being for inappropriate use of the Green Belt which would detract from the openness and rural character of the area. Additional reasons in support of the rejections being congestion and inconvenience to other road users as well as the unsustainability of the location.

- 1) Can you explain to me how you can possibly see the two situations as being different. Both are Brown Field sites within Green Belt. One is rejected as being inappropriate development of Green Belt with the location being deemed unsustainable. The other is deemed appropriate use of Green Belt (at least enough to be put forward for consultation) with the location being considered sustainable. Please explain how this can be.
- 2) Filers coach yard reapplication 11/05078NAR was due for a decision 24/1/12. Can you explain why this decision has been delayed by 3 months so far.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3037 / 3 Name: Mr Phil Townshend Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We write to you as the joint owners of the Winding House, Wick Lane, Pensford, BS394BU, the land and property next door on the north side to the above land under consultation. We purchased the property and moved in end September 2011.

During the legal process of purchase, we were made aware of a series of planning rejections at a local coach yard, the most recent being on the basis of inappropriate use of Green Belt which would detract from the openness and rural character of the area. Subsequent to this, on reapplication, a further rejection took place on the same grounds, inappropriate use of the Green Belt. Additional grounds also given in support of these rejections included congestion and inconvenience to other road users as well as the unsustainability of the location. If you are not aware already, the coach yard is the neighbouring property on the south side of the proposed travellers site. It should be pointed out that mention was also made of the fact Wick Lane is predominately a single track highway.

We proceeded with the purchase largely on the basis of the property being within the Green Belt and BANES clearly demonstrating their respect for the Green Belt by rejecting these applications, clearly this appears to be no longer the case!

To be informed last week that BANES were putting forward the Old Colliery Buildings as a potential travellers site has left us bemused, particularly as new national guidelines from central Government, of which you are part, state clearly that traveller sites on Green Belt are inappropriate development. There are clearly no "very special circumstances" in this case, particularly when this site scored so badly for suitability on your own scoring matrix.

Would you please confirm if you are prepared to spend significant sums of taxpayers money carrying out this consultation knowing full well that you will be acting against your own Governments guidelines and therefore unlikely to succeed.

In addition we would like you to explain how a site that scored so lowly for suitability, finishing 17th out of the 20 sites put forward, could remain on the shortlist for consultation? On the surface it would appear that the result didn't fit with your expectation so you disregarded it.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3039 / 1 Name: Dr Giles Haythornthwaite Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing to express my concerns with regard to proposal to create a Gypsy and traveller site at the old Colliery in Stanton Wick. I understand the need to create authorized sites for Gypsies and travelers so as to promote the health and well being of the children and families. As a Consultant in Paediatric Emergency medicine at Bristol Royal Hospital for children, I have treated many children from the Gypsy and travelling communities and I have found them and the families to be a courteous and caring. I know that they often live in extended family groups and often have a large number of children.

It is with particular reference to the health and well being of children that I am concerned that the site at the old Colliery Stanton Wick is not appropriate. I list the concerns to which I would like a response please, they are as follows.

1. I understand there is a concern with regard to asbestos and arsenic contamination of the site. While this perhaps could be cleared to a certain level. Could I request that a full environmental health assessment is undertaken with particular reference to the fact that the proposed planning permission is likely to bring a large number of children to the area? Due to the fact that children naturally explore the whole area would need to be assessed rather than just the proposed living area.
2. There has been a collapsed mine shaft on the site which greatly concerns me. As undocumented derelict mine shafts would pose an absolutely unacceptable risk for the safety of the children. I would like to ask that there is a full documentation of all mine shafts in the area and action to fill in all potential shafts. If there is any doubt as to whether there are still existing shafts then the proposal to house children on the site is not acceptable and would be grounds for claims of negligence.
3. I am also concerned that the site is not within safe walking distance of a secondary school.
4. The site is quite isolated and for young people does not offer opportunities to become integrated into surrounding communities.
5. There is poor access to nearby healthcare, being a significant distance from the nearest GP.
6. There are no pedestrian walk ways alongside the road in that area. The combination of the adjacent bus company and the increased traffic from the site would cause a significant hazard to child pedestrians. I would like to request the Highways agency makes a full assessment of the area with particular reference to child pedestrians. Failure to this would also be negligent.
7. I would also like to request that you ask the opinion of the BANES child safeguarding board whom should receive a full assessment of the site with regard to the above concerns that have been raised. I would also like to ask for their opinion to the appropriateness of the site for the visiting of professionals. I understand the site is above the standard recommendations for size and therefore could present challenges to those supporting the community and its children.
8. I feel that the site has the potential to cause conflict between the travelling population and the council, along with significant bad press for the council. The image of travellers being moved out of Bath onto an isolated, unsafe and disused colliery is quite a provocative image. Add to this the real risk of a child be injured and you have a situation that none of us want to see.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3041 / 1 Name: Mr John Rees Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick site is not appropriate as it is contaminated with arsenic. The information gain be gained on BANES web site.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No - The proposed allotment exceeds government guidelines and is located in the green belt. The site could easily spill over into the 27 acres available at great cost to local council (see Dale Farm)

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No - The site is liable to mine shaft collapse and it is unstable - Last repairs by the Coal Board were in April-May this year. Who/what will finance the planning of this super site.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This site does not meet Highway Access required - It is an S.N. site (which BANES are trying to change ??). It will dwarf the local hamlet of Stanton Wick. There is no sewerage/water/electricity, who will meet these costs ??

It is not the preferred pitch of the travellers!!!

So who benefits?

Respondent: 3041 / 1 Name: Mr John Rees Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The cost of water supply and sewerage for The Old Colliery would be so high that 15 pitches tax would not cover and as the site is (SN) registered can not be covered by septic tank or water treatment. Who will pay this cost.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3043 / 1 Name: Ms M A Kelly Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Old Colliery is within the greenbelt and should not be allowed for this inappropriate development. The proposed development would overwhelm the local existing residents. As the site is so big, unauthorised expansion would be difficult to control. There are no pavements in the area and access along the single track lane would be very dangerous, as well as having no public transport within safe walking distance. Facilities such as doctors, shops would not be sufficient for this large site, and there is limited employment in the area.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO. There is limited employment in the area. The site is greenbelt and is a nature conservation site. The site is dangerous due to contamination and mineshafts. There is no mains sewerage in Stanton Wick. The proposed large site would overwhelm the local community. There is no local facilities such as shops and doctors within safe walking distance.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO. The site is not suitable as it is too large to be controlled and will overwhelm the local community. The site is down a single track lane with no pavements and with no safe walking route many people will resort to driving to and from the site and the small lane would struggle to cope with increased traffic and B&NES has refused previous applications due to increased volume of traffic.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The site is greenbelt. Please stop allowing inappropriate development. Previous applications have been refused at the Old Colliery due to the site being within the greenbelt. They have obviously been refused to a reason. The site is a site of nature conservation

Respondent: 3043 / 2 Name: Ms M A Kelly Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I fully appreciate that BANES need to find suitable gypsy sites, but The Old Colliery site at Stanton Wick is far from suitable. Firstly, as I am sure you must know the location in question is within the Greenbelt. National Guidelines say that gypsy and traveller sites in green belt "are inappropriate development!" That means that planning permission would NOT be available.

There is also inadequate road access, the site is a long way down a single track lane, which is sometimes steep and muddy with no street lighting and no pavements for pedestrians. With such an increase in traffic from this proposed large site would make this lane more hazardous for cars and even more of an issue for pedestrians, a accident is just waiting to happen.

As the site is located down an unlit single track lane, there is therefore no safe walking route to local amenities, such as schools, shops, doctors etc, how can BANES ensure the children will get to schools safely. If they are expected to walk, then it needs to be realised that the lane will have an increase in traffic, increasing the possibility of accidents. The development is unsustainable as everyone will have to use cars to access the basics of life.

What also horrifies me is the huge size of the site that is proposed, the proposed 20 pitches is larger than the governments stated maximum making is "difficult to manage", the site is a size that could easily be expanded, therefore how will BANES deal with unauthorised expansion, and if this should happen, the concerns regarding safety on the lane would obviously increase tremendously.

Another concern regarding the size of the proposed site is the fact that it would overwhelm the village of Stanton Wick's residents to 2:1 or 3:1. With such an overwhelming amount of travellers, social cohesion would be difficult to achieve, how is BANES going to satisfy this requirement?

Another problem with the site is the fact that an expert report and survey of the site has found it to be contaminated with dangerous levels of arsenic, and the majority of the site has not even been surveyed. The site also has mineshafts and safety issues have not been considered. Again, another accident waiting to happen, either from mineshafts or arsenic! Do BANES really want this issue to be on their shoulders?

Why this site, the site has nothing in common with the type of site preferred by travellers as shown in the West of England Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Travellers prefer close proximity to amenities and small family sites of upto 5 pitches. Therefore this particular site is the opposite to what travellers actually want.

Lastly, who will be paying for any or all of the work required to make the site habitable, i.e. water, sewage, and electricity plus all the safety issues highlighted above?

This site is completely flawed and I, along with many local residents suggest that this site is taken off the short list now before anymore money is wasted in proposing this site. The cost to BANES for legal work could escalate hugely and for a site that is not suitable is clearly a waste of public money.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3044 / 1 Name: Mr John Swift Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The evidence that has emerged during this process shows that original consultation carried out by MR was seriously flawed. We as residents of BANES have had to pay for a consultation that is unacceptable and has not been supervised. In addition the matrix has been ignored allowing the process to become a complete shambles.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO
 The opportunities that were perceived by BANES, ie, the Cabinet, to give credibility and political advantage to the present committee without taking into consideration any of the items listed shows how incompetent the Cabinet is. These items are:

- a) Site is in Green Belt
- b) Has no amenities or Public Transport
- c) The site is contaminated and, fit for human habitation
- d) The existing services are inadequate, so to increase the population by 200+ is ludicrous. Who will pay for improvement?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO for the reasons given above, plus the fact that a number planning applications on the adjacent site have been refused; eight additional vehicles were applied for and the Cabinet want to increase the number of vehicles by possibly 80 to 100 shows how little thought has gone into this proposal. So little thought and so much money spent.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This proposal should be dropped immediately to reduce the antagonism now being developed between the Council and the local communities of Stanton Drew, Pensford, Chelwood, Chew Magna, Clutton and Whitchurch. The appalling situation can only result in a total loss of trust in BANES ability to govern which will never be resolved. BANES appear unable to listen to their residents and lost the trust of the electorate and I believe the Cabinet should resign.

Respondent: 3044 / 2 Name: Mr John Swift Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Indeed, how can a site that scored 17th.out of 23 sites, become one of the top preferred sites.Perhaps you would be good enough to explain this in your reply to us.

The complete disregard of the scoring matrix leads us to believe you have a hidden agenda which would confirm the rumours circulating in the community that this is already a "done deal".

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3045 / 1 Name: Mr Jane & Davies Organisation:
Lawrence

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes, and I refer, specifically, to Old Colliery Buildings Stanton Wick and wish to formally object to the proposal to allocate the site to Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People

My key argument for the removal of this site from the short list is that the Stanton Wick site does not comply with planning guidelines, and I offer the following points to support my challenge:-

- It is in Greenbelt. National guidelines say that gypsy and traveller sites in green belt "are inappropriate" development. That means that planning permission would not be available.
- In their assessment Bath and North East Somerset Council accept that the road access is incapable of coping with the increase in traffic but claim that the increase will be modest. Approximately 100 people will have to use cars in order to get anywhere, producing a massive traffic increase, many times the current level. All previous planning applications have been refused where there was likely to be an increase in traffic. How are Bath and North East Somerset Council going to keep everyone safe? How are the roads supposed to cope with the traffic without accidents? I understand that Bath and North East Somerset Council have not even asked the Highways Department to look at this proposal.
- The site has no safe walking route to amenities such as schools, shops, doctors etc other than a steep, unlit and muddy track. Bath and North East Somerset Council have not explained where all the children will go to school, neither have they explained how they will safeguard people walking around with no pavements.This development is unsustainable because everyone will have to use cars to access the basics of life.
- The proposed 20 pitches is larger than the government's stated maximum making it "difficult to manage." The Bath and North East Somerset Council report boasts that the site has potential to expand to 50 pitches – more than three times the maximum. The site is more than half the size of the whole of Victoria Park in Bath. Bath and North East Somerset Council have not explained how many people they expect OR how they will deal with unauthorised expansion across the site, OR what business activities will be allowed and volume of lorries etc, etc, etc.
- National guidelines categorically state that the site should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement. Even at 20 pitches the travellers would outnumber Stanton Wick's residents, possibly 2 or 3:1 Bath and North East Somerset Council have not explained how social cohesion will be achieved under these circumstances. The Council are obliged to ensure integration and cohesion. How are the Council intending to satisfy this requirement?
- In an expert report and survey, the site was found to be heavily contaminated with dangerous levels of arsenic that has not been removed. The majority of the site has not yet been surveyed. It has mineshafts, other contaminants but important safety issues have apparently not been considered. Bath and North East Somerset Council have not explained what they intend to do about this.
- The site has nothing in common with the type of site preferred by travellers as shown in the West of England Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Travellers prefer close proximity to amenities and small family sites of up to 5 pitches. The site is not on a recognised traveller route
- Bath and North East Somerset Council have not explained who will be paying for any or all of work required to make the site habitable; to supply potable water; to remove sewage and provide drainage capacity coupled with other

environmental issues; or to connect electricity and other utilities. They have not explained what the cost is for any mine safety work or roadwork costs or the costs to enable children to be accommodated in the schools.

- And finally what consideration has Bath and North East Somerset Council given to Nature Conservation as the site is within an area of outstanding natural beauty

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Although Bath and North East Somerset Council have made strong political commitment to identifying Gypsy and Traveller sites, I believe they have been, and continue to be, totally misguided in their selection of the Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick because they are wholly unsuitable for the proposed purpose and demonstrate the flawed thinking of the Council members in misunderstanding the National and Local Planning Policy criteria

The Stanton Wick site is both dangerous and unsafe

Respondent: 3045 / 2 Name: Mr Jane & Davies Organisation:
Lawrence

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I have been a resident of Stanton Drew for nineteen years and enjoy an extremely pleasant location in the Chew Valley with my easterly view over beautiful countryside across the Standing Stones and beyond to the hillsides of Stanton Wick and Pensford

I understand that Bath and North East Somerset Council members have made a strong political commitment to identifying gypsy and traveller sites within their bailiwick. However, their desire to pursue the Stanton Wick site is, we believe, misguided as it does not satisfy legislated planning criteria. Government policies consider traveller sites, whether permanent or temporary, to be inappropriate development and harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. There are no special circumstances to support approval for this site...

And I quote, "As a rule it will not be appropriate to make provision for gypsy sites in areas of open land where development is severely restricted, for example, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, and other protected areas. Gypsy sites are not regarded as being among those uses of land which are normally appropriate in Green Belts. Green Belt land should not therefore be allocated for gypsy sites in development plans"

In unison with the vast majority of residents, our key arguments for the removal of this site from the short list is that the Stanton Wick site does not comply with planning guidelines for many substantial reasons

The targeted land lays within the designated greenbelt and you will be well aware that National Guidelines clearly state that gypsy and traveller sites in green belt "are inappropriate" development. This means that planning permission must not be available

In their assessment Bath and North East Somerset Council members have accepted that the road access is incapable of coping with the increase in traffic, yet claim that the increase will be "modest". At least a hundred additional people will

have to use cars in order to reach any every day amenities / facilities thus producing a traffic increase of many times the current level

All other planning applications have been refused by Bath and North East Somerset Council members where there was “likely to be an increase in traffic”. How are Bath and North East Somerset Council members going to keep everyone safe? How are the roads supposed to cope with the massive increase in traffic volumes without creating additional road traffic incidents? As I understand it, Bath and North East Somerset Council members have not even asked the Highways Department to look at this proposal...

National Guidelines also state that the site “should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement”. Even at twenty pitches the travellers would outnumber Stanton Wick’s residents, possibly 2 or 3:1. The proposed site will totally dominate the community. Bath and North East Somerset Council members have not explained how social cohesion will be achieved under these circumstances. The Council are obliged to ensure integration and cohesion. How will they satisfy this requirement?

The site has no safe walking routes to schools, shops, doctors or other essential amenities other than a steep, unlit and muddy track. Bath and North East Somerset Council members have not explained exactly where all the children will go to school. How will they safeguard the increased numbers of people walking around with no pavements. This development is unsustainable because everyone will have to use cars to access the basics of life

The size of the proposed twenty pitches is larger than the government’s stated maximum of making it “difficult to manage.” The Bath and North East Somerset Council members report boasts that the site has potential to expand to fifty pitches – more than three times the maximum. The proposed site is over half the size of the whole of Royal Victoria Park in Bath!

Bath and North East Somerset Council members have not explained how many people they expect to take up residence on the pitches; how they will deal with unauthorised expansion across the site; what business activities will be permitted, or what will be the permitted additional volume and weight of lorries permitted, etc., etc

In an “expert” report and survey, the site was found to be contaminated with dangerous levels of arsenic and other materials that have not been removed. The majority of the site has still to be surveyed. It has mineshafts and many other safety issues which have not been considered. Bath and North East Somerset Council members have not explained what they intend to do about this

The site has absolutely nothing in common with the type of site preferred by travellers as shown in the ‘West of England Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment’. Travellers have frequently stated that they much prefer close proximity to amenities with small family sites of up to five pitches

Bath and North East Somerset Council members have not explained who will be paying for any or all of the work required to make the site habitable or to bring in water, sewage and electricity. Neither have they explained what the cost will be for any mine safety work; roadwork costs; the costs to enable children to be accommodated in the schools; public transport access / egress; drainage capability; other environmental issues, and the fact that the site is not on a recognised traveller route

The future of our communities is in our hands and we urge you to ensure that we do not let others, who live outside our community and therefore do not fully appreciate the true nature of our environment, to decide our future and possibly change the face and character of our neighbourhood for the worse and forever

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Inappropriate development in the greenbelt, will overwhelm existing community, site larger than proposed development will be difficult to prevent unauthorised or uncontrolled expansion - increase in traffic will cause problems on undersized roads, no safe walking routes to schools/shops/public transport, nearest doctors surgery is at maximum capacity already.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No! Previous applications stated traffic volume and greenbelt as reason for refusal.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No - site is not suitable contaminated ground old mine shafts, limited employment in area.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The site has historic significance.
 Close to conservations area.
 Site is of nature conservation interest.
 Due to mine shafts, subsidence is a possibility.
 Remove contaminated ground would be intolerable.
 And cause massive traffic movements.

Respondent: 3046 / 2 Name: Nicholas Shephard Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I would like to voice my concerns and demand that BANES come to one or more of the local village halls as part of the consultation process, I would like it explained why this site has been selected considering:-
 Why is it proposed in a green belt area?
 How is it proposed to control unauthorised expansion of the site?
 The land was reported to be contaminated by dangerous levels of arsenic?
 The nearest amenities are accessed down narrow lanes with no footpath?
 The nearest amenities are accessed down narrow lanes with no street lighting?
 Why are planning guidelines being ignored?
 What is the highway dept opinion regarding the increase in traffic levels?
 What is the total cost of preparing this site will be?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

It will overwhelm the local village, 20 pitches is far too large.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3047 / 1 Name: J & K Laycock Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We write as local residents to express our concern regarding the proposed site for gypsy and traveller provision at Stanton Wick.

We have many concerns shared with the communities here, in particular EDUCATION and the impact on the very limited resources in local schools.

Please could you reassure us that the following questions have been addressed:

1. What is the present capacity and potential for expansion of Pensford Primary School?
2. What is the present capacity and potential for expansion of Stanton Drew Primary School?
3. What is the present capacity and potential for expansion of Chew Magna Primary School?
4. In the event of sufficient places not being available at these schools (given the constraints of class-size, pupil-teacher ratios and building space) what alternative plans does B&NES have to accommodate many new pupils?
5. What estimate has been made of the educational provision required (based on the number of proposed pitches at this site) and any likely future expansion?
6. Do alternative plans exist to provide transport and/or specialist visiting teachers if required and, if so, what is the estimated cost?

In view of the very short period of public consultation we are sure that you will treat this with the utmost urgency.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3048 / 1 Name: Mr Simon Love Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

As residents of Pensford, Bristol, myself and my family are writing to express our very grave concerns regarding the proposal for a Gypsy and Traveller site in neighbouring Stanton Wick.

- The proposed site has previously had planning permission refused for housing development on the basis of the lack of 'any' amenities (electricity, gas, sewage) and the suitability of the narrow and poor condition 'single track access' for additional vehicles. If these reasons meant the site was deemed unsuitable for either a single luxury dwelling- or a small development of affordable housing for local residents how can it possibly now be deemed suitable for 15 permanent pitches, 5 'transit pitches' and even a 'showman's yard'?

- 'Filers Coaches', the neighbouring business to the proposed site, have recently had an application to increase their existing fleet by 2No. coaches refused because of the nature and condition of the 'single track access' again, how can the council even begin to consider this site to be suitable as a Gypsy and Traveller Site when they have refused such a comparatively innocuous application- which would have had a fraction of the impact on the road in question?

• It has been stated at a recent residents meeting to discuss the impact of this proposal that based upon the council's own criteria for 'scoring' a site's suitability i.e. access, utilities, amenities, impact upon existing facilities and impact upon the local area and residents etc .. etc .. -this site would not even be on the list- let alone seated at the very top, and proposed to achieve 70% of the council's objectives for providing facilities for Gypsies and Travellers. Is it possible please to apply under the 'Freedom of Information Act' for exact details of how all of the proposed sites were of the process- in order that 70% of the council's 'problem' (as I am sure that they would view it) is pushed to the very boundary of their jurisdiction, where it will be less visible to the majority of their constituents- thus costing them fewer votes in the next election than

creating the camp in one of the more populated but eminently more suitable locations would otherwise do.

-The 2 local primary schools (Pensford and Stanton Drew- current combined number of students approx.' 100) had a total intake of 16 children between them last year with 20 expected to start this year. This will swell their numbers to unprecedented levels in recent years- but they are confident they can cope. How many children will an encampment of 20 Gypsy caravans add to this number- and have the council truly evaluated the disruption to the education of the existing pupils when class sizes are increased by anything up to 50% with 'transient' classmates who do not always attend? NB: This is neither derogatory nor stereotyping- it is merely stating the facts that Gypsy and Traveller families tend to have more children- and the very nature of their existence is 'nomadic' -i.e. they do not stay rooted to one place (hence the council proposing 20% of the pitches being 'transit' pitches)?

- Pensford is the only local village with a small Post Office and general store- with the nearest shopping facilities 4 miles away in Whitchurch -again, does this fit the council's model for suitable shopping facilities for these new families?

- Finally, with regard to Stanton Wick itself, a Gypsy and Traveller site of this magnitude would completely overwhelm the character of the village itself- with settled local people likely to be outnumbered by at least 2-1 by the new influx surely this demographic alone should be enough for the proposal to be discounted out-of-hand

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3049 / 1 Name: Hilary Padfield Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing to express my deep concern at the proposed "short list" for a gypsy and traveller site on the Old Colliery at Stanton Wick. Stanton Wick is in the green belt, a very sleepy village with absolutely no infrastructure for a gypsy and traveller site. There is no village shop, school, doctors surgery or frequent bus service, the access to the site is down a very narrow lane and totally unsuitable. The impact on the surrounding area, Chew Valley would be horrendous, the schools would just not be able to cope or the doctors surgeries, to put a site in this area would be ludicrous and a threat to the environment. I realize that by law BNES has to provide sites for gypsies and travellers but this is certainly not the place surely there are brownfield sites in the BNES area with better access to facilities for these people whom I'm sure if asked would much prefer to be somewhere more convenient for them. I ask BNES to urgently reconsider this matter, we, the council tax payers of the Chew Valley are already under pressure from BNES regarding the Stowey Quarry application, surely enough is enough, find a more suitable site and stop putting our beautiful valley under such pressure.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3049 / 2 Name: Hilary Padfield Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I wish to strongly object to the proposed gypsy & traveller site at The Old Colliery at Stanton Wick. This small hamlet is in the green belt, has no infrastructure to take a site as proposed, there is no regular bus service, schools or doctors surgery the access for the site is down a small lane which is totally unsuitable for caravans & the like. To put a site in this position would be ludicrous, I was under the impression that sites such as these were not recommended to be put in the green belt. Have BANES consulted with the schools & the doctors surgeries regarding this proposal? Surely there are Brownfield sites more suitable & with much better access than Stanton Wick to even consider putting a site here is totally irresponsible both to the gypsy community & to the environment. I ask BANES to reconsider & look elsewhere.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3050 / 1 Name: Mrs Sharon Pledge Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Old Colliery at Stanton Wick is designated Green Belt & thus is wholly inappropriate to develop under any circumstances for residential or commercial purposes, no matter who the proposed residents are to be. Previous planning applications for this site & other properties in Stanton Wick have been refused for this very reason alone & thus it is hypocritical of the Council to propose this to suit their purpose.

The potential size of this site would totally overwhelm Stanton Wick. The local roads & infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increase in population that has been suggested. Major redevelopment of the water, drainage & sewerage systems will be necessary, at considerable expense & I fear that the rural beauty of the area will be irreversibly changed.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No – the opportunities on this site are few & the constraints are briefly discussed in the Council's paper, but their implications have not been fully considered. These constraints will have a huge impact upon the intended residents of this site & also the residents of Stanton Wick & Pensford. This might explain why this site has not been granted permission for development in previous years.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No – under no circumstances should this pitch be considered for formal allocation

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I fully support the policy to try & provide safe & healthy accommodation for gypsies & travellers & it appears that the Development Plan Document lays out the process of identifying suitable sites quite definitively. Had B&NES followed the process laid out in this document, it would have become apparent very early on that the Old Colliery Site is not suitable.

Respondent: 3050 / 2 Name: Mrs Sharon Pledge Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We refer to our letter of 23rd May concerning access to the above location & were bemused to see a notice from the council appear on Wick Lane informing us of impending carriageway improvements throughout June & July; a busy time for us & we hope our business will not be adversely affected. We wonder if this is pure coincidence or if B&NES are intending to remedy in full the issues we raised in our previous letter. Whilst repairs & resurfacing of the existing road will be very much appreciated, any major works would surely impact upon the rural charm of Stanton Wick. We would appreciate your comments concerning the nature of the carriageway works to be carried out please.

Of course by improving the road, you will be ensuring better access for both travellers & local Stanton Wick residents to our local amenities. Do we presume that both Pensford & Stanton Drew Primary Schools will be accepting the potentially large number of children from a pitch of this proposed size? Should this be the case, obviously the number of vehicles travelling to & from, & parking at both these schools will be increased. We're sure you are aware that parking at both sites is very limited; our children both attended Stanton Drew Primary School & during their time there, there were numerous issues with both local residents & parents concerning parking & the amount of traffic on the road. We would imagine that much the same situation occurs in Pensford, as the parking is limited to the area on the road by the Post Office. As customers of the Post Office, we avoid going there both at 9.00am & 3.15pm as there is absolutely no hope of a parking space.

Which brings us onto another vital local amenity – the Doctors Surgery. As you will no doubt be aware, the Chew Magna surgery has relocated to Chew Stoke, & although now has larger premises, the parking is still limited & there appears to be no improvement in appointment availability. We wonder how the surgery will cope with the increase in patients from the traveller site? Not only that, the Surgery is clearly not within the 1,500m proximity criteria as laid out in the Issues & Options Paper. It has been mentioned that it is possible that a medical facility will be established actually at the Old Colliery – will Stanton Wick residents be able to use this?

It is interesting that very few of these amenities are located in accordance with your criteria for provision of pitches; yet more reasons why this site is totally unsuitable for this purpose. We would imagine you have a duty of care towards this sector of the community (one of the most discriminated against according to B&NES literature) & we wonder if they are aware that you are persistently trying to force the development of this site when it is blatantly not suited to their needs, preferences but more importantly, their well being & personal safety.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3050 / 3 Name: Mrs Sharon Pledge Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We have been made aware that BaNES are considering the above location as a potential traveller site & whilst we fully support their commitment to fulfil the obligations towards this sector of our community, we cannot help but feel great concern about access to this particular location.

Our concerns are twofold, being both on a personal level, but also the effect this will have on the Carpenters Arms, which we manage on behalf of Buccaneer Holdings Ltd. We shall address our personal concerns first.

We walk along Wick Lane frequently & whilst it is a very pleasant & rural area, the lane is surprisingly busy with traffic. You

are of course aware that the national speed limit of 60mph applies to this road & that the road itself is very narrow in places. There have been numerous occasions when we have had to stand virtually in the hedge to allow vehicles to pass safely (some slow down, but most continue at their usual driving speed) & we are sure you will agree that an increase in either motor traffic or pedestrians will increase the likelihood of accidents dramatically, jeopardising the safety of both travellers & residents alike.

There are very few passing places on the lane, which is only really ideally suited for single lane use. Again, an increase in motor traffic will impact upon this.

The surface of the road is very poor in places, with potholes & cracking tarmac, especially on the stretch from Stanton Wick to the bridge. Parts of the road flood when there is a lot of rain – again, not ideal for either vehicles or especially pedestrians. We are hopeful that this problem will be addressed.

During freezing & snowy weather, Wick Lane is not gritted or cleared by BaNES; the corner by the old telephone box & further along, the sharp left turn towards the Old Colliery buildings, are notoriously dangerous. Again, the potential for an accident is enormous if road traffic is increased. At the other end of the lane, the steep incline from Pensford towards the Old Colliery buildings becomes equally treacherous. We would neither drive nor walk in these conditions.

From a business perspective as Managers of the Carpenters Arms, we also have grave concerns:

Our Inn is well known for its quiet, rural location & this plays a big part in our marketing strategy. Any increase of traffic travelling along Wick Lane at normal driving speed, (ie not slowing down to come to the Inn), impacts upon our business in a negative way. We have seating along the front of the Inn, where our customers can enjoy a drink & the peaceful setting – not so if more cars & vehicles are passing. The majority of our letting accommodation is at the front of the building, with the windows virtually on road level. Even with double glazing, we still receive complaints about road noise & certainly do not want that to increase.

The safety of our customers is paramount; a large proportion of them are elderly & as you are aware, the majority of our customer car parking is opposite the entrance to the Inn. This means they have to cross Wick Lane to come into the building; again, we are concerned about the increased potential for accidents.

In a similar vein, our resident's car parking entrance is already difficult to negotiate & we have to rely on a mirror opposite to check if the road is safe; the chances of an accident will be increased by more vehicles using this road.

Our car parks are already used by a number of vehicles as passing places (the Centurion Bus which provides transport to Chew Valley School has to turn round in our car park, with our permission, to ensure the safety of its passengers) & we are reluctant to see more vehicles doing this. Again, there is potential danger for pedestrians & also vehicle damage.

We are very keen to learn how you propose to keep both travellers & residents of Stanton Wick safe on Wick Lane; there is no pavement or street lighting & it is not conducive towards pedestrian activity. We are sure that the travellers will want to safely walk in this area & not rely on motor transport. If this is not the case & there is a significant increase in vehicle activity (which, if we are honest, we feel there will be, as local amenities for both the travellers & residents are not as 'local' as BaNES seem to think), then all of our concerns expressed above will prove to be true.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3052 / 1 Name: Barry Gillett Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site in Stanton Wick is totally unsupportable and clearly of no value as a traveller encampment.

- It is a Green Belt sit which cannot be used given government rules.
- This site is unsafe and contaminated- unfair to traveller and almost certain to lead to compensation requests.
- There is no safe passage on foot in either direction along the only exit road.
- The planning department have established that this only road system cannot accommodate two extra vehicles (coach company)
- This proposed increase in population will swamp the existing hamlet of Stanton Wick which is against government policy.
- There is no capacity at the nearby secondary schools to accommodate even a small number of pupils.
- GP services in Chew Valley are already stretched. Even longer waiting times will occur.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

no absolutely

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The council do not have the resources to pay for the millions of pounds needed in infrastructure, to reserve for compensation claims, pay for litigation which is already in place.
Remember this party were the clowns which created the Roman Baths debacle which cost the rate payer millions in costs and compensation.

Respondent: 3052 / 1 Name: Barry Gillett Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Clearly the site in Twerton would be suitable. It exists and has the required infrastructure. The MOD sites being developed by BANES offer real opportunities as all the amenities and infra structure will be developed alongside a structured social environment.

A suitable site could surely be found on Lansdown. Ample land which is not contaminated. Adequate road system schools, hospitals, shops, etc close by in North Bath.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

- Scored at 17th in the matrix test
- Contaminated - dangerous
- Having refused permission to coach company because road system inadequate up to 60 extra vehicles cannot be accomodated unless costly widening of access road is carried out
- Building not appropriate in green belt land
- Recognised by BANES as site of historical interest and designated as a conservation area

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

There was no consultation with local organisations or people prior to publishing the paper. Clearly the council will be challenged and costly legal costs will have to be incurred. Surely we are not going to get a repeat of the Bath bathes scandal and lose further millions of pounds.

Respondent: 3052 / 2 Name: Barry Gillett Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I have just recently become aware that there is a proposal to develop a large traveller site on the old mine workings at the Pensford Colliery. In the former role as warden of the footpaths in Publow with Pensford Parish I paid regular visits to this area as the existing footpaths in Publow continue across this proposed site. I can qualify that this area is totally unsuitable as a residence for country people or any other citizen in the U.K.

This land is contaminated with metals and probably arsenic and this has persuaded the planning authorities to refuse permission to build dwellings in the past. As a former industrial site there are many dangerous buildings and former industrial workings, which have been abandoned. Children, especially, would be constantly exposed to a high level of danger. It is clear that several million pounds would be required to make this site safe and to landscape the area to an appropriate residential environment.

The footpath CL18/28 onto CL17 /19 goes through woodland, crosses the old railway bed and then passes over an uneven slope which is a water meadow. It is difficult to access in all but the driest periods. The alternative route to the closest retail store and primary school is via the roadway between Stanton Wick and Pensford. For most of the 1.1 miles from the proposed site entrance to the village the road is a single track, tarmac road with only three or four passing opportunities for vehicles, there are two 90 degree bends as well as several bends on the steep hill which prevent drivers observing pedestrians. There is no paved or off road footpath for the entire length of this road. Danger to children and all pedestrians is enormous and considerably magnified during the hours of darkness. The planning authorities refused permission for the Bus Company to increase their fleet by two vehicles for this reason. At the very least a paved footpath will be required which can only be laid by increasing the width of the road by several feet, this will be impossible across the railway bridge.

It is my understanding the government has instructed councils not to build residential properties and caravan sites on the green belt. This site is on green belt land and therefore unqualified for consideration. Clearly this site is totally unsuitable as a traveller encampment for the reasons given above and therefore justifies an immediate disqualification from consideration. I find it disturbing that BANES council have failed to conduct a survey of local residents before considering a project of the nature. I have certainly not, and neither has my wife, received any communication and we have observed no advertisement in or around Pensford. At a meeting last Saturday this matter was debated. Clearly! Everybody present were unaware of the council's actions and this included Mr Jeremy Sparks the councillor for Clutton, Mr Sparks made it quite clear that he had only become aware of the proposed development list in the last week. The meeting was made aware that BANES claim consultation had taken place. However, the local councillors, the Parish Councils (Stanton Drew and P.with Pensford), the local shop, the local schools (I am a Governor at Pensford Primary School) were unaware of the situation until notification of the meeting on the 9th May was announced.

Under my rights given by the freedom of information legislation and as a BANES council tax payer could you please send to me the following information:-

1. Based on the matrix for scoring a sites suitability as a travellers encampment how many points did Stanton Wick score out of forty, (does this include a rating for poison, pollution and a danger to children).
2. What methods were used to seek consultation.
3. Dates and content of notification to local councillors, local parish councils, local schools, local medical practitioners and local retail outlets.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3095 / 2 Name: Mr Joe Evans Organisation: Avonside CPRE

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The proposal as it stands is for the Old Colliery to be a large site, providing 15 of the 25 permanent pitches that are currently felt to be needed (albeit on the basis of an insufficiently robust evidence base as described above). As such it will form the primary element in the provision of permanent authorised pitches in B&NES. It is important that such a site would meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers.

Policy CP11 of the B&NES Draft Core Strategy states that the Council will:

“identify suitable and deliverable sites to meet the established accommodation needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople through separate Development Plan Documents (DPDs) for the period to 2011”.

That policy includes a number of requirements for assessing site suitability:

a: local community services and facilities, including shops, schools and health facilities, should be accessible by foot, cycle and public transport

b: satisfactory means of access can be provided and the existing highway network is adequate to service the site”

The March 2012 Policy also sets out the need for site provision to:

“11 c: ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis

11 d: provide a settled base that reduces the need for long-distance travelling and possible environmental damage caused by unauthorised encampment “

The Old Colliery site does not meet the requirements of either the B&NES Draft Core Strategy or the March 2012 Policy in this regard. There are no nearby shops or health facilities; the nearest secondary schools are 5-7km away and would be very difficult to access by public transport alone. The highway network is not adequate to serve the site, which is situated on a narrow country lane. As the proposal is for five transit pitches as well as permanent pitches, there would be expected to be a steady flow of larger vehicles and caravans. The current road access would not be appropriate for this.

The March 2012 Gypsy and Traveller Policy states that Local Authorities should:

“relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population’s size and density” [4.2.1]

And Policy C (12) of that document states:

“When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community. “

The Stanton Wick site very clearly fails to meet those requirements. Stanton Wick itself is a hamlet of some 26 dwellings with a population of around 60. The proposed site would comprise 20 pitches in total, each with an average occupancy of 1.9 caravans or vehicles (figure from the 2007 GTAA). That could imply 35-40 caravans or residential vehicles on site, with a population of perhaps 60-80. It is therefore not an appropriate site in light of the March 2012 Policy.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

1. Evidence base

We question the validity of the current evidence base for the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and its compliance with current government policy. The 2007 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation (and other needs) Assessment has been used as the basis for this process. However, at five years old, it cannot be taken as an authoritative guide to the needs of a population that is by definition transient and fluid. Paragraph 4 of the DCLG’s ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ of March 2012 states:

“...that local planning authorities should make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning”

B&NES Council has clearly not made its own assessment of need as required; it has relied on five year old regional research. B&NES Council’s own Site Assessment Report states:

“The precise need for sites to meet the new national policy will require a review of the GTAA study, preferable [sic] at the West of England level.” [para. 1.4]

This has also not yet been carried out.

The March 2012 Planning Policy also states:

“In assembling the evidence base necessary to support their planning approach, local planning authorities should:

1. pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities (including discussing travellers’ accommodation needs with travellers themselves, their representative bodies and local support groups)
2. co-operate with travellers, their representative bodies and local support groups, other local authorities and relevant interest groups to prepare and maintain an up-to-date understanding of the likely permanent and transit accommodation needs of their areas over the lifespan of their development plan working collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities
3. use a robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to inform the preparation of local plans and make planning decisions.”

Because B&NES has not carried out its own research, it does not comply with this policy, having had no new formal consultation with travellers on their accommodation needs.

Because older research is being used, B&NES Council will not have a ‘up-to-date understanding’ of travellers’ needs as required.

In failing to comply with the first two requirements, B&NES Council has not created a ‘robust evidence base’ and thus does not comply with the third requirement.

We are calling for a fresh process of evidence-gathering to inform a revised list of possible preferred sites based on up-to-date evidence.

2. Requirements of different travelling communities

The DPD recognises that the needs of travelling showpeople are different from those of gypsies and travellers [2.7].

However, it does not recognise the different and sometimes incompatible needs of New Travellers, Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers. These groups do not always have harmonious relations with one another and B&NES Council’s previous consultations suggested that enough land should be allocated to allow groups to live separately from one another [3.3]. The current proposed preferred options list places 15 of 25 permanent places on one site, the Old Colliery at Stanton Wick. This would not allow different groups to live separately from one another and would thus not meet the aims set out at 3.3. We would argue that a larger number of small sites would better meet travellers’ needs than the current list. It would also minimise the impact on settled communities.

This is back by Paragraph 4.6 of the B&NES Council Issues and Options Report on this subject, which states:

“The need for smaller sites in Bath & North East Somerset district is supported by the West of England GTAA which found that most surveyed respondents expressed a preference to live in smaller family-sized sites of no more than five pitches.” We would like to see an analysis of the different needs of the different sectors of the travelling community as part of the new evidence-gathering process mentioned above.

3. Green Belt

Policy E (para. 14) of the March 2012 policy states:

“Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. “

This is backed by the National Planning Policy Framework. Government policy thus prevents the development of Gypsy and Traveller Sites in Green Belt except in very special circumstances. We do not feel that this requirement has been met by the current process. Of the six proposed Preferred Sites, GT1 (Woolard Lane), GT 2 (Old Colliery, Stanton Wick) and GT8 (Lower Bristol Road) lie within Green Belt. The only justification given for the ‘very special circumstances’ required to approve development in Green Belt is that no other sites are available. The Sites Assessment Report states:

“The absence of appropriate land outside the Green Belt to meet the identified level of need is considered to contribute to

very special circumstances.”

In this case, the absence of other available sites does not simply ‘contribute’ to the ‘very special circumstances; it is the sole justification for Green Belt development.

We feel that this is plainly not sufficient to prove that ‘very special circumstances’ exist, especially taken alongside the out-of-date evidence base being used. If the justification for Green Belt development is that there is a need that cannot be met in any other way, then plainly the need must be derived from the most robust evidence. Equally, although the Call for Sites did not yield any other sites outside of Green Belt, such sites may well exist, especially if the principle set out above of using smaller sites rather than larger is followed.

We feel that a fresh needs assessment should be carried out to provide a robust evidence base; further work should then be done to identify additional potential sites that are not in Green Belt. The current list of preferred options should be revised, to include only those Green Belt sites for which there is robust, up-to-date evidence of need and for which it can be demonstrated that there are genuinely exceptional circumstances to justify their inclusion.

4. Flaws in policy-making processes

Although the DPD has been prepared with a process that gives the appearance of being based on assessment of evidence, it is in fact deeply flawed. The matrix used to assess the suitability of sites in the Site Assessment Report appears to have been scored in an arbitrary manner in places; furthermore, the results of the scoring matrix bear little relationship to the shortlist of sites taken through to the Preferred Options DPD consultation document. A decision was taken at the Council’s Cabinet meeting on 9 May 2012 to eliminate rejected sites so as to prepare the Preferred Options DPD consultation document. At that stage, no meaningful consultation had been carried out on either the process of site selection, the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community in the area or the specific sites included in the process. The decision to create a shortlist before consultation had been carried out was contrary to both the 2008 Regulations on the preparation of Development Plan Documents and the 2012 NPPF, which states:

“155. Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area, including those contained in any neighbourhood plans that have been made.”

Respondent: 3098 / 1 Name: Mr C.J. Morris Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

It beats belief that our council are wasting time and money on an obviously inappropriate site for the gypsy development @stanton wick. I despair, having attended the various council meetings, that the councillors are digging themselves a deeper and deeper hole of illegalities as explained to them by an eminent barrister, experienced on this type of development (Dales Farm). By perusing this line of action they are incurring extra costs for us rate payers to 'pick up the tab' As local residents we already experience some of the short falls in our village of Stanton Drew. Poor roads with no drainage, no shops buses, street lighting to name but a few.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No! Waste of rate payers money, council are like a load of hemmings jumping over the cliff.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

No point suggesting any considerations as certain councillors are hell bent on following a route which is totally inappropriate and unsatisfactory.

Respondent: 3098 / 2 Name: Mr C.J. Morris Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

following the public meeting in Stanton Drew, I am at a loss to understand why the site at the Old Colliery, Stanton Wick is being considered for the gypsy and travellers community at all. The site does not comply with any of the Government criteria. It is in greenbelt, there is inadequate road access, there are no local amenities, no shops, no doctor's surgery, where would the children go to school? The settlement would overwhelm the local residents, the site is contaminated with arsenic, there are mineshaft issues, would the travellers really want to be there? What would it cost to make this site meet all the Government criteria and who would be paying as water, sewage and electricity would have to be brought to the site? Previous planning applications have been refused on these very grounds, so why is the site now considered suitable? The roads surrounding the site are already in a very poor condition and are in a dangerous state for existing ratepayers due to lack of maintenance over the years, this situation would be exacerbated by increased volume.

I feel that proper detailed consideration has not been given to this scheme and that time and money is being wasted, as on closer inspection, it is obvious that this site should not even be considered.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3099 / 1 Name: Shaun Huggins Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes, plenty of evidence on why Stanton Wick is not suitable – all your own, and Government's, policies and procedures, as listed below:-

B&NES Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007

- a)Policy GB1: the proposed development of this area would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt
- b)Policy GB2: the proposed development of this area would detract from the openness and rural character of this area within the designated Green Belt.
- c)Policy T1: the proposed location is remote from services and public transport facilities. Therefore there will be an increase in vehicle journeys (not a reduction) to and from the site which will have an impact on travel journeys and the environment in this area.

Planning Policy Guidance Note No. 13

- a)The proposed development is remote from services and public transport facilities and therefore there will be a significant increase in vehicular traffic in this area.
- b)Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA): this proposed development should be subject to an EIA.

National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012

- a)Core planning principles, item 17: the proposed development does not protect the Green Belt or recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside or support the rural community around this site.
- b)Supporting a prosperous rural economy, item 28: this proposed development does not support the existing local

businesses within the vicinity and could be detrimental to them

- c)Travel plan: this proposed development will generate significant amounts of movement and therefore a travel plan will be required
- d)Minimise journey lengths, item 37: this proposed development will maximise journeys as there are not immediate employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities in this area
- e)Overall quality of the area, item 58: planning decision should aim to ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area. This proposed development will have the opposite effect if this is approved.
- f)Promoting healthy communities, item 69: this proposed development will not promote a safe and accessible environment but create a fear of crime and disorder and will undermine the quality of life and the existing community cohesion.
- g)Green Belt, item 87: this proposed development is inappropriate and will be harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved
- h)Conserving and enhancing the natural environment, item 109: this proposed development will not enhance the natural and local environment or protect and enhance a valued landscape
- i)Unacceptable environmental risk, item 109, 120 and 121: this proposed development could be adversely affected by soil contamination and land instability due the former mining activity that took place there. Has the landowner and Council undertaken professional surveys before recommending this site?
- j)Minimise pollution, item 110: as there isn't a mains foul water and sewerage system in the area, there is a risk that the stream within the area could be affected by any run off from this site

Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012

- a)Protect the Green Belt, item 4: this states that the Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development. This proposed development is inappropriate development
- b)Provision of suitable accommodation, item 4: this proposed development will have little or no access to education, health, welfare and employment. The local schools are full, the nearest doctors are 5 miles away, no welfare services and there is little employment in the area
- c)Protection of local amenity and environments, item 4: this proposed development will have a huge impact on Stanton Wick and the neighbouring villages. Stanton Wick population will double and so will the traffic on the country lane going through it
- d)Sustainable economically, socially and environmentally, item 11a-f: this proposed development goes against everything stated in this planning policy. There won't be an integrated co-existence between the site and the community. There isn't any public transport to this site or village. The access road is a single country lane carriageway, there isn't any mains services (e.g. gas, foul water, sewage)
- e)Policy C, sites in rural areas, item 12: states that the local planning authority should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community. This proposed development will out-number the existing residents of Stanton Wick.
- f)Policy E, traveller sites in Green Belt, item 14: I quote, "inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved. Travellers sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development" unquote.
- g)Policy H, determining planning applications for travellers sites, item 23: this proposed site will not respect the scale of the local community, it will dominate the local community and will place undue pressure on the local infrastructure. The country lane is unsuitable for this amount of additional traffic, the access into and out of Stanton Wick from the main road is extremely dangerous as vision is impaired in both directions, there are no mains services and no public transport

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)

- a) Local Planning Policy Context, item 2.7: the proposed site does not have good access to local services, facilities and public transport, it does not have safe and convenient access to the road network (Stanton Wick junction is notoriously dangerous), it will not blend in as the proposed site is on an elevated position, there are not services for foul and surface water drainage and there will be a harmful impact to local residents and local businesses due to the close proximity of this site. There are no local services within easy walking distance or served by public transport

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I do not agree. The evaluation was poorly done, inaccurate and should never have gone through to the consultation stage. I fail to understand the logic behind this. How can such a low score (and should have been lower if done properly) still be ok? The score is speaking for itself – the site does not meet the requirements that are set out in all the documents you refer to. If an evaluation was done properly, a minimum score should have been set for a ‘pass rate’. If a site fails to meet that score, it is deemed not suitable and rejected. But, guess what, no such pass rate was done and guess what, Stanton Wick would never have got past this pass rate if one had been set.

The assessments and evaluations are flawed, this process needs to stop, and the whole thing re-considered before you waste even more tax payers money.

The Council has not acknowledged all the constraints on this site or even considered that this site is special in relation to bats and the potential destruction of their environment either.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I do not agree. There should be no pitch provision as this site fails to meet any of the essential criteria set out in any of your policies and procedures as I have fully stated in item 1. And a site must meet ALL the criteria set out, not just because of its size!

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Please see my full response in item 1, but all the policies below are not being adhered to.

- a) B&NES Local Plan - Policy GB1, GB2 and T1
- b) Planning Policy Guidance Note No.13
- c) National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 items 17, 28, 37, 58, 69, 87, 109, 120, 121, 110
- d) Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012 items 4, 11a-f, Policy C, item 12, Policy E item 14, Policy H, item 23
- e) Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations DPD , item 2.7

Respondent: 3101 / 1 Name: Linda Newey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Evidence presented at local meetings as to the unsuitability of the site.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Stanton Lane and the approaches to this are not adequate to take vehicles and caravans and large vehicles of the type Showmen usually have. We also are aware that the council rejected an application by Filers Coaches to increase the number of vehicles to be kept at the adjacent site. The rejection as far as we are aware, was based on the inadequate road system and site facilities. On this basis, how can the council consider the above proposal which will increase the vehicle movement in Stanton Lane which is likely to involve much larger vehicles than coaches? The development will also increase the number of people on site (possibly up to 200).

What is the considered impact on the A37 through Pensford, in particular, from the Bristol direction. We already have an overloaded road system at peak times due to the narrow restrictions of Pensford Hill, in both directions. We consider that most of the additional traffic created by this proposed development, should it go ahead, will be using this already inadequate route.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3105 / 1 Name: Bob and Gerken Organisation:
 Janet

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Green Belt area
 History of planning refusals
 No mains sewerage
 Contaminated site

Respondent: 3192 / 1 Name: Mr J. D. Boyd Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The logic behind the policy of sanctioned pitches for the traveller community is of irrefutable weight and value. The proposed execution of the policy around the Stanton Wick colliery is physically dangerous, socially reckless and an open invite to political embarrassment and ridicule.

As, according to the evaluation of the council, this site was deemed only the 17th most suitable from a possible 23 choices, that is, it was among the least suitable, its presence on a shortlist of 7 has left the surrounding communities somewhat bewildered. Even more bewildering than its initial choice is its size. 15 permanent pitches, each accommodating 3 generations, and a further 5 transit pitches, could of course potentially house 200 individuals, and yet the site is serviced by a single track road deemed inadequate on several occasions to carry any extra traffic. The erection of one house in the vicinity of the site was denied because the road serving the area could not accommodate any extra traffic. The omnibus operator next door to the site was denied planning permission for the storage and operation of 2 more vehicles again on the grounds of an impermissible increase in traffic. The proposal of the council to create a conurbation of hundreds, in almost the exact same spot, seems inconsistent. Three days after a meeting in Pensford to discuss these inconsistencies, two school children were struck down on separate occasions by passing motor vehicles on the very same road, vindicating the council's prior logic in refusing any extra vehicular burden on the highway.

Traffic issues are not hte only anomalies in the choice of the site, oddly chosen to sit atop mine spoil; the plan appears to immediately threaten those settled on it. The coal-board, as I am sure you are aware, has recently propped up collapsing shafts, and the site has been condemned as contaminated with arsenic. You stand to receive accusations of condemning the travelling community to living conditions deemed unfit for the rest of society. To even the more balanced observer, it seems a simple demonstration of 'dump them there and be done with it' neglect, which wilfully ddisregards the travllers and the population that surrounds the colliery. Intelligent planning procedure does not put several hundred individuals on a barren and potentially fatal mine spoil that would dwarf the nearest settlement, thus courting the type of social animosities that effective policy execution should be designed to circumvent.

The proposal also flies in the face of planning law, by attempting to seat the pitches on a tiny island of brown belt in a sea of green belt, which the law works to protect in all possible circumstances. With 30% of the land in B&NES designated brown belt, the list of accusations of complacency only continues to grow.

The entire proposal seems unbelievably rushed. The observations given above are merely the low hanging fruit, but even in selecting those, the Stanton Wick colliery site can be shown to be literally the most unsuitable option for the policy of providing traveller pitches. This is surely just because time has not been taken to actually provide suitable sites. There is, of course, ample time to do this before the next general election, which again begs the question of why this site has been so hurriedly and inappropriately chosen.

If it is developed any further, the Tory MP whose constituency it would fall in will undoubtedly lose his seat over the issue, and it follows that his replacement would not be from among the Lib Dem candidature. This brings out the final question of why the council seems to want to court public and political ridicule over the issue. For the more frequently this issue is discussed, the louder the discussion will become, quickly devolving into yet more labelling of the Liberal Democrats as amateurs who are unfit to govern. Such proposals as the Stanton Wick colliery site are merely ammunition for those wishing to point out the self-fulfilling prophecy of a Liberal Democrat handling of power that seems to believe it will be its last, and thus attempts to push through policies to make it thus. Take a chance to arrest that development. Develop this policy, and its sites, properly, removing from consideration the hazardous, woefully inappropriate and indefensible Stanton Wick colliery proposal.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3192 / 1 Name: Mr J. D. Boyd Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Please read these concerns thoroughly and carefully, as I believe the observations listed will both be consistent with, and also depart from, others addressed to you by my community. The logic behind the policy of sanctioned pitches for the traveller community is of irrefutable weight and value. The proposed execution of the policy around the Stanton Wick colliery is physically dangerous, socially reckless and an open invite to political embarrassment and ridicule.

As, according to the evaluation of the council, this site was deemed only the 17th most suitable from a possible 23 choices, that is, it was among the least suitable, its presence on a shortlist of 7 has left the surrounding communities somewhat bewildered. Even more bewildering than its initial choice is its size. 15 permanent pitches, each accommodating 3 generations, and a further 5 transit pitches, could of course potentially house 200 individuals, and yet the site is serviced by a single track road deemed inadequate on several occasions to carry any extra traffic. The erection of one house in the vicinity of the site was denied because the road serving the area could not accommodate any extra traffic. The omnibus operator next door to the site was denied planning permission for the storage and operation of 2 more vehicles again on the grounds of an impermissible increase in traffic. The proposal of the council to create a conurbation of hundreds, in almost the exact same spot, seems inconsistent. Three days after a meeting in Pensford to discuss these inconsistencies, two school children were struck down on separate occasions by passing motor vehicles on the very same road, vindicating the council's prior logic in refusing any extra vehicular burden on the highway.

Traffic issues are not the only anomalies in the choice of the site, oddly chosen to sit atop mine spoil; the plan appears to

immediately threaten those settled on it. The coal-board, as I am sure you are aware, has recently propped up collapsing shafts, and the site has been condemned as contaminated with arsenic. You stand to receive accusations of condemning the travelling community to living conditions deemed unfit for the rest of society. To even the more balanced observer, it seems a simple demonstration of 'dump them there and be done with it' neglect, which wilfully disregards the travellers and the population that surrounds the colliery. Intelligent planning procedure does not put several hundred individuals on a barren and potentially fatal mine spoil that would dwarf the nearest settlement, thus courting the type of social animosities that effective policy execution should be designed to circumvent.

The proposal also flies in the face of planning law, by attempting to seat the pitches on a tiny island of brown belt in a sea of green belt, which the law works to protect in all possible circumstances. With 30% of the land in B&NES designated brown belt, the list of accusations of complacency only continues to grow.

The entire proposal seems unbelievably rushed. The observations given above are merely the low hanging fruit, but even in selecting those, the Stanton Wick colliery site can be shown to be literally the most unsuitable option for the policy of providing traveller pitches. This is surely just because time has not been taken to actually provide suitable sites. There is, of course, ample time to do this before the next general election, which again begs the question of why this site has been so hurriedly and inappropriately chosen.

If it is developed any further, the Tory MP whose constituency it would fall in will undoubtedly lose his seat over the issue, and it follows that his replacement would not be from among the Lib Dem candidature. This brings out the final question of why the council seems to want to court public and political ridicule over the issue. For the more frequently this issue is discussed, the louder the discussion will become, quickly devolving into yet more labelling of the Liberal Democrats as amateurs who are unfit to govern. Such proposals as the Stanton Wick colliery site are merely ammunition for those wishing to point out the self-fulfilling prophecy of a Liberal Democrat handling of power that seems to believe it will be its last, and thus attempts to push through policies to make it thus. Take the chance to arrest that development. Develop this policy, and its sites, properly, removing from consideration the hazardous, woefully inappropriate and indefensible Stanton Wick colliery proposal.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3193 / 1 Name: Ms Hilary Cox Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I try to be fair and open minded, but I have serious concerns regarding the Council's plans for this site. I have been to a meeting here in Pensford, called by residents, to inform everyone what these plans are and what they involve. The meeting was well run, constructive and well attended. I also took notes, and below are the things that concern me most about the proposal to develop the Stanton Wick site:-

Safety of the site: the old mining area is riddled with old mining shafts which collapse & shift, affecting the ground above. Also contaminated top soil and slag.

Environmental attractiveness of the site: over the last 50 years or so, since the mines closed, nature has gradually reclaimed the land. Protected bats and protected orchids now colonise the area (I understand planning applications have been turned down due to these considerations).

Access lanes: have you actually visited the site and driven along the lanes to reach the site from either the A37 at Pensford or the A368 at Stanton Wick? They are lovely lanes, but they would have to be developed as roads (2 way traffic): has that cost been factored in.

Consultation. I understand that Bath & N.E. Somerset are working on this project in isolation. Have you consulted with neighbouring authorities regarding where their travellers sites are, and the main travellers routes?

Size of the proposed site. Although physically the site might be able to hold 15 permanent pitches, 5 transit pitches and still have capacity for further development (excepting suitability of site, see my first concern), the scale of the site would quite swamp the local community of Stanton Wick and add considerably to the population of the village of Pensford. The proposed numbers planned are quite disproportionate to the local population, infrastructure and council services and I don't think that is sustainable.

I ask you to give considerable thought to my concerns, and the appropriateness of what you are proposing. I am not at all happy with the Council's ideas for this.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3193 / 1 Name: Ms Hilary Cox Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am writing to you regarding Bath & NE Somerset Council proposed Gypsies and Travellers site at Stanton Wick. I try to be fair and open minded, but I have serious concerns regarding the Council's plans for this site. I have been to a meeting here in Pensford, called by residence, to inform everyone what these plans are and what they involve. The meeting was well run, constructive and well attended. I also took notes, and below are the things that concern me most about the proposal to develop the Stanton Wick site:-

Safety of the site; the old mining area is riddled with old mining shafts which collapse and shift, affecting the ground above. Also contaminated top soil and slag.

Environmental attractiveness of the site: over the last 50 years or so, since the mines closed, nature has gradually reclaimed the land. Protected bats and protected orchids now colonise the area (I understand planning applications have been turned down due to these considerations).

Access lanes; have you actually visited the site and driven along the lanes to reach the site from either the A37 at Pensford or the A368 at Stanton Wick? They are lovely lanes, but they would have to be developed as roads (2 way traffic): has that cost been factored in.

Consultation. I understand that Bath & N E Somerset are working on this project in isolation. Have you consulted with

neighbouring authorities regarding where their travellers sites are, and the main travellers routes?

Size of the proposed site. Although physically the site might be able to hold 15 permanent pitches, 5 transit pitches and still have capacity for further development (excepting suitability of site, see my first concern), the scale of the site would quite swamp the local community of Stanton Wick and add considerably to the population of the village of Pensford. The proposed numbers planned are quite disproportionate to the local population, infrastructure and council services, and I don't think that is sustainable.

I ask you to give considerable thought to my concerns, and the appropriateness of what you are proposing. I am not at all happy with the council's ideas for this.

Respondent: 3194 / 1 Name: Anne & Bennett Organisation:
Colin

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I understand (from the meeting with Mr.T.Ball) that other sites are less unpopular, cheaper and nearer to the facilities. Please save our rate - payers money and use them!

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. The site is in the Greenbelt, therefore covered by policy E14. it would vastly swamp the local small village (policy C12).

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No - please look closer at other locations GT2 should never have been shortlisted. Why have you ignored your own matrix? To take this site further would involve huge extra costs over the other ones.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This site is contrary to all the above codes of practice, in a MAJOR way. It could not be more wrong, so why is it being considered.

Respondent: 3194 / 1 Name: Anne & Bennett Organisation:
Colin

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We object strongly to this proposal on the grounds that the site is totally unsuitable.

To consider putting families on a site that is severely contaminated, unstable, and not near enough to essential facilities is misguided, and a waste of our rate-payers money.

We are sure when you consider all the facts regarding this site, you will realise its unsuitability.

Meanwhile, we would like to ask how it came to be elevated to the short-list, when it was 17th (near the bottom) of your own matrix-list of requirements?

Why waste time and money preparing devices to aid decisions, if they are then ignored?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3194 / 2 Name: Anne & Bennett Organisation:
Colin

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

In Greenbelt and would constitute 'inappropriate development in the Greenbelt' contrary to policy E14. the site would be far too large and swamp the village of Stanton wick which would have only a third of the number of inhabitants contrary to policy C12.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No! By far the most expensive site to develop - requires purchase from private ownership, ground clearance of toxic waste, access developmetn. Grade 2 listed building - adding to cost of development. According to the criteria in BANES matrix, this site should not have been short listed.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The proposal for GT2 seems to contravene, planning policies, national and local policies, government guidance and best practice for gypsy and traveller sites. Lack of local facilities such as schools, doctors, shops and dangerous transport issues also contravene common sense!

Respondent: 3195 / 1 Name: Mr Peter Sessford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

It would appear that the site is totally unsuitable for both residents and travellers for the following reasons.

1. The site is and has been declared unsafe owing to its previous use.
2. The road leading to the site from either direction cannot handle any more traffic.
3. There is no transport method other than to drive to access the area.
4. There are no pavement footpaths to the site.
5. Water and drainage supplies would cost huge amounts to install.
6. There are none of the following within a sensible walking distance. a) A shop b) A Doctor c) A hospital
7. The schools in the area are already at a maximum capacity with Chew Valley being over capacity.
8. The proposed site would be larger than the present residency of Stanton Wick.
9. The site is not on an already recognised traveller's route.
10. The site is in the Green Belt and has many types of wildlife including bats, newts, adders, slow worms.

It seems that even though this site is unacceptable it is still being considered as it will solve the BANES problem, almost in one go, for finding sites for these travellers.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3195 / 1 Name: Mr Peter Sessford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

YES

Highways - road to site is single track

Site is in green belt

No amenities e.g. school, doctors, shops, bus service

No mains drainage

Contaminated site

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

The hamlet of Stanton Wick is very small - any pitch provision here would be too many.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The site does not meet ANY government guidelines. The council is wasting taxpayers money persuing this. The green belt was intended to protect the environment, the council should read their own rules before taking this any further.

Respondent: 3198 / 1 Name: Mrs Elizabeth Heaford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I am extremely concerned that the Old Colliery site at Stanton Wick is in the green belt, contaminated with arsenic, with an extremely difficult and unsuitable access. There is no safe walking route to the one small shop in Pensford or Stanton Drew school and the nearest doctors' surgery is already over-subscribed and about 5 miles away. Perhaps the Somerdale site at Keynsham and the old MOD site in Bath would meet more of your requirements.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

This site failed the matrix test, coming 17 out of 23 and clearly fails this test. The only advantage is the size which would encourage uncontrolled expansion of the site. How do BANES propose to deal with this?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Bearing in mind that there are so many things wrong with this site, how could I possibly agree that it be taken forward? It is OUR money that BANES will be spending to make it remotely suitable for human habitation. Therefore NO.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This site would totally overwhelm the settlement of Stanton Wick and would profoundly effect the villages of Pensford and Publow by its potential size.

Respondent: 3198 / 1 Name: Mrs Elizabeth Heaford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Letter dated 30th April 2012

Dear Sir.
POTENTIAL PITCH PROVISION - STANTON WICK OLD COLLIERY BUILDINGS
Firstly I would like to comment on how little time the public has been given to give their opinion about the above before the Cabinet meeting on 9th May as we only heard about this last week. This is unacceptable.
You might gather that I object most strongly to this proposal for some of the following reasons and there are more:
1) Access - very important to the success of this project and totally inadequate in view of the single track lane this site is on from one direction, with bad visibility onto the A368 from the other direction. This would be extremely dangerous
2) Schools - Pensford Primary School is virtually full and there is a very strong demand for Chew Valley school from people who already live in the area
3) Doctors' surgery - this has now moved to Chew Stoke which is about 3/4 miles from the site and is already extremely oversubscribed. Keynsham is also about the same distance from the site
4) Contamination - arsenic has been found there and a full Environmental Impact Assessment would need to be carried out. I am extremely surprised that this has not already been done before you have so readily spent our money having got this far
5) Proximity to food shop - there is a small Post Office/store in Pensford, the future of which is uncertain
6) Green Belt - BANES have their own ideas about this being a brownfield site within the green belt - sounds to me like a BANES invention to suit yourselves
7) The proximity of this site to Stanton Wick is totally non-viable as it would by far outnumber the residents in Stanton Wick. Pensford is also a small place

I strongly object to this proposal and would suggest that you look again at some of the other sites which are on your shortlist.

Yours faithfully.

CC: Mr T Ball

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3200 / 1 Name: Ms Lesley Smart Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

If there is any sure evidence of contaminated ground, there should be human rights on anyone whose' health could be affected. Both local residents and any travellers/gypsies. Children especially, could be harmed as they are unaware of any dangers.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. Because there will be on-going conflict and general misconception to both parties concerned. Making for a general upset in the village, and surrounding areas. Although I agree they have to live somewhere, in a very small community this shouldn't be the case, as I said before, blame would be easy to assume with both sides.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

No.

Respondent: 3200 / 1 Name: Ms Lesley Smart Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am strongly opposed to this proposal for the following reasons/concerns:

- The site is within the designated Green Belt
- Access to the site is via a narrow country lane, and increased traffic will result in the lane becoming even more hazardous than it currently is.
- There is no public transport that serves that area.
- The ground is unsafe i.e. mineshafts, and as I understand to be the case previous examination of the land have found it to be contaminated.
- According to your matrix/requirements for a traveller's site as stated on the council website the proposed site does not provide shopping within the recommended distance.
- Again, according to your matrix/requirements for a traveller's site as stated on the council website the proposed site does not provide a doctor within the recommended distance.
- Occupation of the proposed site would dwarf the community of Stanton Wick, which comprises approximately 25 houses.
- How can the proposal for a site of this size be approved by the council, when previous planning applications for dwellings at the same site have been denied for some of the concerns/reasons listed above by the same council.
- The site will impact on the local environment e.g. water supply, drainage capability and power (electric) capacity.
- The proposed site is not on a recognised traveller route.

The Governments Localism Agenda places decisions on our neighbourhood in the hands of the people who live here. I am concerned that no contact has even been attempted by yourselves to inform us, (the local residents) of the proposals, and to open up a dialogue with the local community.

Respondent: 3202 / 1 Name: Denise Harris Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Although I have lived in Hampshire for a considerable number of years, Somerset is where I was born, brought up and educated until I was eighteen. I continue to visit the county regularly, meeting with family and enjoying this area of outstanding beauty.

It is with considerable shock that I hear from my brother , who lives in the village of Stanton Wick, that there is a proposal to allow the development of a Travellers' Site in an area which is classified as Green Belt.

It is my understanding that this is totally against National Policy.

From a layman's point of view, it would appear that local issues have not been thought through. In villages like Stanton Wick, the local infra-structure, which adequately supports the existing residents, is unlikely to cope with a sudden and large influx of people, as would happen with the establishment of a Travellers' Site. Likewise, introducing a new community with a different lifestyle and a separate infra-structure, in the hope of encouraging integration, is unlikely to succeed. Surely, Councillors could not allow a thriving village to be subsumed by an overwhelming number of new families, thus changing the balance of an existing community.

I urge Bath and North East Somerset councillors to consider, carefully, the welfare of both the residents of Stanton Wick and the Travellers who are seeking a suitable and appropriate site, when making such a momentous and irreversible decision about their future.

I am sending a copy of this letter to my local M.P Mike Hancock, also a Liberal Democrat, asking him why in your area, Liberal Democrats are considering flying in the face of National Guidelines, despite the fact that they clearly state that Traveller Sites (permanent or temporary) in the Green Belt are inappropriate.

Respondent: 3204 / 1 Name: Mr G Hunt Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I write to object to the proposed traveller's site at Old Colliery Buildings Stanton Wick, fifteen permanent and five transit pitches for the reasons below.

- 1.Green Belt site not appropriate.
2. Ground unsafe with mineshafts and old coal pit workings.
3. Slag heap health and safety issue.
4. Over shadow very small community.
5. Possible effect on countryside and local business.
6. High unemployment in surrounding areas.
7. No shops or public transport.
8. Police cuts already to existing community.
9. Single track lane with no pavements from site to Pensford village, with old railway bridge already with considerable vehicle damage and rebuild, with congestion in Church Street Pensford.
10. From Stanton Wick to site no pavements with narrow parts in many places.
11. Considerable wildlife in existence on site could be disturbed (example bats, snakes, lizards).

Respondent: 3204 / 1 Name: Mr G Hunt Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

1. The matrix was flawed
 2. Why the site at the Old Colliery, Stanton Wick, has even got as far as this consultation seeing that it was in 17th position. At the roadshow on 11th June 2012 at Pensford Hall, councillors could not give any answers to it, only that the the site was put forward- not good enough.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO!
 1. The site is in the green belt, there has been planning permission refusals (Green belt has been cited as reason for refusal)
 2. The land is contaminated, what about health and safety and compensation issues? Remediation would be extremely expensive and involve many vehicle movements along Wick Lane.
 3. The site has several old mineshafts within it, what knowledge have you about the depths and are they safe or dangerous? We come back to health and safety issues here.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No!
 1. It would overwhelm the existing community.
 2. There is no mains sewerage
 3. There is inadequate road access from both directions with no pavement (BANES has cited traffic volume in previous refusals)

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

1. There is limited employment in the area
 2. Police cuts already to existing community

Respondent: 3204 / 1 Name: Mr G Hunt Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Dear Mr Tim Ball
 I write to object to the proposed traveller's site at Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick, fifteen permanent and five transit pitches for the reasons stated below:
 1) Site is in the greenbelt inappropriate development
 2) Ground unsafe mineshafts and old coal workings
 3) Occupation of the site would dwarf the local community
 4) High unemployment in the area
 5) Insufficient road access and capacity, blind bends and congestion in Church Street, Pensford
 6) Insufficient walking access no pavements
 7) No shops
 8) No public transport immediately available
 9) Increase of services, doctors, schools, police, fire etc.
 10) Stanton Wick to proposed site, lane has no pavements and narrow in places
 11) Planning permission was not approved for increase in coaches being parked on site (using lane)

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3206 / 1 Name: Mrs V Hunt Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I write to object to the proposed traveller's site at Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick, fifteen permanent and five transit pitches for the reasons stated below.

1. Site is in the greenbelt inappropriate development.
2. Ground unsafe mineshafts and old coal workings.
3. Occupation of the site would dwarf the local community.
4. High unemployment in the area.
5. Insufficient road access and capacity, blind bends and congestion in Church Street, Pensford.
6. Insufficient walking access, no pavements.
7. No shops.
8. No public transport immediately available.
9. Increase of services, doctors, schools, police, fire etc.
10. Stanton Wick to proposed site, lane has no pavements and narrow in places.
11. Planning permission was not approved for increase in coaches being parked on site (using lane) .

Respondent: 3209 / 1 Name: Mrs J Shattock Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Re: the above, I am very much against the proposed above site for these reasons:

Foremost the site is unsafe due to old mine shafts.
The ground is poisoned.
There are no near amenities.
There is no public transport.
The lanes are very narrow and not intended for the amount of traffic this site will provide.
It is in the GREEN BELT.
Insufficient schooling facilities.

It would dwarf the small hamlet of Stanton Wick.

Young children and older people would be totally out of contact with their own ages and it would be like putting them in a concentration camp.

Finally there is the wildlife in the very near vicinity which would be put at risk with several species being protected.

May I conclude with, it would appear that who ever put forward this proposal is a very stupid person with no common sense at all and little understanding of life in general.

Respondent: 3211 / 1 Name: Mrs Dlugiewicz-York Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am writing to express my concern for the proposed gypsy site at Stanton Wick. This site seems to defy all logic and reasoning in that this area is unsafe with arsenic detected in the ground. With the mine workings also it beggars belief that this site was even considered.

Coupled with access being a single track and that 'Filers coaches' were not allowed more vehicles to and from their site opposite, it just goes to show that if the council wants to push something through that others are ignored in favour of BANES having to find a suitable site, and thinking that because they are the council what they say goes. As far as I am concerned and others the residents of Stanton Wick and surrounding villages all pay their taxes and so therefore we should have a vote as to where our money is spent.

Having the site here would outnumber the residents 3 to 1, there is no footpath or local amenities - they would need transport to doctors, schools etc. Who pays for this - yes us again I think!

Once travellers get to know of this site it will be inundated; and the mess and damage that we know will be caused would be damaging to all around. Therefore, I raise my objections to you and hope you will tell us why this area seems to have to find so many sites when there doesn't seem to be any nearer to Bath! Perhaps you want to 'move on' the illegal camp at Newbridge and where better to put this mess than here out of sight to you!

Respondent: 3215 / 1 Name: Mr Neil Tibbs Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. The ground is unsafe due to mineshafts. Insufficient road access. Drainage capability could not cope. Site is in green belt.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. The site is not a recognised Travellers Route, no doctors within walking distance, no school capacity and no shopping within walking distance.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Green belt site. Twerton - Bath is a much better site for transport links, schools, buses, shops, doctors etc. etc.

Respondent: 3215 / 2 Name: Mr Neil Tibbs Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing in response to the BANES council proposed development of The Old Colliery in Stanton Wick to provide 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches for travellers.

I would like to raise objections to this development on the following grounds:-

BaNES have not explained who will be paying for any or all of the work required in order to make the site habitable, bring water, sewage and electricity. They have not explained what the cost is for any mine safety work or road work cost or the cost to enable children to be accommodated in the local Schools.

National guidelines state that the site should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement. Even at 20 pitches the travellers would outnumber the Stanton Wick's residents possibly 2 or 3 : 1. The proposed 20 pitches is larger than the government's stated maximum making it difficult to manage. BaNES report boasts that the site has potential to expand to 50 pitches - more than three times the maximum.

This is clearly an over development of a greenbelt site which would have a huge detrimental effect on the surrounding residents and facilities including roads and schools. I would also mention that as the site is in greenbelt area, central government guidelines suggested that traveller's sites should not be located in greenbelt.

I would therefore urge you to remove this site from your shortlist before the end of the consultation period of the 18th July 2012.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3215 / 3 Name: Mr Neil Tibbs Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I would like to raise objections to this development on the following grounds:-

Schools:-

The two primary schools in the Stanton Wick area (Pensford & Stanton Drew) are very small rural schools, whilst there are some spaces at these schools the impact of a large intake of children at all year levels would have a detrimental effect on the quality of education provided to all children due to the amount of time and resource it would take to assess the abilities of the new intake children. The resources at these schools would be severely stretched.

Access to both these schools, which are more than 1.5km from the proposed site, is very poor and there is no suitable footpath making walking to school extremely hazardous.

There is limited parking at both schools and additional vehicles would further increase this problem with the likelihood of an increase in illegal parking causing danger to children outside of schools.

Environment:-

A development of the size would have a detrimental effect on the environment. I believe there is no mains drainage in the village of Stanton Wick and therefore Septic tanks would need to be provided for all pitches.

There are bats and no doubt other rare species on this land which need protecting. Wildlife would be disturbed and possibly destroyed during a development of this size. There is a danger of mine shafts collapsing. Please note bats are protected.

This is a green belt site – central government guidelines suggest that travellers sites should not be located in greenbelt. It is also interesting to note that Filer coaches who are a well respected local business located next door to the proposed travellers site made an application to extend their premises to accommodate an additional 10 coaches. This application was turned down due to “Inappropriate development in the Green Belt, detracting from openness and rural character of the area:- resulting in congestion and inconvenience to road users and unsustainable location of the site”. A reapplication was made and rejected on 29 September 2011 (only 7 months ago) on the same grounds. It therefore seems amazing that a development of the size suggested and the amount of traffic it would create is now being considered.

would therefore urge you to remove this site from your shortlist of potential sites at the meeting on 9 May 2012.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3218 / 1 Name: Mr Lewis Tibbs Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. The site at Stanton Wick in an expert's report was found to be contaminated with dangerous levels of arsenic that has not been removed. The site has mineshafts and safety issues have not been considered.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. The site has nothing in common with the type of site preferred by travellers, shown in the West of England Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Banes need to explain who will be paying for any or all of work required to make the site habitable i.e. water, sewage and electricity.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Stanton Wick is in a green belt area, and the guidelines say that gypsy and travellers sites in green belts area are inappropriate development - therefore planning permission would not be available.

Respondent: 3222 / 1 Name: Charles Farmer Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I feel the council have been ill advised and have rushed into decisions without consulting the residents with these decisions to be a success they require this backing of the Electorate. The use of this site would not promote social cohesion, it would overwhelm the residents of Stanton Wick. Old gas tips have been know to self combust.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

I certainly do not agree for the above reasons. It is also green belt, previously applications have been turned down for this reason. The land is polluted, removal of this pollution may well expose worse pollution. The cost of removing this could be prohibitive, surely sites of this nature should not be on unstable ground.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3227 / 1 Name: Mr David & Tibbs Organisation:
Phyllis

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. Road poor. No amenities. Contaminated site and shafts. No sewage/water.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. Too large re resident numbers in Stanton Wick currently.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

No.

Respondent: 3228 / 1 Name: Mr Mark & Tibbs Organisation:
Clare

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. Road access dangerous. No shops within walking distance (or other amenities except a pub). Site safety of question (shafts and contamination). Prevision of amenities not explained.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. Likely to outnumber nearest settlement numbers.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

No. Except to ask if gypsies and travellers have a preferred option or if they have been asked.

Respondent: 3236 / 1 Name: Goodlet Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We are writing in support of the Stanton Wick Action Group to protest at the proposed site for gypsies and travellers at the old Colliery buildings in Stanton Wick. We believe the site is unsuitable for the following reasons.

- Ground is unsafe (mineshafths)
- Insufficient road access and capacity.
- Insufficient walking access and capacity.
- Insufficient public transport access.
- Insufficient water supply.
- Insufficient Drainage capability.
- Insufficient Power (electric) capacity.
- No shopping within recommended distance.
- No doctor within recommended distance.
- No school capacity.
- Site is in the Green Belt.
- Occupation of the site would dwarf the local community.
- The site is not on a recognised traveller route.

We therefore do not agree with the proposed site and wish to register our objection.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3239 / 1 Name: Ms Vivienne Winstone Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

We live on the lane which would be the direct access to site. A single track lane with no pavement or layby!! Please consider your tax payers safety on the roads as well as incoming residents when assessing the suitability of this site.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3239 / 1 Name: Ms Vivienne Winstone Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am writing to you in the hope that your Duty of Care extends to us the residents of Stanton Wick as well as to future residents at the Old Colliery should this huge development proceed.

So many points have already been eloquently put forward as to the unsuitability of the site that I can only add as very close neighbours of the above that the stress and worry this has caused not only myself but my husband and 90 year old mother is something I could never have envisaged in a fair society where all parties are listened to and no one sector is singled out for preference.

How is it possible that a site already turned down for development on a much smaller scale than the one proposed and only granted permission for limited occupation now is deemed suitable for more inhabitants than currently live in this hamlet?

Stanton Wick has now planning applications refused in the past primarily because of lack of road infrastructure. How has this changed?

Does this new way of looking at sites mean that local youngsters who previously had to live away but work in the valley will now be afforded the same treatment, i.e. families wanting to offer land for a dwelling will now be looked on favourably!

Please as I am sure you will and I respectfully ask that this letter is replied to personally.

Please do not direct me to the roadshow as I have already attended these and have spoken to your solicitor there and Cordelia (Gypsy Liaison Officer).

Respondent: 3241 / 1 Name: Mrs Muriel Hodges Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I wish to protest against the site planned for the gypsy and traveller site planned for Stanton Wick. Talked about a while ago but just came to the public notice.

There are 13 good reasons why this site is not suitable. People should be put near a city like Bath where they would have all the amenities they need for a good living, not living on unsafe ground. The access is not good and with shops no post

office, miles to a doctors it all means more traffic for Stanton Drew. The site is also in a greenbelt. This proposal is not a good idea.

Respondent: 3241 / 2 Name: Mrs Muriel Hodges Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I wish to oppose the opening of a Travellers and Gypsies Travellers site at Stanton Wick. I am surprised it was ever thought about, being built over an old mine shaft the access to it and all the amenities required for a happy life, not to mention it being in the green belt. There are thirteen good reasons why this should not be allowed to happen, we are the next village to this site we only have the nearest school which I am sure could not accommodate all the children we only have a pub and church. I am sure a site near a city would suit a traveller better. Is there no way nearer Bath? I have lived in Stanton Drew since 1946 a good village.

Respondent: 3241 / 3 Name: Mrs Muriel Hodges Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am sorry I have never met you although being so near, I do not go about. I am very opposed to the idea of a gypsies and travellers site for Stanton Wick. It has everything wrong with it. With 13 reasons why it is wrong and building on mineshafts is a real danger. Stanton Drew only has a church, school and pub and narrow roads. I have lived in Stanton Drew for 66 years, to me it has always been a lovely village. Also the green belt should not be ignored as the local people have not been given much time to respond to this matter.

Respondent: 3243 / 1 Name: Mrs Judith Steiner Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

As a resident of Pensford it has been brought to my attention that the Bath & North East Somerset Council are giving consideration to land at Stanton Wick being utilised as a Travellers' Site. That the Council should think this land is suitable

for housing people gives rise to serious questions about their selection process and the criteria used in the selection process for sites in the BANES area.

I would urge your attention to the following points:

Firstly, I would bring your attention to a document I located on the internet originating from BANES Planning Services, entitled Pensford Conservation Area for Character Appraisal. Although dated 2008 I believe it is still relevant today.

At Page 3 of this document the Introduction reads:

'Pensford was identified as being of special architectural and historic interest and was designated a Conservation Area in May 1988.

The Council has a duty to pay special attention to preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of Conservation Areas in exercising its planning powers, including periodic re-appraisal of boundaries. This provides a consistent and sound basis upon which to determine planning and other applications.

The appraisal identifies features which contribute towards the character of the area and those that detract from it. This provides a base upon which to develop proposals for preservation and enhancement.

The preparation of the statement also enables local residents to participate in the identification of features which are important to the special character of the area in which they live.

Summary of Special Interest (the one item which is important here)

Evidence of the former mining industry including miners' cottages, the miners' welfare and abandoned mine works in the surrounding area.'

As a resident of Pensford I would request the Council adhere to this 2008 appraisal of Pensford, by paying attention to the preservation of its characters, including abandoned mine works and the surrounding areas and desist from all thoughts of establishing a travellers' site on the aforementioned land.

Secondly, I would invite the Council to consider the following individual points:

Contamination of the land

This must be extensive as there has been mining on this site for many years. To rectify this land to a standard acceptable for habitation would surely prove so costly as to make the whole project unviable.

Ground Unsafe

By the very nature that this land was mined for so many years makes it unsafe. Has the Council carried out a survey to establish exactly where mine shafts exist and the cost of remedial work to make such areas safe?

Site is in Green Belt land

Let us not forget where this site is – on Green Belt land - by definition 'countryside where urbanisation will be resisted for the foreseeable future'.

Access to the site

I wonder if BANES representatives have had the opportunity to walk the route to this proposed site? If they have then they will know that it is accessed by a single track lane which, in summer, when trees and bushes bloom in full leaf, is both narrow and dark at certain points. Are they expecting a large group of people to use this lane on a daily basis on foot and with vehicles? Current residents of this lane have already voiced their concerns over traffic levels with just themselves as residents. With a site of this size proposed and with only this lane for access, we can surely expect frequent accidents.

Also it must be borne in mind that this lane is without street lighting (as is much of Pensford). Is BANES expecting young

children to walk to school during the dark mornings and dark evenings of winter through this lane? At one point in the lane (over the railway bridge) it is impossible for traffic to see around the corner. A recipe for an accident waiting to happen – especially with children.

Let us not forget either the winter of 2010 when deep snow ensured that most lanes around Pensford were impassable. Were such weather conditions to happen again (as they well might) one wonders how people on such a site would cope? They would be cut off from main roads and away from public transport, with no immediately obvious support.

Water supply/drainage

A water supply and drainage is an essential element for such a site. I believe current residents of the lane have a water supply and use septic tanks for drainage. Whilst the Council may say that water and septic tanks can be installed at a cost, those already resident in the lane say you have to be extremely careful with the septic tanks so as not to contaminate the water supply. One wonders, if such a site was introduced, would regular checks be made on the water supply and the septic tanks at the site to ensure contamination was not taking place? And who would be paying to empty and maintain them?

Day to Day Facilities

Having a large number of people on such as site as is being proposed brings the inevitable need for shopping, schools, medical facilities and the like. The Council must be aware that there is but one general store in Pensford and that this store is some distance from the proposed site. Likewise the primary school and the doctors’ surgery. The Council may be aware that just recently a new doctors’ surgery has opened in Chew Magna. This means that present Pensford residents who use this surgery have to travel an even further distance themselves and this would of course apply to residents of any proposed site also.

Size of site would overwhelm current community

It must be borne in mind that a site of the size proposed would completely overwhelm the hamlet of Stanton Wick. Any idea of the site residents blending in with the hamlet is unthinkable. Residents who have lived at Stanton Wick for many years would find themselves completely overwhelmed by such an influx of so many people/vehicles/noise etc.

Recognised traveller route

The proposed site is not of course on a recognised travellers’ route. Nor is it very close to the A37 (unless of course you prefer the field route!)

It does seem as if the Council is willing to consider this site because it is large, with room for expansion, and is being offered by a private owner. It will also solve at a stroke the Councils obligations over providing suitable sites for travellers. I believe this is extremely short sighted of the Council as they do not appear to be putting into the equation the impact on the surrounding area such a site will have. Also, such a site is, by very nature of the land, going to be extremely costly to achieve and in these times of austerity I wonder how the Council will justify such an expensive venture.

And of course we have then to consider the question of whether the travellers themselves will accept the site. That will be for them to decide!

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3244 / 1 Name: Mr S Grimes Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We are writing to express our serious concerns that BANES is apparently considering accommodating 15 permanent and 5 transit Gypsy and Traveller pitches at Stanton Wick, near Pensford and are amazed that BANES considers this site to be remotely suitable for this purpose.

We understand that BANES undertook an assessment to determine site suitability and that 7 sites including this one were selected following a site assessment. We understand that 16 sites were rated higher than Stanton Wick on the council's own criteria out of 23 sites considered. We cannot seriously believe that Stanton Wick found itself at the top of the council's list of suitable site despite its obvious unsuitability and that this selection was made without notice to or consultation with local residents.

The BANES report contains a scoring matrix which identified a number of constraints on the development of gypsy sites. This includes use of Green Belt, and contaminated land. The report mentioned that sites should NOT be located in the Green Belt except in exceptional circumstances. Bearing in mind that it is our understanding that the Stanton Wick site is located in the Green Belt (in an area of outstanding natural beauty) and is contaminated with arsenic we therefore find it unbelievable that BANES can justify the selection in contravention of its own criteria.

We understand that BANES core strategy includes a number of criteria for assessing site suitability and would draw your attention to the following serious shortcomings which we consider highlight the total unsuitability of this site based on the Council's own criteria:

1. "LOCAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES INCLUDING SHOPS, SCHOOLS AND HEALTH FACILITIES SHOULD BE ACCESSIBLE BY FOOT, CYCLE AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT".

BANES seem unaware that there are no shops at all in Pensford or Stanton Wick (apart from a small post office, under threat of closure). The primary school in Pensford is not accessible by public transport from Stanton Wick and walking for about 1.5 miles along the remote, steep country lane (without a footpath) would be hazardous for children. The senior school is in Chew Stoke is oversubscribed and equally inaccessible. There are no health facilities in Pensford or Stanton Wick, the nearest being in Chew Stoke which cannot be directly accessed by public transport or on foot.

2. "SATISFACTORY MEANS OF ACCESS CAN BE PROVIDED AND THE EXISTING HIGHWAY NETWORK IS ADEQUATE TO SERVICE THE SITE".

BANES seem to have overlooked that this site is in a very remote area and that there is no decent access road. The site is accessible only via a single, unlit track (with passing places) and with no pavement. The route into Pensford involves a very difficult access to Pensford High Street, a narrow one way street not suited to high traffic flows.

3. "THE SITE DOES NOT HARM THE APPEARANCE OF THE SURROUNDING AREA".

BANES has completely ignored the fact that Pensford was designated a Conservation Area in May 1988.

Bath and North East Somerset Planning Services- Pensford Conservation and Character Appraisal Brochure March 2008 states:

'Pensford's inclusion within the Bristol-Bath Green belt signifies the importance of the landscape setting and helps prevent development which would be harmful to the area' Views from the top of High Street and higher ground around the village highlight the importance of Pensford's roofscapes. The irregular pattern of pitched roofs with traditional clay tiles and chimney pots is a characteristic of the village. Development within and around the conservation Area should reflect this ' Clearly, the current proposal is in direct contravention of this policy.

Our understanding is that government planning policy is to help local communities to be more thoroughly engaged in the planning process and able to influence the outcomes of the planning of their neighbourhood. Therefore, we would hope the Cabinet to take the wishes of the local community into account and reject the Stanton Wick site as totally unsuitable for purpose.

At this stage, we do not propose to further express our concerns in greater detail. We hope that the Council will reconsider; see sense and not proceed with the Stanton Wick proposal. However, the purpose of this letter is to make it

abundantly clear that we object to this proposal and that it will be our firm intention to vigorously oppose this development if it progresses to a later stage.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3244 / 1 Name: Mr S Grimes Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes. I am particularly concerned about the site at Old Colliery Buildings Stanton Wick which on all the evidence available is a wholly unsuitable site for a substantial gypsy site or, indeed, any other form of significant residential development.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

1. I consider the selection of this site blatantly political. This site should NOT be included in the initial consultation as it was rated 17th out of the 23 sites considered. It is wholly inappropriate to include this site until AFTER the 16 rated higher have been formally considered and rejected.
2. This site is in the "green belt" and, as such, ANY residential development on this site, including a residential development for gypsies, would constitute 'inappropriate development'. The Council has therefore made a serious error of judgement by including the site in this consultation.
3. The site is adjacent to the Pensford Conservation Area. The Council should be aware that Conservation Areas are 'areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance' (Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990). The Council has an obligation to protect the special character of Conservation Areas and clearly a gypsy site adjacent to such an area would be detrimental.
4. The site is treacherous. It is contaminated with arsenic and has several old mineshafts which render the land liable to subsidence and old coal seams which create a potential fire hazard.
5. There are no public transport services whatsoever within a reasonable walking distance. The existing, infrequent bus service to Pensford would be utterly inadequate to accommodate the increased local population.
6. The site is inaccessible. The only means of access to the site from Stanton Wick and Pensford is by a poor single carriage, unlit country lane with no pavements. This would be extremely dangerous for children walking to school or playing on the road.
7. Traffic emanating from the site would cause major problems when it reaches the junction at Old Pensford High Street. Old Pensford High Street is a one-way street and not suitable for use as a through route. It was by-passed by the A37 many years ago and is mainly used for local access only. However, the gypsies would have to use the Old High Street to reach the A37 for Bristol and for Pensford School, both of which would cause major problems.
8. There is only, one small local shop, the Post Office in Pensford; no medical facilities and no senior school in Pensford which would mean the gypsies would have to travel several miles on unsuitable, narrow country lanes to reach all of these services.
9. This proposed gypsy site would overwhelm the existing settled community at Stanton Wick by a large margin.

10. The site provides a habitat for many rare species and these must be protected.

11. There are no mains services (e.g. gas, water, sewage and electricity). Putting in the necessary infrastructure would be extremely expensive and would be an unwelcome and unnecessary burden on the tax-payers. This alone should point to the need to reject this site in favour of one with established mains services.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Definitely not. For the reasons given above I consider the Stanton Wick site wholly unsuitable. It would devastate the green belt and communities in the Mendip Hills; an area of outstanding natural beauty.

There are other more suitable sites available in Bath & NE Somerset which are not in the green belt. For example, there is a large area of surplus land available for residential use at the former MOD site in Lansdown, Bath. This is a brownfield site; it is not located in the green belt or in a conservation area, or in an area of outstanding natural beauty. The MOD land is located near to all amenities, has all mains services and is more easily accessible by road and public transport than the site at Stanton Wick.

Alternatively there is surplus industrial land available in Keynsham, Radstock and Midsomer Norton none which suffer from the shortcomings of Stanton Wick. For example, the former "Focus DIY" premises at Midsomer Norton is currently disused and it could provide a suitable site. It is located on developed land, it has plenty of space, it is opposite a Tesco supermarket and petrol filling station, it is on a good road, it is near the town and it has mains services already in existence.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Stanton Wick is not on a recognised traveller route.

Pensford was identified as being of special architectural and historic interest and was designated a Conservation Area in May 1988. The Council has a duty to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. I would refer you to Bath & NE Somerset's own "Conservation Area Character Appraisal" approved by the Council in 2008 which states: "Pensford's inclusion within the Bristol-Bath Green Belt signifies the importance of the landscape setting and helps to prevent development which would be harmful to the area".

Respondent: 3245 / 1 Name: D B Shattock Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I wish to register my objection to the proposed travellers site at Stanton Wick (a decision apparently made without any prior ~ consultation with the local villages).

Also to request that the proposal will be dealt with by the full council so that views of the local communities will be taken into account. The decision to make Stanton Wick the preferred site appears to have been taken by a few members of the Planning Committee who appear to have no local knowledge of the area.

Wick Lane is mainly narrow & unable to cope with the extra traffic which will be generated by the site. in particular the inevitable lorries.

Local schools (unable to expand in Pensford) will be swamped. The proposed limit as to future numbers of vans will exceed the dwellings in Stanton Drew village itself.

The nearest doctor & dentist will be unable to cope.

The site is in the green belt & the area is a wildlife haven.

I am seeking your support to oppose the planned site & hope that you will ensure the proposal is dealt with by the full council.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3247 / 1 Name: Mrs J Shattock Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No
 This is contravenes the aims of Green Belt legislation
 Local roads will not be able to cope with the extra traffic
 Local services are not available in sufficient size and volume in the close proximity and those available are not suitable for the extra numbers of residents
 Local employment for the numbers envisaged is not available – local unemployment facilities are not available
 Road access into the site is dangerous and the site has issues concerning safety
 A site of this size will overwhelm local communities such as local schools and completely destroy the balance of views / influence in the local community
 The cost of providing utilities to the green field site will far out strip any benefit

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Although appreciating the need to provide facilities for travellers and their families this proposal smacks of desperation in that it is a site with no redeeming features except it is remote and potentially available. The proposal whilst laudable in principle does not take into account the physical and safety problems of the site, the views of the local population and the basic principles of planning law.

Respondent: 3249 / 1 Name: Mr S Stock Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

After visiting the Road-Show in Stanton Drew Village Hall on 7th June and from all we have heard and read about the above proposed development we feel we must convey our serious concerns to you, and others involved in this project, and register our objections.

It appears that this proposed site is at odds with many of the criteria laid down in the Core Strategy Policy CPII, the planning guidelines for the development of accommodation for gypsies and travellers, as follows:-
 (a) local community services and facilities including shops, schools and health facilities should be accessible by foot, cycle and public transport.

This site meets none of these requirements - facilities too far away for walking and no public transport.

(b) satisfactory means of access can be provided and the existing highway network is adequate to service the site
The existing lanes are totally inadequate and could become more dangerous with the additional traffic

© the site is large enough to allow adequate space for on-site facilities and amenity, parking and manoeuvring, as well as any commercial activity if required

True. BUT the unused area of the site is vulnerable to being used illegally, possibly leading to confrontation with police as has happened in other parts of the country.

(d) the site does not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area
Constant site supervision would be required to comply with this dictum.

(e) adequate services including utilities, foul and surface water and waste disposal can be provided as well as any necessary pollution control measures
These are undoubtedly lacking at the present time and could involve considerable expenditure to provide

(f) use of the site must have no harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
There is bound to be an impact on the whole area due to the increased number of people and traffic

(g) the site should avoid areas at high risk of flooding and have no adverse impact on protected habitats and species, nationally recognised designations and natural resources
The site would probably meet this requirement.

We would also remind you that as this proposed site is within the Green Belt national guidelines regard this as 'inappropriate development'. Although planning permission has been granted for a single dwelling (05/02227 /FUL) that is a very different proposition to the ,present extensive proposals and permission should now be refused . There are no shops in Stanton Wick or Stanton Drew and only a very small shop in Pensford where it is very doubtful whether they could cope with a large influx of gypsies and travellers . Bristol or Keynsham are much too far away for walking or cycling and there is no public transport .

With regard to schools. There is nothing in Stanton Wick and the schools at Stanton Drew and Pensford are very small. A large influx of gypsy and traveller children would completely overwhelm these - to the detriment of local village children. Stanton Wick's population would also be overwhelmingly out numbered by 2 or 3 to 1. This is contrary to the requirements of clause (f) of the Core Strategy Policy CPU.

We understand from an expert survey that the proposed site is contaminated with dangerous levels of arsenic and there is the added danger of mine shafts. To make the site safe would be expensive and an enormous task which would cause disruption all around for a long time while contaminated soil and materials are removed and then replaced with 'clean' materials.

Gypsies and Travellers are human beings just as much as we are and deserve to be offered really suitable sites with all the necessary facilities as laid down in the Core Strategy Policy CPII Document. This site clearly does not meet these requirements on many counts and therefore this proposed development must not proceed.

This proposal for a Gypsy and Traveller Site at the Old Colliery at Stanton Wick should be abandoned as being completely unsuitable.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

It appears that this proposed site is at odds with many of the criteria laid down in the Core Strategy Policy CPII, the planning guidelines for the development of accommodation for gypsies and travellers, as follows:-

(a) local community services and facilities including shops, schools and health facilities should be accessible by foot, cycle and public transport.

This site meets none of these requirements - facilities too far away for walking and no public transport.

(b) satisfactory means of access can be provided and the existing highway network is adequate to service the site

The existing lanes are totally inadequate and could become more dangerous with the additional traffic

(c) the site is large enough to allow adequate space for on-site facilities and amenity, parking and manoeuvring, as well as any commercial activity if required

True. BUT the unused area of the site is vulnerable to being used illegally, possibly leading to confrontation with police as has happened in other parts of the country.

(d) the site does not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area

Constant site supervision would be required to comply with this dictum.

(e) adequate services including utilities, foul and surface water and waste disposal can be provided as well as any necessary pollution control measures

These are undoubtedly lacking at the present time and could involve considerable expenditure to provide

(f) use of the site must have no harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

There is bound to be an impact on the whole area due to the increased number of people and traffic

(g) the site should avoid areas at high risk of flooding and have no adverse impact on protected habitats and species, nationally recognised designations and natural resources

The site would probably meet this requirement

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

We would also remind you that as this proposed site is within the Green Belt national guidelines regard this as 'inappropriate development'. Although planning permission has been granted for a single dwelling (05/02227 /FUL) that is a very different proposition to the present extensive proposals and permission should now be refused. There are no shops in Stanton Wick or Stanton Drew and only a very small shop in Pensford where it is very doubtful whether they could cope with a large influx of gypsies and travellers. Bristol or Keynsham are much too far away for walking or cycling and there is no public transport.

With regard to schools. There is nothing in Stanton Wick and the schools at Stanton Drew and Pensford are very small. A

large influx of gypsy and traveller children would completely overwhelm these - to the detriment of local village children. Stanton Wick's population would also be overwhelmingly out numbered by 2 or 3 to 1. This is contrary to the requirements of clause (f) of the Core Strategy Policy CPII.

We understand from an expert survey that the proposed site is contaminated with dangerous levels of arsenic and there is the added danger of mine shafts. To make the site safe would be expensive and an enormous task which would cause disruption all around for a long time while contaminated soil and materials are removed and then replaced with 'clean' materials.

Gypsies and Travellers are human beings just as much as we are and deserve to be offered really suitable sites with all the necessary facilities as laid down in the Core Strategy Policy CPII Document. This site clearly does not meet these requirements on many counts and therefore this proposed development must not proceed.

This proposal for a Gypsy and Traveller Site at the Old Colliery at Stanton Wick should be abandoned as being completely unsuitable.

Respondent: 3250 / 1 Name: Mr 7 G Beedell Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

We are deeply concerned at the proposal to put a traveller/gypsy site at the old colliery at Stanton Wick.

The site clearly fails to meet the government's criteria for such sites, it is in a green belt area, has inadequate to local amenities and the land is contaminated due to it's mining past.

I understand a previous planning application was refused. The access is a single track lane which will cause considerable risk to an increase in vehicles and people. I urge you to reconsider this proposal and look for a more suitable location which will have near-by facilities, shops, schools etc" which will be far more suitable.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3251 / 1 Name: M J Coles Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Although I do not reside close to the above development. I wish to add my support to the objections made by people in the Stanton Wick area. I have had first hand experience of Travellers living close by some years ago, when they occupied the old Queen Charlton concrete works site. The impact on this small community will be catastrophic and irreversible.

If this development is allowed to go ahead, it will not only bring pressure on roads and schools it will alter the way of life for the population of Stanton Wick and beyond for ever.

BNES have a duty to its council tax payers first and foremost to protect them from such a major disruption in there lives.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3251 / 1 Name: M J Coles Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Old Colliery Site, Stanton Wick

YES

Having lived and worked in the Pensford area all my life (I am now 72) I am fully aware of the site location. Therefore I know first hand how narrow and twisted the roads are both sides of the proposed site. Also, the site is in an elevated position in relation to Pensford and will have to be cleared of trees etc. exposing it to be seen. As was the colliery spoil tip before it became covered with vegetation.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree. In my opinion the local population of Stanton Wick and Wick Lane should be given proper consideration, because it will affect their lives for ever, should this proposal come into affect. Also on a wider issue, doctors, schools, public transport, main sewerage, would need to addressed.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Have the Gypsy and Travellers views been assessed?

Respondent: 3253 / 1 Name: Brian Smith Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

May I bring to your attention the following relevant points that I would be pleased if you would take into consideration when debating the proposed site at Old Colliery Buildings Stanton Wick.

The Hamlet of Stanton Wick is separate from Pensford and Stanton Drew and consists of approximately 25 dwellings 50% of which are occupied by one or two people a large majority being middle aged or retired.

It has no Mains Sewage, no Mains Gas, no Street Lighting no Footpath, no Shop no School and no Public Transport and is accessed by a single carriageway road. It is therefore impossible to see how it can meet the published criteria of "access to facilities and site access"

With a proposed development of 15 permanent and 5 transit sites which I understand would mean at least 45 permanent

and 15 transit families the present population of about 70 adults and children could be trebled creating severe problems with access and services, doing so would increasing the transport movement dramatically with all the environmental implications.

I strongly urge you to discount this site as it is completely unsuitable in favour of a more suitable location with better services and in an area where there would be less impact on the existing environment.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3253 / 1 Name: Brian Smith Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No. But I suggest sites of proposed housing developments that will have amenities provided include a small area for these sites.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Above site unsuitable as it fails on all counts to meet government criteria.

1. within greenbelt
2. inadequate access to local amenities (schools, doctors, shops, public transport)
3. site has history of contaminations and unrecorded mine shafts
4. highways unsuitable for additional traffic
5. mains water supply inadequate. And no mains sewerage (considerable cost to provide.)

Respondent: 3256 / 1 Name: Mrs J I Denis-Meeria Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Following the last two meetings held at Stanton Drew on 23rd and 25th May, I would like to make comments on various points made at these meetings.

Having already written to our MP Mr Rees-Mogg. He passed my comments to a Mr David Trigwell. He replied that my suggested numbers that the proposed site was far in excess of those planned. I beg to differ, as every single person I have met agrees with me. I've been where there are gypsies many times, I never yet come across a single person living on there

own.

I was born in this village and am almost 79 years old, I am also familiar with the coal mines around the area, my father was a minor at Bromley , Broad Oak and Writhlington. I am also aware that the two shafts at Stanton Wick, one of which has collapsed, also that the owner of the coaches was refused planning for a further 3 coaches. The reason, traffic problems, well with more inhabitants than the whole of Stanton Wick, pushed into 8 acres, plus cars, lorries and vans and horses that doesn't make sense to me.

Also before these plans were made known to us the public, why did you refuse four houses to be built on the site, there is arsenic contamination (so say) and the excuse was the same as Mr Filer, traffic congestion, ground danger, and lack of services.

What about school for the children? I haven't seen or read anything regarding this. Apparently Stanton Drew School has been silently ear marked for Juniors. This little school is very good on education so far, and already takes the over flow from Chew magna, Bishop Salton, Norton Malseward and Pensford with the village and Stanton Wick children, will it be any use? I don't think so.

The fact that all this is suggested on Greenbelt, how is it no one else can build on any green belt in the area, even the landowners? I am speaking with my own experience with BANES, and not from grapevine information.

How is it possible to move the site from 17th to 7th? What happened to the 10 others between? No answers forthcoming, no explanations!

As you never seem to have time to come to any meetings to date, it would be nice to get some real straight answers.

One small site that is now put on hold, is a proposed site for 5 pitches on the field now suited for the childrens play area, also included in that was the old Scout Hut, that was a big secret in 2008? The owner of the scout hut purchased long before that was never even given any hint, what the hell goes on in your BANES offices, they are like a closed shop.

The public are not getting very good consideration, or information, until long after any plans seem underway.

One lady representative for the gypsies told the public the main gypsy movement do not want to move, they wish to stay where they have settled, why doesn't Bath clean these sites up and let them remain near amenities? It rather looks like Bath wishes to have ethnic cleansing, to have the city looking neat and beautiful, but the outskirts who get no benefits, still have to foot the bills.

Perhaps if they wish to devalue all our properties, we should all get together, and the percentage of value from our properties, should reflect the same percentage on the rates value.

If we all got together and did like wise, this may be a very good idea.

I have delivered this letter to our council chairperson, she will deliver them to you, ensuring all correspondence has been received, I understand that you do not reply to emails.

Respondent: 3265 / 1 Name: Mrs Kristine Mountford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Inappropriate development of Green Belt - effect on wildlife & nearby conservation area. Ground contamination & remedial cost very high. Conversion of Old Colliery Buildings to be undertaken to highest standard - again cost very high. Highway restrictions due to narrow lanes with blind bends narrow ancient bridge on route to schools & to & from site. Lack of public transport. Poor water supply. No main sewage. Small local shop only main shop / supermarkets require car journeys & also secondary school doctor also approx 5 miles away - again requires car journey. Previous planning refused

domestic building because of highway access.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

On site services & utilities? No mains drainage - poor water supply. Building conversion very costly. Will not encourage social integration. huge impact on current residents. Accommodation of several Gypsy/ Traveller families & future growth will devastate the balance of the village life by outnumbering existing families. Site is overlooked by Winding House - unavoidable therefore invading privacy of residents on site (of G/T). No safe walking route to primary schools therefore use of vehicles will increase for this on shopping trips.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO. Highways agreed provision of dwelling with 5 cars on this site but declined Filers coaches application for additional coach parking. Precidence must be given to existing local employer if there is to be an increase in traffic. Delivery of the site is costly prohibitive due to lack of facilities, contamination & road access. Schol, shops & doctor surgery only reached by car journey or school by unsafe walk. Development will harm Green Belt & wildlife habitat. Illegal spread of site will be unmanagable.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

major access problems - contaminated land - lack of facilities - Green Belt intrusion. Prohibitive cost of delivery - a very poor investment for any potential developer based on legal numbers - increasing threat of illegal growth / spread. Services both emergency & non emergency will not be able to cope with inceased population. Previous planning history details should be studied. Negative effect on wildlife & Green Belt. Historic interest of site will be lost. Dangerous for children who may play on adjoining area due to collapsing mines - LITIGATION FOR DEVELOPMENT? DUTY OF CARE?

Respondent: 3265 / 1 Name: Mrs Kristine Mountford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I have been researching in order to help me to understand the consultation process that is referred to concerning the above proposed development. In spite of attending Parish Council, Cabinet and Public meetings I have not yet experienced consultation as I understand it to be, as explained for example, on the Wikipedia website:

Public consultation, or simply consultation, is a regulatory process by which the public's input on matters affecting them is sought. Its main goals are in improving the efficiency, transparency and public involvement in large-scale projects or Jaws and policies. It usually involves notification (to publicise the matter to be consulted on), consultation (a two-way flow of information and opinion exchange) as well as participation (involving interest groups in the drafting of policy or legislation). A frequently used tool for understanding different levels of community participation in consultation is known as Arnstein's ladder.

Why have there been no Cabinet representation at the Scrutiny Panel meeting (planning consultant and a junior planning officer only), Parish Council and Public meetings to encourage two-way flow of information and opinions?

The Arnstein's ladder link then takes me to Participation (decision making)

Participation in social science refers to different mechanisms for the public to express opinions - and ideally exert

influence - regarding political, economic, management or other social decisions.

Why, when public opinions have been expressed via letter and or email, have there been very little or no response? How are members of the public able to exert influence on social decisions?

For well-informed participation to occur, it is argued that some version of transparency, e.g. radical transparency, is necessary, but not sufficient. It has also been argued that those most affected by a decision should have the most say while those that are least affected should have the least say in a topic [citation needed] .

As none of the questions in my previous letter have been answered how can I be wellinformed?

Can you please advise me when a rigorous two-way consultation will take place?

Representation of BaNES by consultants or juniors is not acceptable, when will we the public including Gypsy and Travellers be able to have a 'two-way flow of information and opinion exchange 'with yourself and others responsible for this project?

I wish to make it absolutely clear that I am NOT Xenophobic and am very concerned for the welfare of everyone and that is why we should be given the opportunity to help and feel involved in finding the solution to this.

Respondent: 3265 / 1 Name: Mrs Kristine Mountford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

As I have not received a reply to my correspondence dated 17th May I assume that it has not reached you and so this is being delivered to your office by hand, to ensure that it arrives safely.

Although a member of Stanton Drew Parish Council I am writing in a personal capacity.

Regarding the above proposal, I have a number of questions relating to the site. I would appreciate a response on each of these questions.

In my experience a costing exercise is carried out to test the feasibility of a project before commencement. At what stage will this be done regarding the Gypsy/Traveller site selection?

From initial research and information supplied, the Stanton Wick site requires ground contamination remediation, asbestos removal, a new water supply, a sewage system and additional power in addition to any other 'regular' site preparation work. What would be the cost of additional surveys and reports from, for example, Environmental Impact Assessments?

If, as Councillor Tim Ball stated during our meeting on 2nd May at Stanton Drew Village Hall, the owner of the site is liable for remedial work, preparation and maintenance of the site, is the owner aware of the total cost of this, when will his ability to do so be assessed/checked, and how will completion be guaranteed? Should private funding become a problem during the process, what happens then and would this leave Council Tax payer liable to fund the completion of a half finished job?

The road structure, as stated in planning refusal (for this and the adjacent Filer's Coaches site) many times by BaNES, is unsuitable for increase in heavy traffic- who would be responsible for road improvements and widening or alternative access with the relevant compensation costs to land owners along the route and the resulting increased maintenance? Have land owners been approached?

Present road maintenance is very poor with even the requested provision of a grit box refused. The required increase in other services, refuse collection, schools, policing and medical care will also need funding are funds available for this?

The lane is narrow and water supply is limited: have BaNES had any consultation with the emergency services?

Have enough funds been made available for the whole cost of this project - both start up and ongoing?

The Dale Farm site started as a small authorised site but then grew into a huge site costing millions of pounds to sort out, what is BaNES action and contingency plan for this?

Does the Council believe that the cost will be met by the rent/rates/taxes of the qualifying Gypsy/Travellers occupying sites?

If the above has been considered, when will the figures be available for us to scrutinise?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3265 / 1 Name: Mrs Kristine Mountford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Although a member of Stanton Drew Parish Council I am writing in a personal capacity.

Regarding the above proposal, I have a number of questions relating to the site. I would appreciate a response on each of these questions.

In my experience a costing exercise is carried out to test the feasibility of a project before commencement. At what stage will this be done regarding the Gypsy/Traveller site selection?

From initial research and information supplied, the Stanton Wick site requires ground contamination remediation, asbestos removal, a new water supply, a sewage system and additional power in addition to any other 'regular' site preparation work. What would be the cost of additional surveys and reports from, for example, Environmental Impact Assessments?

If, as Councillor Tim Ball stated during our meeting on 2nd May at Stanton Drew Village Hall, the owner of the site is liable for remedial work, preparation and maintenance of the site, is the owner aware of the total cost of this, when will his ability to do so be assessed/checked, and how will completion be guaranteed? Should private funding become a problem during the process, what happens then and would this leave Council Tax payer liable to fund the completion of a half-finished job?

The road structure, as stated in planning refusal (for this and the adjacent Filer's Coaches site) many times by BaNES, is unsuitable for increase in heavy traffic - who would be responsible for road improvements and widening or alternative access with the relevant compensation costs to land owners along the route and the resulting increased maintenance? Have land owners been approached?

Present road maintenance is very poor with even the requested provision of a grit box refused. The required increase in other services, refuse collection, schools, policing and medical care will also need funding are funds available for this?

The lane is narrow and water supply is limited: have BaNES had any consultation with the emergency services?

Have enough funds been made available for the whole cost of this project - both start up and ongoing?

The Dale Farm site started as a small authorised site but then grew into a huge site costing millions of pounds to sort out, what is BaNES action and contingency plan for this?

Does the Council believe that the cost will be met by the rent/rates/taxes of the qualifying Gypsy/Travellers occupying

sites?

If the above has been considered, when will the figures be available for us to scrutinise?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3265 / 2 Name: Mrs Kristine Mountford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I have a number of questions relating to the site. I would appreciate a response on each of these questions.

In my experience a costing exercise is carried out to test the feasibility of a project before commencement. At what stage will this be done regarding the Gypsy/Traveller site selection? From initial research and information supplied, the Stanton Wick site requires ground contamination remediation, asbestos removal, a new water supply, a sewage system and additional power in addition to any other 'regular' site preparation work. What would be the cost of additional surveys and reports from, for example, Environmental Impact Assessments?

If, as Councillor Tim Ball stated during our meeting on 2nd May at Stanton Drew Village Hall, the owner of the site is liable for remedial work, preparation and maintenance of the site, is the owner aware of the total cost of this, when will his ability to do so be assessed/checked, and how will completion be guaranteed? Should private funding become a problem during the process, what happens then and would this leave Council Tax payer liable to fund the completion of a half finished job?

The road structure, as stated in planning refusal (for this and the adjacent Filer's Coaches site) many times by BaNES, is unsuitable for increase in heavy traffic- who would be responsible for road improvements and widening or alternative access with the relevant compensation costs to land owners along the route and the resulting increased maintenance? Have land owners been approached?

Present road maintenance is very poor with even the requested provision of a grit box refused. The required increase in other services, refuse collection, schools, policing and medical care will also need funding are funds available for this?

The lane is narrow and water supply is limited: have BaNES had any consultation with the emergency services? Have enough funds been made available for the whole cost of this project - both start up and ongoing? The Dale Farm site started as a small authorised site but then grew into a huge site costing millions of pounds to sort out, what is BaNES action and contingency plan for this? Does the Council believe that the cost will be met by the rent/rates/taxes of the qualifying Gypsy/Travellers occupying sites? If the above has been considered, when will the figures be available for us to scrutinise?

Respondent: 3265 / 2 Name: Mrs Kristine Mountford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

These are once again my personal thoughts and comments.

I have been researching in order to help me to understand the consultation process that is referred to concerning the above proposed development.

In spite of attending Parish Council, Cabinet and Public meetings I have not yet experienced consultation as I understand it to be, as explained for example, on the Wikipedia website:

Public consultation, or simply consultation, is a regulatory process by which the public's input on matters affecting them is sought. Its main goals are in improving the efficiency, transparency and public involvement in large-scale projects or laws and policies. It usually involves notification (to publicise the matter to be consulted on), consultation (a two-way flow of information and opinion exchange) as well as participation (involving interest groups in the drafting of policy or legislation). A frequently used tool for understanding different levels of community participation in consultation is known as Arnstein's ladder.

Why have there been no Cabinet representation at the Scrutiny Panel meeting (planning consultant and a junior planning officer only), Parish Council and Public meetings to encourage two-way flow of information and opinions?

The Arnstein's ladder link then takes me to Participation (decision making) Participation in social science refers to different mechanisms for the public to express opinions - and ideally exert influence - regarding political, economic, management or other social decisions.

Why, when public opinions have been expressed via letter and or email, have there been very little or no response?

How are members of the public able to exert influence on social decisions?

For well-informed participation to occur, it is argued that some version of transparency, e.g. radical transparency, is necessary, but not sufficient. It has also been argued that those most affected by a decision should have the most say while those that are least affected should have the least say in a topic citation needed•

As none of the questions in my previous letter have been answered how can I be well informed? Can you please advise me when a rigorous two-way consultation will take place?

Representation of BaNES by consultants or juniors is not acceptable, when will we the public including Gypsy and Travellers be able to have a 'two-way flow of information and opinion exchange' with yourself and others responsible for this project?

I wish to make it absolutely clear that I am NOT Xenophobic and am very concerned for the welfare of everyone and that is why we should be given the opportunity to help and feel involved in finding the solution to this.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3269 / 1 Name: Simon Parker Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Stanton Wick site is situated in the Greenbelt and under new government guidelines, Gypsy and Traveller sites within the Greenbelt are considered inappropriate development, and because of this, planning permission would not be available. The number of travellers living on the proposed number of pitches would dwarf the neighbouring community of Stanton Wick.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

There are other constraints on the site, these being there is no public transport within safe walking distance, the nearest doctors surgery is around 5 miles away, the only local shop is a post office in Pensford which does not stock sufficient provisions for food shopping requirement, and the site has mineshafts underneath it which could possibly subside making it unsafe.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

It should not be taken forward as the Old Colliery is a site of nature conservation interest and provides a habitat for many important species including the horse shoe bat, which is a European protected species. Also, the site is situated in the Greenbelt and is deemed inappropriate development according to national guidelines.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Gypsy and Traveller accommodation assessment states that gypsies and travellers prefer to live in small communities of up to 5 pitches, and accordingly the Old Colliery site of 20 proposed pitches is too large for a gypsy and traveller site.

Respondent: 3271 / 1 Name: Mrs E Pryce Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I wish to register my opposition to the plan for a traveller's site at Stanton Wick. This is green belt land and the old colliery may well be contaminated from its previous use. Stanton Wick is a tiny community which would become completely overwhelmed by a large traveller plot.

We are a quiet village community and we wish to keep it that way.

Respondent: 3272 / 1 Name: Mrs Brenda Stone Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

This is a requirement for BANES to provide a site for the above mentioned communities. There are MOD sites already or about to become vacant. I understand that mixed housing is planned for these. What better opportunity could you want for a blank canvas to incorporate this need.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No
 It is on green belt land
 It has contaminated land
 Its access is difficult already for the present use, from the Bishop Sutton Road Lane down to the only shop/post office is impossible for car/trailer/caravan. With only 300 locals, it would swamp the ratio. I feel the local children would suffer, with an infection of children who through no fault of their own get limited schooling.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?
 No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?
 The Pensford site is SO unsuitable, I cannot imagine how you ever considered it in the beginning. Yes they do have to have provision but please lets have things decided fairly.

Respondent: 3272 / 1 Name: Mrs Brenda Stone Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?
 Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?
 I am writing to you to express my disbelief that you are even considering a Gypsy Site at Stanton Wick. If this came to fruition it would be another example of planning rules made for disregarding for some, and not others. This is in a greenbelt area, how can you justify it, or is it a special case for gypsies? Perhaps it falls under the same rules that you allow parking on the A37 in front of a cottage on Pensford Hill, when there is no planning allowed?
 Secondly the road access to this site was not viable for extra coaches for the business that brings jobs to the area, but apparently fine for 4 x 4 's and caravans in tow. Road access dare I suggest is much more viable on the outskirts of Bath, and would not be in the greenbelt.
 Thirdly the local schools will be overwhelmed with the ensuing children, and what effect will it have on the children of the village. Travelling children tend to need special attention because they have so little settled education - how much extra funding do BANES propose to pump into the teaching staff?

Respondent: 3273 / 1 Name: Ms Christine Abel Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?
 I was horrified to learn from my brother of the proposal to make the land adjacent to his property a site for 20 traveller families. Having spent a few days with him at the beginning of the year we were impressed with the views from his house over the beautiful North Somerset countryside and the peace and quiet of living in a lovely rural area. In addition, the fact that his house is on 3 storeys with the living accommodation on the top floor, means he will have no possibility of screening the view if this proposal is passed.

Since the proposed area is in Green Belt the development of a site here would be totally inappropriate. Green Belt must be protected at all times to prevent encroachment of town on our rural areas and I had thought that this was the Government's aim.

There are also other issues here:

- Wick Lane is predominantly a single carriageway. We found it dangerous and had to be constantly vigilant when walking down to Pensford village. The road certainly could not cope with increased two-way traffic. 20 caravans with heavy vehicles to tow them and the many other cars and vans that would accompany the families would generate a huge amount of traffic on a surface not built for this volume or weight of traffic.

- I understand that new Government guidelines (from the Conservative/Liberal Democrat coalition) suggest strongly that the balance of the community must be maintained. 20 caravans: how many people do you calculate to be resident in each of these vans - 4, 5, 6 or more? If we say 4 people per van that makes 80 extra people living in the vicinity. I understand that Stanton Wick has a population of about 60 residents so that more than doubles the population.

- How does this fit with the services in the area? Can the local area cope with the increased need for education, health and social services? And what about drainage, sewage and water?

I thought I had understood that the purpose of the Localism Bill was to enable local people to make decisions about local issues that affected their local community. I do not see how the imposition of a plan such as that proposed, which upsets the balance of that community and clearly goes against Green Belt policy, can be just.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3274 / 1 Name: Ms Clare Traub Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

With respect to the above issue, I am writing to protest to this proposed site based upon a number of legal, environmental, procedural and social issues. These are summarised below as follows:

Legal

1. It is understood that BANES have claimed to undertake a pre-consultation exercise. No residents within Pensford or the local Parish Council have any records of this and as such this is in breach of national and local guidelines and standards. The process that has been undertaken so far seems to be, at least, underhand and at worse, does not conform to the proper legal process. Can you please advise as to the process that has been undertaken and provide evidence that pre-consultation has been undertaken in accordance with standards and guidelines.

2. The current site only had previous planning permission for one house. How has the planning permission been expanded to a size way beyond that previously? I also understand that the coach company in the vicinity was only granted limited extra space due to safety constraints associated with the local highway. The current BANES commitment of 15 permanent and 5 transit pitches would cause traffic far in excess of that already allowed, posing a significant increase in road traffic and a number of health and safety risks. Can you please advise as to whether the Highways Agency was consulted and whether they have approved the scheme?

3. I understand that BANES must consult neighbouring authorities. Given that the proposed site is very close to Bristol, can

you please provide evidence that they have been consulted and that they agree with the proposal?

Environmental

4. The proposed site is on top of unstable ground and dis-used mineshafts. Previous environmental assessments have found evidence of arsenic contamination. BANES have a duty of care to anyone residing on this location. Has BANES conducted a robust environmental assessment to prove that risks are As Low as Reasonably Practicable? You should be aware that if an incident were to occur on the site that BANES and individuals involved with the decisions to use the site could be prosecuted under Corporate Manslaughter legislation. This can lead to fines of up to 10% of turnover and jail for those involved with the decision, (should an inadequate assessment be made or if evidence is overruled/ignored).

5. The proposed site is elevated above most of the surrounding populated area and the watercourse. The presence of such a site poses a risk of watercourse contamination impacting upon the health of the current local population, flora and fauna in the surrounding area. Can BANES provide details of how these risks have been assessed and how the site was deemed to be suitable?

Procedural

6. The whole process shows no evidence of pre-consultation with the local population. I am formally requesting that BANES provide detailed evidence of the pre-consultation that has taken place to date.

Social Issues

7. The site would dwarf the local community. This is clearly in breach of planning guidelines

The process undertaken to date has been clandestine and takes no consideration of the impact upon the local population and environment. The whole approach seems to be deceitful and based upon meeting government targets (and hence funding) rather than addressing the needs of BANES existing residents, which BANES Councillors are supposed to be committed to serve.

I am formally protesting that the process and the decision to select Stanton Wick as one of the proposed sites. For the reasons outlined above the site is wholly unsuitable and the process seems to have not followed protocol. As a resident, I am fully supportive of the Stanton Wick Action Group and will support them wholeheartedly.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3275 / 1 Name: Paul Traub Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

With respect to the above issue, I am writing to protest to this proposed site based upon a number of legal, environmental, procedural and social issues. These are summarised below as follows:

Legal

1. It is understood that BANES have claimed to undertake a pre-consultation exercise. No residents within Pensford or the local Parish Council have any records of this and as such this is in breach of national and local guidelines and standards. The process that has been undertaken so far seems to be, at least, underhand and at worse, does not conform to the proper legal process. Can you please advise as to the process that has been undertaken and provide evidence that pre-

consultation has been undertaken in accordance with standards and guidelines.

2. The current site only had previous planning permission for one house. How has the planning permission been expanded to a size way beyond that previously? I also understand that the coach company in the vicinity was only granted limited extra space due to safety constraints associated with the local highway. The current BANES commitment of 15 permanent and 5 transit pitches would cause traffic far in excess of that already allowed, posing a significant increase in road traffic and a number of health and safety risks. Can you please advise as to whether the Highways Agency was consulted and whether they have approved the scheme?

3. I understand that BANES must consult neighbouring authorities. Given that the proposed site is very close to Bristol, can you please provide evidence that they have been consulted and that they agree with the proposal?

Environmental

4. The proposed site is on top of unstable ground and dis-used mineshafts. Previous environmental assessments have found evidence of arsenic contamination. BANES have a duty of care to anyone residing on this location. Has BANES conducted a robust environmental assessment to prove that risks are As Low as Reasonably Practicable? You should be aware that if an incident were to occur on the site that BANES and individuals involved with the decisions to use the site could be prosecuted under Corporate Manslaughter legislation. This can lead to fines of up to 1 0% of turnover and jail for those involved with the decision, (should an inadequate assessment be made or if evidence is overruled/ignored).

5. The proposed site is elevated above most of the surrounding populated area and the watercourse. The presence of such a site poses a risk of watercourse contamination impacting upon the health of the current local population, flora and fauna in the surrounding area. Can BANES provide details of how these risks have been assessed and how the site was deemed to be suitable?

Procedural

6. The whole process shows no evidence of pre-consultation with the local population. I am formally requesting that BANES provide detailed evidence of the pre-consultation that has taken place to date.

Social Issues

7. The site would dwarf the local community. This is clearly in breach of planning guidelines

The process undertaken to date has been clandestine and takes no consideration of the impact upon the local population and environment. The whole approach seems to be deceitful and based upon meeting government targets (and hence funding) rather than addressing the needs of BANES existing residents, which BANES Councillors are supposed to be committed to serve.

I am formally protesting that the process and the decision to select Stanton Wick as one of the proposed sites. For the reasons outlined above the site is wholly unsuitable and the process seems to have not followed protocol. As a resident, I am fully supportive of the Stanton Wick Action Group and will support them wholeheartedly.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3275 / 1 Name: Paul Traub Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am writing to protest to this proposed site based upon a number of legal, environmental, procedural and social issues.

Legal

1. It is understood that BANES have claimed to undertake a pre-consultation exercise. No residents within Pensford or the local Parish Council have any records of this and as such this is in breach of national and local guidelines and standards. The process that has been undertaken so far seems to be, at least, underhand and at worse, does not conform to the proper legal process. Can you please advise as to the process that has been undertaken and provide evidence that pre-consultation has been undertaken in accordance with standards and guidelines.

2. The current site only had previous planning permission for one house. How has the planning permission been expanded to a size way beyond that previously? I also understand that the coach company in the vicinity was only granted limited extra space due to safety constraints associated with the local highway. The current BANES commitment of 15 permanent and 5 transit pitches would cause traffic far in excess of that already allowed, posing a significant increase in road traffic and a number of health and safety risks. Can you please advise as to whether the Highways Agency was consulted and whether they have approved the scheme?

3. I understand that BANES must consult neighbouring authorities. Given that the proposed site is very close to Bristol, can you please provide evidence that they have been consulted and that they agree with the proposal?

Environmental

4. The proposed site is on top of unstable ground and dis-used mineshafts. Previous environmental assessments have found evidence of arsenic contamination. BANES have a duty of care to anyone residing on this location. Has BANES conducted a robust environmental assessment to prove that risks are As Low as Reasonably Practicable? You should be aware that if an incident were to occur on the site that BANES and individuals involved with the decisions to use the site could be prosecuted under Corporate Manslaughter legislation. This can lead to fines of up to 10% of turnover and jail for those involved with the decision, (should an inadequate assessment be made or if evidence is overruled/ignored).

5. The proposed site is elevated above most of the surrounding populated area and the watercourse. The presence of such a site poses a risk of watercourse contamination impacting upon the health of the current local population, flora and fauna in the surrounding area. Can BANES provide details of how these risks have been assessed and how the site was deemed to be suitable?

Procedural

6. The whole process shows no evidence of pre-consultation with the local population. I am formally requesting that BANES provide detailed evidence of the pre-consultation that has taken place to date.

Social Issues

7. The site would dwarf the local community. This is clearly in breach of planning guidelines.

8. A proposed it was previously refused in Crewe on the basis that there was insufficient access for emergency vehicles (in the event of a fire). The size of the proposed site and poor access at Stanton Wick would equally apply. As such I believe that a precedent has been set and that BANES should not ignore such a key health and safety issue.

The process undertaken to date has been clandestine and takes no consideration of the impact upon the local population and environment. The whole approach seems to be deceitful and based upon meeting government targets (and hence funding) rather than addressing the needs of BANES existing residents, which BANES Councillors are supposed to be committee to serve.

I am formally protesting that the process and the decision to select Stanton Wick as one of the proposed sites. For the reasons outlined above the site is wholly unsuitable and the process seems to have not followed protocol. As a resident and owner of a local business I am fully supportive of the Stanton Wick Action Group and will support them wholeheartedly.

Respondent: 3299 / 1 Name: Mr M Abolkheir Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The very idea of jamming in an entire community along with the required development into a small, rural and "green belt" setting that already suffers from access and traffic difficulties and limited infrastructure is an erroneous idea, which should have been taken off any list of proposed sites at a much earlier stage.

The level of objection and outrage of the local residents in the directly affected villages: Stanton Wick, Pensford and Stanton Drew are so strong that it would be a genuine puzzle if the "democratically elected" councillors might think they could simply push aside the local way of life and carry on spending more public money on researching an idea that was clearly ill-conceived from the outset.

I urge the councillors to listen to the wise voice that has come from local residents and take this site off the list at the earliest possible opportunity; and to focus their time, efforts and indeed public resources on investigating sites which stand a serious chance of meeting the aspirations of an incoming community without ruining existing ones.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3301 / 1 Name: Mr Mathew Swanson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The site at Stanton Wick makes a far better use of the available land. It is also less close to residential properties and main roads.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Yes for Stanton Wick.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3302 / 1 Name: Ms Becky Pullinger Organisation: Avon Wildlife Trust

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Wildlife Trust has for a number of years now been concerned over threats to the Pensford Colliery Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI). Initially, we were involved when the owners started to bull-doze the areas of wildlife importance prior to putting in a planning application, then we were heavily involved in objecting to the application and the modified application to remove the colliery waste. More recently, we have heard rumours of a revised application being submitted and now I understand that the owners are questioning its designation as an SNCI in the Wansdyke Local Plan.

The land is of high wildlife value (see attached comments made on the original and modified planning applications) and is much loved by local people (this was evident from the local objections to the application). The current owners appear not to have the interests of wildlife or the local community at heart and it seems that, without action, the threat will always remain.

The Wildlife Trust would therefore like to suggest the idea of designating the site a Local Nature Reserve, perhaps through compulsory purchase. We would be very interested in your initial reactions to this idea and feel that we could support the case as required.

Respondent: 3303 / 1 Name: Mr Bruce Toase Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT THE STANTON WICK SITE IS SUITABLE

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

IN PART.

THE LACK OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS TO HAVE GREATER EMPHASIS. THE ACCESS IS DANGEROUS, EVEN NOW. THERE ARE NO ADEQUATE FACILITIES AT ALL.

SHOULD THIS LAND BE DEVELOPED, THE LOCAL POPULATION WILL BE OUTNUMBERED BY SEVERAL FACTORS.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO.

IT WOULD BE WRONG TO DEVELOP THIS AREA OF GREEN BELT LAND FOR ANY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT. THE FACT THAT THIS IS GREENBELT LAND HAS (RIGHTLY) BEEN A REASON FOR MUCH SMALLER DEVELOPMENTS IN THE SAME AREA BEING REFUSED.

THERE IS NO ADEQUATE ACCESS, PUBLIC TRANSPORT, WALKING ROUTES, HEALTH SERVICES NOR OTHER AMENITIES.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

National policy guidance states that Traveller sites (temporary or

permanent) are inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that the development of Traveller sites should not be approved "except in very special circumstances".

4.3 Very special circumstances are not defined in national policy. However, paragraph 88 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that "very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

WE SEE ONLY NEGATIVE FACTORS FOR THIS SITE, AND CERTAINLY CAN SEE NO POSITIVE FACTORS THAT COULD POSSIBLY OUTWEIGH THE INNAPPROPRIATENESS OF DEVELOPING WITHIN GREENBELT (SEE POINTS 4.2, 4.3 ABOVE AND IN YOUR CONSULTATION DOCUMENT)

Respondent: 3304 / 1 Name: Mr James Cogan Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Evidence and information is readily available as the government guidelines relating to this issue are published on the BANES website. I would hope that the Officials in charge of this process have read these guidelines and have visited the proposed sites.

In the relation to the Stanton Wick site:

- The site is evidently located on Green belt.
- The site is contaminated land.
- The site is accessed via a narrow country lane.
- The site will dominate the nearest settlement.
- The site is far away from schools, doctors or shops.

A visit to the Stanton Wick site would allow the visitor to quickly realise that access to local amenities from this site is almost impossible by foot. I am surprised that BANES can show such disregard for the education and health of the traveller community by proposing that they not be allowed easy access to needed amenities.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I do not agree. In the 'Preferred Options' document the Council hasn't explained any 'opportunities' represented by this site, but rather have just stated that they can't find anywhere else. This leads on to the process of finding sites. The first my neighbours and I heard of the council looking for sites was after they had already chosen them.

In regard to the constraints of the site, the council have neglected to explain all the constraints of this site. There is no mention that this site fails most, if and not all, national guidelines for the allocation of traveller sites. It would appear that the council has not looked at the issue of the land being contaminated, the fact that the site is far away from any local amenities and cannot be accessed by foot, nor the fact that the nearest settlement would be dwarfed if this site allocation were to go ahead. The only issue mentioned is that the site is accessed by a narrow road. The document fails to explain why this is a problem.

It would seem that the Leadership of the Council care little for the communities they are meant to serve. There is also a complete lack of consideration for the wellbeing of the traveller community who may be unfortunate enough to be given

no choice but to inhabit somewhere so unsuitable.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, the pitch provision is on a site which is wholly unsuitable and it would be a disgrace for the leadership of BANES Council to show such disregard for the wellbeing of the traveller community by suggesting that they live on this site.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The process by which these sites have been shortlisted is a shambles; therefore the 'preferred options paper' is nothing but a continuation of this shambolic process. It fails to explain all the issues related to each of the proposed sites, I can only come to the conclusion that this is a deliberate attempt to deflect attention away from any of the very serious constraints relating to each site.

I understand that the Stanton Wick site was originally 17th in a list of at least 20 possible sites. In other words it was originally deemed to be extremely unsuitable. The Leadership of BANES have disregarded this and failed to explain why they have done so.

Respondent: 3309 / 1 Name: Mr Nick Scholefield Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

This site should not be taken forward as a formal allocation, as it is inappropriate and undeliverable on the following grounds:

- The site lies within the greenbelt, and its development as a permanent & transit Traveller's Site cannot be justified by the assumption of 'very special circumstances'.
Furthermore, such inappropriate development of this site would set an unwelcome precedent for other greenbelt protected regions within BNES.
- Areas within the proposed site are unsuitable for development as they suffer arsenic contamination and would be excessively costly to decontaminate and made safe.
- Access to the site is very restricted by narrow rural lanes and thus potentially hazardous for movement of HGV's and large caravans.
- The development being considered would inevitably have a significant and unacceptable social impact on relatively small neighbouring rural settlements.
- There are minimal shops or services local to this site.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3313 / 1 Name: Mr Bill Whitmarsh Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes,

The Stanton Wick Site is in the Green Belt and the proposed site would constitute "inappropriate development in the

Green Belt”.

- A large development such the proposed Old Colliery development would overwhelm the existing settled community (up to a factor of 3 to 1)

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Stanton Wick Site is in the Green Belt and the proposed site would constitute “inappropriate development in the Green Belt”.

- A large development such the proposed Old Colliery development would overwhelm the existing settled community (up to a factor of 3 to 1)
- The overall Old Colliery site is much larger than the area earmarked as a G&T site. Can BaNES reassure residents that uncontrolled expansion will not take place?
- There is a long history of planning application refusals, both at the Old Colliery and the adjacent site (Filer’s Coaches): the only permission that has been granted in recent years is for a single dwelling. Inappropriate development in the Green Belt has been cited as reason for refusal.
- Wick Lane, Stanton Wick Lane and the junctions, cannot support any real increase in traffic volume without substantial road widening and junction alteration: BaNES have cited traffic volume in previous refusals.
- There is no safe walking route along the roads either to Pensford or Stanton Drew schools. The public footpath from the side of the Winding House to the A37 is not safe, even in summer.
- There is no public transport within safe walking distance.
- The only local shop in Pensford is very small, does not stock sufficient for a food shopping requirement and there is no safe walking route.
- The nearest Doctor’s surgery is around 5 miles away and there is no public transport.
- The water supply to Stanton Wick is notoriously unreliable and is at capacity for the infrastructure. There is no mains sewerage in Stanton Wick and a development of the proposed size cannot be supported by septic tanks.
- The land at the Old Colliery Site is contaminated and remediation would uneconomic without a significant contribution from the Council and would involve an intolerable number of heavy vehicle movements along Wick Lane.
- The site is dangerous, has several old mineshafts within it, and these could be liable to subsidence at any time.
- There is limited employment in the area.
- The Old Colliery is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and provides a habitat for many important species.
- The site is very close to the Pensford Conservation Area.
- The site has historic significance
- The site is immediately adjacent to, and overlooked by, one residence and is very close to another

(Note that I am the owner of 1 Malthouse Barn, Chelwood, though I am not currently resident.

Respondent: 3323 / 1 Name: Ms Grace Bishop Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

NO

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

As the oldest resident in this little hamlet (90th year) I have felt very worried at such a huge amount of people possible moving in and feel very vulnerable with regards to my safety on the narrow lane with no lighting and extra traffic

Respondent: 3330 / 1 Name: Mr M Pewney Organisation: Stawton Drew Action Group

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

NO

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

NO

Respondent: 3363 / 1 Name: Mrs Roberta Williams Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

28th April 2012

Dear Mr Ball

RE: PROPOSED GYPSIE & TRAVELLERS SITE STANTON WICK

I am writing to express serious concerns regarding the proposed site in Stanton Wick. As you know the site, although large, is surrounded by many circumstances that render the area totally unsuitable for such proposals.

The area must be considered unsafe because of previous mining. Mine shafts are unstable and could at any time collapse and engulf anything upon it. In the event of such an event happening I wonder if Banes has considered the legal position it would find itself in - if God forbid there was a tragic accident.

There are issues of road access. The lane is unsuitable for additional usage. There are no pavements and a winding single track road is the only provision to the nearest shops. Indeed there would be a 3 mile round journey to obtain even basics such as bread or milk. As you know the coach company Filers were denied planning for two or three extra coaches to expand their business because of inadequate width of the lane.

There would be a public transport issue for occupants of such a site and transportation to schools would become a major problem - if indeed school capacity locally was available.

There is no water supply, drainage capacity or sewerage provision in the area. The entire concept is flawed and indeed the cause for most serious concerns. I am certain there would be tests made on soil and subsoil in the area, but the levels of arsenic on that site must represent a serious health hazard to anyone living upon the site.

Please reconsider this misplaced notion that this site is suitable for human habitation, and not incur the costs which would be inevitable. At a time when cutbacks are deep and much felt, this has to be a mistake and should be avoided at all costs. I remain hopeful that at your cabinet meeting on May 9th 2012 all considerations of this site will be dismissed as inappropriate.

Yours sincerely ..

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3363 / 1 Name: Mrs Roberta Williams Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes. Stanton Wick

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing to express serious concerns regarding the proposed site in Stanton Wick. Some of the issues are as follows:-

- 1) Site a previous coal mine with unstable mine shafts that could fall in engulfing anyone upon it
- 2) Contamination of said land would be unhealthy, and certainly the toxic waste would cause great concerns if played on by children living there. Anything grown there would also cause a health hazard.
- 3) The winding lane is predominantly single track with few passing places and not suitable. There is no pavement and would involve a three mile round journey to use a local shop.
- 4) There is no water supply. There is no electricity or drainage. Sewerage would also need to be by septic tank and could be a potential hazard to brooks and streams if leakage happened.
- 5) School capacity could well be a major problem and transportation of children would only add to congestion in the above mentioned narrow lanes.
- 6) There is no public transport in that area and the distance to health care services would again cause congestion due to the almost certain increases in private transport.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

There are many other issues which are being voiced as objection, but those I have mentioned seem in themselves to be enough to cause the Council to seek a more suitable site. I urge you to reject the proposal at the Cabinet meeting on May 9th 2012.

Respondent: 3364 / 1 Name: Ms Denise M. Harris Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Dear Councillor Ball,

Although I have lived in Hampshire for a considerable number of years, Somerset is where I was born, brought up and educated until I was eighteen. I continue to visit the county regularly, meeting with family and enjoying this area of outstanding beauty.

It is with considerable shock that I hear from my brother, who lives in the village of Stanton Wick, that there is a proposal to allow the development of a Travellers' Site in an area which is classified as Green Belt.

It is my understanding that this is totally against National Policy.

From a layman's point of view, it would appear that local issues have not been thought through. In villages like Stanton Wick, the local infra-structure, which adequately supports the existing residents, is unlikely to cope with a sudden and large influx of people, as would happen with the establishment of a Travellers' Site. Likewise, introducing a new community with a different lifestyle and a separate infra-structure, in the hope of encouraging integration, is unlikely to succeed. Surely, Councillors could not allow a thriving village to be subsumed by an overwhelming number of new families, thus changing the balance of an existing community.

I urge Bath and North East Somerset Councillors to consider, carefully, the welfare of both the residents of Stanton Wick and the Travellers who are seeking a suitable and appropriate site, when making such a momentous and irreversible decision about their future.

I am sending a copy of this letter to my local M.P. Mike Hancock, also a Liberal Democrat, asking him why, in your area, Liberal Democrats are considering flying in the face of National Guidelines, despite the fact that they clearly state that Traveller Sites (permanent or temporary) in the Green Belt are inappropriate.

I look forward to your response.

Yours sincerely ..

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3368 / 1 Name: Mr Clarke Osborne Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes:

In respect of the Old Colliery Stanton Wick;

- By your submission and comment – the site 'large', with the capacity of 50 pitches. Based on GTAA statistics this equates to nearly 200 mobile homes/caravans and c600 people. If your repost to this is that this number of pitches is not proposed (as 15 permanent and 5 transit pitches) There is no proposal or statement as to how the site can be managed so as to control the number of pitches occupied.

- In respect of the criteria of size, and the issues Identified. The SA states: - This site (Stanton Wick) performs well against a number of the SA objectives, including protecting and enhancing the districts environment. The allocation of this site would assist in the achievement of this objective partly due to the scope to provide a largescale site on previously developed land with little landscape impact. The allocation ofthis large scale site would also reduce the need to allocate and develop land elsewhere in the district to meet the identified need'

- There is no planning policy to support a strategy of a large site to protect the remaining district environment. This is not a greenbelt purpose. The statements are not adequately researched and are misleading.

- The site is in greenbelt and only a small section where the disused buildings are located can be categorised previously developed land (referred to as Brownfield), and not necessarily the whole curtilage. The Council have failed to provide sufficient information regarding the matter of designation and the clear provisions within the planning act to ensure the protection of the Greenbelt.

- The Council have failed to consider and to explain how this proposal can possibly meet the requirement to maintain cohesion and not overwhelm the next nearest settlement. Clearly and obviously it the proposed development of this site cannot meet either.

- The Council has failed to adequately consider how the site could be delivered as there are significant constraints due to highways layout and capacity, land contamination, safety; utilities and sewage management.

- The Council has failed to adequately consider the threat to SNCI and European Protected Species.

- The Council has failed to recognise that there is insufficient capacity at Stanton Drew and Pensford Schools. Any ability to take the theoretical number is constrained by physical playground sizes. Both schools are landlocked and are operating at near safety capacity.

- The Council has failed to calculate with any reasonable accuracy the expected number

of Children that, based on the proposed development, will be eligible for schooling.

- The Council has failed to consider the requirement of drainage. There are no mains connected or collective sewage system in Stanton Wick. The constraints within the site and surrounding area make the use of non mains connected systems unsuitable and the connection to mains drainage is not possible within any reasonable financial cost consideration.
- The Council have failed to accurately examine and consider the routes and use of footpaths to provide safe walking to public transport and to a shopping facility. There is no safe and usable footpath or footway to and from the proposed development.
- The Council have failed to consider to any extent the required protection of the Heritage which surrounds this site.
- The Council have failed to adequately recognise and assess the SNCI and EPS issues.
- The Council have failed to calculate and recognise, even at a rudimentary level the huge increase in vehicle journeys that would occur as a result of this proposal.
- The Council has failed to accurately calculate and advise the public on the likely number of Living Vans, Touring Vans, Motor Vehicles, Business Facilities, On Site Support Facilities, Number of Adults residing and Number of Children Residing at this site and have chosen instead to refer to the proposal by number of pitches. Further when challenged the Council have quoted a make up of pitch elements which is much lower than the GTAA quoted averages. It has therefore not been possible for members of the public to fully consider the implications of many important parts of the proposal on which they are asked to comment.
- In making the proposal, the Council have failed to access information which is readily available to them in respect of Highways issues, Land Contamination, Size of the nearest settled community, Heritage issues, SNCI issues and most importantly the planning history of the site. This is, in my opinion, negligent.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. By further explanation;

Highways;

- David Horne , Highways DC, responded 20/3 to the internal consultation as follows

(from FOI response):-

"Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick – Outside general development boundary. Poor access to local facilities. Remote from public transport. Will result in increased reliance on the use of the private vehicles. Unsustainable. Poor nature of highways leading to and from the site (single track in parts and tight bends). Immediately adjacent to a coach depot, conflicting movements likely on narrow roads with only limited/poor opportunity for vehicles to pass. Highway recommendation would be one of refusal".

- Adrian Clarke, Transport Policy ,responded to the internal consultation as follows (from FOI response):-

"The only site that would be rejected at this stage on highway and sustainability grounds is the Old Collier Buildings, Stanton Wick".

- The Old Colliery DPD assessment has not included the internal consultation recommendations. It has at best been economic with the view offered by Highways Dept

- The DPD does not acknowledge the considerable concerns that Highways have in respect of coach movements up and down Stanton Wick Lane by Filers Coaches.

There is an extensive and difficult planning history in part centred around the inadequacy of the road capacity and size.

- Nearly every household in Stanton Wick has sustained vehicle damage at some point, (including me). It is an extremely dangerous single track road with a blind double splay to the main road.

- Richard Harwood (Barrister), commented that the denial of additional planning

permission for the subsequently evicted part of Dale Farm was due to highway constraints. He noted that Wick Lane presented a far worse restriction Utilities;

- The site is served by a 3" water main only. The supply is restricted and inadequate for current needs. The mains water supply is over a mile away and is laid along the road network.
- There are no sewers at the Site or in Stanton Wick and the locality. The concentration of septic tanks for the size of development proposed would not be possible and have an environmental impact on Salters Brook.
- The Sanctus report dated 21/5/10 (available on the Council web-site in respect of a previous planning application) says - 'due to the nature of the ground (colliery spoil) Sanctus recommends that a soak away be constructed away from any slopes and existing or proposed buildings due to potential stability issues'
- The scale of the proposal (equivalent to c60 households) would generate significantly more sewage processing demand than the extant planning permission of 1 home.
- The electricity supply via overhead cables is cannot provide capacity and would require major works.

Contaminated Land;

- The Council internal consultation has graded the Site as high risk .
- The contamination report on B&NES own website investigates the small front area only and reveals high levels of arsenic and methane.
- Any Children will undoubtedly range across the whole site and there should be assessment and acknowledgement of this considerable risk within the SA.
- There have been events of spontaneous combustion in the past - this is not uncommon on old collieries with quantities of coal and slag remaining. This is dangerous and the risk is heightened if the gypsy way of life includes fires. There is understood to be at least 300.000 tonnes of waste on site which the owner had previously attempted to secure planning permission to remove to the Second Severn Bridge crossing. There is no mention of this readily available information on this significant hazard in the Council's published information.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

- The process of matrix assessment was flawed. The following adjustments should be made:-
- SNCI -5 (whole site designated for G&T in DPD. Mine and tip SNCI)
- Hazardous Place -5 (by virtue of contamination in mine and tip areas or from the mineshaft . In close proximity of steeply sloping and unstable sides)
- Noise for very close neighbours -5
- Adjustment to meet established distance criteria to local services (not B&NES adjusted criteria distance) -3
- Total reduction to score -18
- If the site were correctly scored, the result would be a score of -8, making it the lowest scoring site in the DPD assessment and therefore not appropriate for pitch allocation.
- Planning Policy for Travellers Site March 2012 requires the LPA to ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community. The people capacity of 15 pitches has not been clarified . Cllr Nathan Hartley has estimated there will be 80 children. It is reasonable therefore to assume 150-200 people. A development of this scale will dominate Stanton Wick by 3 :1 and therefore contravenes the policy directive.
- It is acknowledged that G&T prefer site of a maximum of 5 pitches. Old Colliery therefore fails to satisfy the preferences of the G&T travelling community.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Yes.
 Greenbelt (GB)/Previously Developed Land (PDL);
 - Old Colliery is situated in GB and is subject to NPPF GB policy p79-92 . The area is washed over greenbelt - there is no inset.
 - Travellers sites are residential in planning terms. Using GTAA average pitch sizes, the Old Colliery proposal is equivalent to 58 single storey homes, with 15 garages (utility buildings) and sundry paraphernalia plus a further 5 (unquantified volume) for transit travellers. It is appropriate to consider this proposal against the high number of planning refusals along Wick Lane , including the extant permission that has been heavily conditioned and an earlier refused permission to decouple the buildings to develop 2 residences.
 - Filers coaches has been subject to refusals and enforcement. The Inspector upholding the openness of greenbelt obligation on the enforcement appeal.
 - NPPF 79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Placing caravans/mobile homes at Old Colliery will not maintain openness .
 - NPPF 80. Green Belt serves five purposes; 1. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; 2. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; 3 to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; 4. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and 5 to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Placing caravans / mobile homes at Old Colliery will not safeguard Stanton Wick from encroachment . Old Colliery is not an urban location in the context of 'recycling of derelict land'

Respondent: 3419 / 1 Name: Ms Nicki Parker Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Stanton Wick site is situated in the Greenbelt and under new government guidelines, Gypsy and Traveller sites within the Greenbelt are considered inappropriate development, and because of this, planning permission would not be available. The number of travellers living on the proposed number of pitches would dwarf the neighbouring community of Stanton Wick.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

There are other constraints on the site, these being there is no public transport within safe walking distance, the nearest doctors surgery is around 5 miles away, the only local shop is a post office in Pensford which does not stock sufficient provisions for food shopping requirement, and the side has mineshafts underneath it which could possible subside making it unsafe.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

It should not be taken forward as the Old Colliery is a site of nature conservation interest and provides a habitat for many important species including the horse shoe bat, which is a European protected species. Also, the site is situated in the Greenbelt are deemed inappropriate development according to national guidelines.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Gypsy and Traveller accommodation assessment states that gypsies and travellers prefer to live in small communities of up to 5 pitches, and accordingly the Old Colliery site of 20 proposed pitches is too large for a gypsy and traveller site.

Respondent: 3421 / 1 Name: Mr Steve Baber Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The SW site is in a Greenbelt area and it is critical that construction is prevented in these now tiny pockets of the UK countryside. By building in these areas we will cause irreversible damage to wonderful countryside/wildlife.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

This is not a suitable area for the reasons stated above.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

No.

Respondent: 3422 / 1 Name: Mr Martin Elsbury Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes I have evidence and information about the Old Colliery site at Stanton Wick. This evidence and information demonstrates that it is not suitable or sustainable, and its proposed potential use as a Gypsy and Traveller site is unachievable.

Green Belt Issues

This site is in the green belt and therefore the proposed development is inappropriate. The Planning Policy for traveller sites issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government in March 2012 states in Policy E, paragraph 14 that 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. Also, the introduction to the policy document states the Government's aims in paragraph 4 'that plan making and decision taking should protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development'.

Planning History

There is a long history of planning application refusals on this site both at the Old Colliery and at the adjacent Filers Coaches site. The only permission that has been granted in recent years is for a single dwelling. 'Inappropriate development in the Green Belt' has been cited as a reason in all refusals. Traffic volume has also been cited as grounds for refusal in previous applications. The lane to Pensford is a steep, narrow, single track lane. There are very few passing places and it is prone to flooding. The lane through Stanton Wick to the A368 terminates in a very dangerous junction with the main road where oncoming traffic from both directions travels at considerable speed and with very restricted visibility of the junction.

The Planning Policy for traveller sites issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government in March 2012 states in paragraph 11 that 'Local Authorities should ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially, and environmentally'. I believe that this requirement is very relevant to the following sections:

Site Contamination

The previous coal mining activities at the site have contaminated the ground with arsenic which is present in measurable quantities of above the recommended safe levels. There would need to be extensive remediation work carried out to the site which would create an unacceptable level of large vehicle movements through the hamlet of Stanton Wick. In my opinion this would be prohibitively expensive for any new owner of the land to consider. If any planning application is put forward for the development of this site it is important that ground remediation is made a condition of any decision.

Access to Local Services

The nearest primary school (Pensford) is 1.5 Km away as is the only local shop. Walking to these would be unsafe either by

road or by Public Footpath which is dark in winter and very wet underfoot all year round. The shop is very small and does not offer sufficient stock for regular cost effective food shopping.

There is no public transport within safe walking distance.

The nearest health facilities (Doctors Surgery) are approximately 5 miles away and are not linked to the site by public transport.

Water Supply

The water supply to Stanton Wick is notoriously low in pressure. The pipeline is old and subject to regular leaks and bursts. When the concrete works were in business they were heavily reliant on rain water storage tanks for concrete mixing. Any future development would need to be supplied by a new pipeline. The cost of installing this would again be prohibitively expensive.

Employment Opportunities

Employment opportunities are very limited in this area. Travel to the cities of Bristol or Bath provides the majority of employment opportunity.

Size of the Proposed Development

A large development such as the one proposed would overwhelm the existing 'settled community' by a factor of as much as 3 : 1. In the Planning Policy for traveller sites issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government in March 2012, paragraph 9 states that Local Planning Authorities should: 'relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density'. In paragraph 12 it states: 'When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi rural settings, local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community'.

Conservation Significance

The Old Colliery is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and provides a habitat for important species

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I would like to comment on the Sustainability Appraisal Report- April 2012 of the GTIS site allocations Development Plan Document.

I will quote relevant lines from Table 4.1 'Summary of the Significant and Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Effects of the issues identified within the Sustainability Appraisal'. GT 2

'This site option is identified as having a number of significant negative impacts against a number of social and environmental objectives due to its isolated location away from the nearest settlement, which is unlikely to improve access to local services and facilities and reduce reliance on use of the private vehicle. The sites designation as a site of Nature Conservation Interest is also likely to be negatively impacted on from the development of this site.'

I agree with the above.

'A number of the likely social Impacts of identifying this site for allocation are negative '

I agree.

' though the site does offer the scope to provide on-site services such as providing space for healthcare visitors and education'.

Developing the existing buildings for these uses would be a hugely expensive exercise

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I most certainly do not agree.

In addition to all the comments and observations I have made in appendix 1 and 2 above which demonstrate that this site is unsuitable and unsustainable I would argue that the site is unsuitable for any level of pitch provision. Although the proposed development applies to just a small portion of the site, the entire site is currently for sale. As B&NES do not intend to administer this site themselves beyond the planning application process there is no safeguard that the site will not expand. I fear that even if there was an authorised site, there is still plenty of land which could attract unauthorised travellers. B&NES have a duty of care towards the existing settled community. The size of this site poses too great a risk. It is too large for them to restrict the number of travellers using it.

There is another very important reason why this site shouldn't be considered as an option beyond the consultation period. Many people have over the last few months argued very strongly that the process to shortlist the 'preferred options' has been deeply flawed. Attempts at revealing the truth about exactly what went on, and how, have only succeeded in creating a climate of mistrust. I believe that the council have lost the trust of the people, and in choosing to press on with this consultation in the face of serious criticism- and having been given ample opportunity to call a halt to the process at a number of points in its history- have done themselves serious damage. For this, they should be deeply ashamed.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3427 / 1 Name: Mr Colin Selwood Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Just NOT suitable!

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Greenbelt
Contaminated site
Only one shop in pensford is to close/cease trading
Bad access, narrow lanes
Old mine shast
Just NOT suitable!

Respondent: 3430 / 1 Name: Mrs J.U Penney Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No information.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

no.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

No.

Respondent: 3431 / 1 Name: Mr M.D Penney Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I have no information on any other sites

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

NO

Respondent: 3434 / 1 Name: Dr R.J Hunt Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

This site, Stanton Wick is unsuitable site because

- 1) Polluted
- 2) Unsafe because old mine shafts
- 3) Access poor, old railway bridge on corner unsafe
- 4) Over looks village of Pensford

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Please consider old MOD sites not in green belt

Respondent: 3436 / 1 Name: Mr Colin Stevenson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The only site I wish to comment on is The Old Colliery, Stanton Wick.

This is totally unsuitable site and the main reasons for this statement are given overleaf.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The main constraints are:

* Stanton Wick is in the Green Belt and the proposed site would be an inappropriate development. It would also overwhelm the small existing community

- * The land is dangerous, with old mine shafts and would be liable to subsidence
- * There is inadequate access to local amenities, and the local lanes could not support any increase in traffic volume
- * There is no mains sewerage in Stanton Wick
- * Work to remedy the points listed above would be uneconomic

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO. The proposed site should not go ahead. There is a long list of planning applications for the site being refused, and inappropriate development in the Green Belt has been cited as the reason for refusal.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3437 / 1 Name: Ms Kathleen Moreton Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

NO

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

What were the reasons Stanton Wick went from the bottom of the preferred list to the top within the space of a few weeks. How could its suitability change so suddenly? Factors against its suitability are plainly obvious to see. Firstly the planned development is very large, 15-20 pitches would increase the village population enormously - overwhelmingly. There is no infrastructure for so many residents, all mains services would need to be installed. Access would need to be improved. There are not sufficient school places (Pensford school is at capacity) and there are no local shops or GP surgery. That is the list of objections with respect to the sites lack of infrastructure. There are also many objections on environmental grounds. The proposed development would be in the Green Belt. This fact has been deemed sufficient grounds to refuse planning permission in the past. The previous applications for planning were for much less radical developments than that proposed by BANES for the same area. BANES obviously consider it just fine to put a huge development in the Green Belt when they want to. The site was an old colliery, this brings many environmental problems with it which would need extensive and expensive remedial action to make the site suitable for residential use, old mine shafts, industrial waste and its resultant pollution would need to be made safe.

The industrial past of the site also brings with it matters of archaeological heritage as well as Nature conservation. This site is home to various unusual and rare species. Instead of trying to shoe horn a large (overwhelmingly large) development into an existing, long established, small community it would be much better if BANES included new, purpose built traveller sites in their redevelopment schemes when residential/ex service/ex industrial, town sites are regenerated. BANES have several such sites planned and they should include traveller pitches among them. Many other councils have achieved a successful resolution of their provision of traveller-sites obligations in this manner, as was outlined at our parish meeting.

Respondent: 3440 / 1 Name: Mrs S Harding Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Sites suitable for development would, in my view, be those outside greenbelt, where there is a proper transport network of roads, pavements, bus, train etc, where there are appropriate facilities nearby ie. Shops, schools etc and where the site is not going to be of an inappropriate size to any nearby local communities. As such, Bath and Radstock would appear

most suitable.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. There is not suitable road network - there isn't even a pavement for safe walking. There is no bus transport and no close proximity to trains. There are no facilities within easy reach and it would appear totally unsuitable as a site. It is also in green belt and this development would alter the nature of the community.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

There is a perfectly appropriate site currently being used in the Lower Bristol Road in Twerton. Invest a small amount here to make it legal and permanent.

Respondent: 3441 / 1 Name: E.A Bailey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

This colliery had the two largest shafts in the coalfield, circular, brick lined, both subjected to mandatory daily inspection for erosion and water damage. Are the two caps in sound condition? Many hazardous materials were used here: - explosives and fuse cord, petrol pump with storage, mercury arc rectifiers, battery acids, carbide, grease, oils, tar, bitumen lead, solvents. Water treatment added to boiler feeds from the cooling tower. Large area of this site is made up ground using the colliery waste.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO. I do not agree that this site should be considered - this would not be a safe site

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This site should be kept as an industrial heritage site as with the Pensford viaduct. As a tribute to those who worked there, most of the village industries have lost such as the mills on the river Chew.

Respondent: 3444 / 1 Name: Mrs M Price Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree that Stanton Wick would be a suitable site. Nearby houses would depreciate in value. Country lanes would be unsuitable for the heavy volume of traffic incurred. No nearby facilities such as shops or public transport. No mains sewerage in Stanton Wick which would cause a big problem.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I do not agree

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3450 / 1 Name: Mr M.G Lavender Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Apart from the over whelming facts pointed out at the public meeting held in Stanton Drew Village Hall on Wednesday 2nd March 2012 why this proposal should not be approved or adopted I would like to add a few other reasons as to the objection to the proposal.

In early 70's and 80's I used the site in question as my operating centre for my small Haulage Business, during that time the site sub surface of the land behind the Dabro concrete yard was continuously burning and several occasions flames could be seen coming to the surface, if the contractor has to remove the top 600ml in order to stabilize the area, it possibly could cause the burning of the tip all over again.

In my opinion the whole proposal area should be examined by experts in this field before any decisions by BANES should be made.

The second point which I would like to bring to your attention is that of dangerous wild life in the area for example Adders which can be found in the undergrowth during the Summer time. Local youngsters would make a point to look for the Adders and would bring to my attention what they had found.

What concerns us is that young children from the proposed site would come across the snakes not knowing the potential of being bitten especially if they were from another country and not know or understand the species and the danger there in.

Respondent: 3461 / 1 Name: Miss Ella Arnold Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Mr Ball. What are you going to do about the horse shoe bats. You are damaging nature.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3462 / 1 Name: Ms Sally Brooks Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I have looked at the evidence to date, the pros and cons of each site that is being considered and the comments made by the council draw their own conclusions - it is clear that the Lower Bristol Road site is the most suitable of all those proposed and would offer far better facilities for the travellers - this should be a major consideration surely?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Not in many ways and Yes in some. They have indicated that preparatory development is necessary prior to occupation, that there are access problems - all those I agree with - the overall suitability of the site surely no one can agree with the council itself by highlighting the constraints are deeming it unsuitable as I see it.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Definitely not. There are so many reasons to reject this site, structure of the area, access for the amount of traffic that would be generated and provisions for the travellers families are very poor in this 'green belt' area. It is ridiculous to even consider the allocation.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

My main objection is the 'Green Belt' areas which once developments are allowed to contravene the law as currently exists, would be subject to requests from anyone and everyone who felt it appropriate to jump on the bandwagon and areas so long protected by governments planning etc would be wide open to over exposure.

Respondent: 3463 / 1 Name: Ms Mary Pryce Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick is a 'Greenbelt' site. The road system in that area is narrow and only just adequate for the present population. Walking in the area is a hazardous occupation.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

We need a formal definition of the pitch. Is this one van/caravan/wagon or a collection of vans with shed etc.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The issue of services, the lack of safe walking, the possible contamination of the Colliery site, the lack of satisfactory sewerage are all factors that militate against this being a suitable site for a traveller settlement.

Respondent: 3463 / 1 Name: Ms Mary Pryce Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick is green belt land. It is also contaminated from previous use. There are no shops. No transport.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3465 / 1 Name: Mr Matthew Hunt Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

BANES need to read and adhere to planning regulations, national and local policies, government guidance, and best practice for Gypsy and Traveller sites when assessing the proposed sites. It seems they have ignored all of the above and ploughed on with an extensive consultation process on sites that have been deemed unsuitable by BANES own criteria.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO the assessment has ignored the following:-

- * Inappropriate development in the Greenbelt
- * Development would overwhelm the existing nearest community
- * Long history of planning application refusals
- * Inadequate access roads
- * No safe walking route to local amenities or public transport
- * No infrastructure for water, sewerage or electricity
- * Site is contaminated and dangerous with old mineshafts liable to collapse
- * Site is a 'Site of Nature Conservation Interest' and provides a habitat for many important species
- * It also has historic significance as part of the Somerset Coalfield

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO
The site should not even be considered for all the reasons outlined above.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Preferred options paper has been a waste of time and money as the 'Matrix' used to assess the suitability of each site is completely flawed. How can a site rated 17th out of 23 be put forward as the leading 'Preferred site'. It has contradicted many planning issues, national and local policies, government guidance and best practice for Gypsy and Traveller sites.

Respondent: 3467 / 1 Name: Mr Nicholas Anstey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes, see next page.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No ..
 There will be significant visual intrusion to the country side.
 Single track access to the site is not suitable- it is not designed to accommodate increased traffic loads/volume.
 Site is within green belt- Previously, inappropriate development in green belt has been cited as reason for refusal in a long history of planning applications.
 No public transport within safe walking distance, no public amenities, poor water supply, no mains sewerage, no safe footpaths and no safe walking to local schools ..
 Land is contaminated which will require large plant movements to rectify and cost.
 A large development would overwhelm the existing settled community.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.
 B&NES should seek Brown Belt instead of Green Belt and should design sites to accommodate smaller number of pitches. This will prevent a large community of Gypsies/Travellers becoming a mini village.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?
 B&NES have refused numerous planning applications in the past citing increased traffic volumes and inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This is contradicting their own rules.

Respondent: 3468 / 1 Name: Ms Rachel Baber Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?
 The site is designated a Greenbelt area, therefore should only be allowed to be developed under extraordinary circumstances and I do not deem a Gypsy and Traveller site to constitute this. The Greenbelt is precious for conservation reasons as well as preserving the Chew Valley countryside.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?
 No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?
 The roads and infrastructure of the Stanton Wick area are not suitable for large vehicles, or increased traffic. This would make driving in this area more hazardous and very likely increase accidents. Also, the water supply and sewerage for this area is insufficient to support such a development.

Respondent: 3472 / 1 Name: Mrs Janet Palmer Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick is a completely inappropriate site as it is in a Greenbelt, the size would completely overwhelm the existing small community and the surrounding highway would not be able to take the traffic needed for the building.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?
 No! The highway concern stated previously has been used AGAINST previous planning applications. The additional traffic needed to build this site is overwhelming and that will then continue as the area has no access (or very little) to public transport so any residents will need to drive everytime they leave. It is unsafe to walk as there are no pavements.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?
 Absolutely not! There are also no shops, schools or other amenities which travellers could use, so I am quite sure that they would be very unhappy to have to use this site, which is inappropriate for ALL concerned. I would also be very concerned about that safety of children living there as the ground is not only contaminated but unstable.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?
 Please think again about the sites looked at in this consultation document, especially Stanton Wick. The wildlife currently habituating the area will have nowhere to go and will be put in danger. This site will also be a large burden on the taxpayers as it will be so expensive to set up. We are aware that the council need to look for travellers sites, but this one is a non starter!.

Respondent: 3472 / 1 Name: Mrs Janet Palmer Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I believe that the most suitable site to be used for this development should be Lower Bristol Road, Twerton, Bath. All facilities for the use of gypsies etc. are close to this site, with easy and safe access. The site is on the edge of the greenbelt and could be easily screened. Close attention must be given to the many criteria items in Appendix B of the Development Plan Document (DPD) where it will be seen that this site conforms much more favourably, than the Stanton Wick site as shown overleaf

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Having lived in Stanton Drew for 25 years, I know that there are no opportunities for gypsies or anyone else to live on the proposed site. I cannot believe that these proposals have come from elected persons who regard themselves to be seen by others as pillars of society. These proposals would impose huge constraints on both the gypsies and established residents. All local services including roads, public transport, schools, doctors surgeries, water and drainage, access to shops etc would not be able to cope

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

This whole exercise must be treated as "Dead in the Water" and Stanton Wick must NOT be considered for any pitch provision. The whole site is contaminated with arsenic, has mineshafts and other safety issues. BANES have not disclosed the cost of clearing and site preparation or an environmental and geological survey action to protect endangered species of plant and animal life. Road access to the site is presently very poor and this will involve extensive and lengthy development to build the site. Compulsory land purchase with vastly improved drainage and water supply. The costs incurred will be colossal, impact hard on council tax payers and NOT provide gypsies, travellers or BANES tax payers with a solution demanded by government.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

There is already much local anger and lack of trust shown by local residents against BANES, in the way and manner that this site has been proposed and the dictatorial attitude of the Council Cabinet to ignore the opinions of local residents and professional experts with regards to safety and other issues - some of which I have given above. Any such scheme will not succeed without the proper consultation and co-operation to be made with local residents. I also refer to Page 11 of the DPD Issues and Options paper where it is obvious to all local residents that the plan for Stanton Wick site clearly contravenes BRE guidance on walking distances to local services and amenities primarily with regards to safety. Other issues are highlighted as being in a Green Belt area, and not to dominate the village of Stanton Wick which clearly would happen with a large number of gypsies, travellers and showpeople then resident.

Respondent: 3473 / 1 Name: Ms Lisa Hurley Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

1. the Stanton Wick Site is in the Greenbelt and the proposed site would constitute inappropriate development in the Greenbelt.

2. there is a long history of planning application refusals, both at the Old Colliery and the adjacent site ; the only permission that has been granted in recent years is for a single dwelling. Inappropriate development in the Greenbelt has been cited as reason for refusal.
3. There is no public transport within safe walking distance.
4. The nearest Doctors Surgery is around 5 miles away and there is no public transport.
5. The site is dangerous, has several old mineshafts within it and these could be liable to subsidence at any time.
6. There is no safe walking route along the roads wither to Pensford or Stanton Drew schools. The public footpath from the side of Winding House to the A37 is not safe, even in the summer!

Respondent: 3474 / 1 Name: Mr Denys Chamberlain Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Old Colliery site at Stanton Wick is totally unsuitable for development of any manor or medium sort as it lies on Greenbelt - The reason given for refusal of previous development applications. Nothing has changed to warrant a reversal of previous policy.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The council have not made a fair appraisal of this site by ignoring such basic facts such as the overwhelming effect on the small existing community and the change such development would cause to the environment.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. This is an unsuitable site by reason of lack of roads, facilities of all types including transport, schools, shops, medical assistance of any sort and basic needs such as sewerage.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Banes Council should take an unbiased and free view of this situation and not allow party political dogma to interfere in a purely local matter.

Respondent: 3474 / 1 Name: Mr Denys Chamberlain Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes, BANES has previously refused planning applications for the Old Colliery Stanton Wick site because it lies on Greenbelt land. The fact remains.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. They have given insufficient reference to the basic facts of the unsuitability of the site for any form of development of a major or medium size.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. Just look at all the problems presented to the council - and ask the Gypsy and Travellers representatives if they think it's a good site.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

REPEAT. This is a Greenbelt land and should remain so.

Respondent: 3475 / 1 Name: Mr+ Julian Nash Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The land is Greenbelt and we do have evidence.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

1. As stated, the land is Greenbelt.
2. It is not near facilities.
3. The site will overwhelm the local communities.

Respondent: 3481 / 1 Name: Mr Christopher Seaton

Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

1. The site is clearly 'inappropriate development in the Greenbelt' and should have been immediately rejected.
2. The area is a sparsely populated rural community and the proposed site would have a very material impact on the community increasing its population by 3:1/
3. The existing infrastructure and amenities could not support such a large influx of people into the area.
4. there is no public transport or appropriate shop in the vicinity.
5. There is very limited employment in the immediate area.
6. The old Colliery site is a nature conservation site of interest and provides a habitat for many important species.
7. there are no pavements or safe walking routes from the site to shops or schools. The doctors surgery is about 5 miles away and there is no public transport to the surgery.
8. It is understood that there is no man sewerage at the site and that it could not be supported by septic tanks.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3482 / 1 Name: Mr Andrew Jones

Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Old Colliery at Stanton Wick is a designated Greenbelt and not giving planning for residential or commercial premises. If given it will totally overwhelm Stanton Wick and its roads.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. has a huge impact on local residents and the resources of the area.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I support the need for Gypsy and Traveller site, but believe this site to be totally inappropriate.

Respondent: 3488 / 1 Name: Mr Paul Johnson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Due to the site location and main points set out within the matrix the suitability of the SW seems flawed. This is due to the lack of amenities (2Km), Doctors (7.5 Km) and school (2Km). The site access must surely raise large concerns also as we are a country used to protecting our Greenbelt, thus road works in this zone must be unsuitable.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do agree that the constraints set out are fair as I feel the travelling community have rights to a land they can call home, in the instance of Stanton Wick however, I am concerned that the Travellers would not see this a suitable location and that they would feel isolated and pushed out of society. No one deserves to feel like that!!

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. Due to the scale, location and safety aspects of this site, and the fact it constrains most of the stipulations outlined by the council, it's seemly ridiculous that this site is taken forward.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3489 / 1 Name: Ms Dawn Harvey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Stanton Wick site seems an odd choice from a health and safety viewpoint. Not only is the land contaminated, but surely there must be concerns over the safety of the minds below - the travelling community have the right to a safe place to live and I believe the costs of remedying the site would be too great. The whole accessible site should be considered not just the specific are proposed as accommodation.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I agree with the method the council have used to assess the suitability of sites. I agree that the travelling community have a right to a home - however I feel the Stanton Wick site is inappropriate for many reasons. I also feel for many travellers the scale of the proposals is too great (they prefer smaller sites) and its location is general more remote than most preferred locations. This site could actually mean the travelling community could end up restricted and isolated.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No - the proposed numbers would 'overshadow' the number of current residents of Stanton Wick. I addition the road structure is not able to support additional traffic and would pose safety issues. The site is too remote from 'local' facilities such as the school, shops and doctors surgery, and there is no nearby public transportation, as such there will be a reliance on the use of cars, which again takes you back to the road structure question and inadequacy.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3490 / 1 Name: Ms Pauline Parnell Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

No public transport.
Nearly as many sites (pitches) as houses in the Village!
No roads to walk to school
No pavements
No local shop or church

Respondent: 3491 / 1 Name: Mr David Parnell Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Colliery site is unfit for human occupation.
The access roads are unsuitable for the additional traffic which will be generated.
The local amenities are insufficient and too far away from the proposal site.
The surrounding areas are greenbelt and conservation areas and unsuitable for this development particularly of the size.

Respondent: 3492 / 1 Name: Ms Pam Richards Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes. I live in Stanton Road and I am aware of the traffic and management issues in the area. Residents in this area have had poor experience of BANES planning and transport (BRT) so are naturally very suspicious and cynical about any new proposed development.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I think the information is too vague. Verbally, the council officer talked of three pitches but this is not in the text. I think the access constraints have been underestimated. This is a busy road and is used by many heavy goods vehicles. Large fairground machinery going in and out of the site will cause chaos.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

I am very ambivalent - I would like to see more concrete proposals about traffics management and more detail about what type and size of machinery will be kept on the site. I think there should be only one residential plot and that one person should be responsible for running and good management of the site - if there are more pitches it is more difficult to control.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I think the mixture of residential and industrial use on this site is not idea. The old railway line is supposed to act as a buffer between residential Ashley Ave. and the industrial units. The area would need landscaping to screen the vehicles etc. What about security? This site could attract people who would damage vehicles but as residents we do not want security lighting etc.

It is important that the site is managed by the council or a housing provider to ensure continuity.

Respondent: 3500 / 1 Name: Ms Claire Harris Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

YES. The Stanton Wick site is located on Green Belt land next to a hamlet. There are no local amenities, shops, doctors or community centres within a safe walking distance. The proposed sites does not have regular public transport, indeed there is no direct service to Bath, a centre of employment for this area.

The access to the site is totally inadequate to cope with the size of the proposed development.

An area of concern is that the local authority appears to be willing to locate families (quite possibly with young children) on a site with not only contaminated land, but disused mine shafts which are potentially dangerous and unstable. I would have to question whether this policy is actually addressing the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller Community at all.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO. The Stanton Wick site is located on Green Belt land and the proposed development would constitute a wholly inappropriate development. In addition the local infrastructure will not be able to cope with an influx of up to twenty "households". Local amenities are not within walking distance, the doctors surgery is between 4 and 5 miles away. There is no direct link to Bath via public transport, this will severely limit the options of commuting to Bath for work and is likely to add to congestion in an already busy area. Again public transport links to Bristol and limited and expensive with the added consideration of poor access to safe walking routes to the local village schools. In terms of safety the land at Stanton Wick is contaminated, in order provide a safe environment for familes and young children, considerable remedial work will be required to make the site safe for human habitation.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO. The number of pitches proposed for the Stanton Wick site will leave a disproportionate impact on the local community. In short, the size of the proposed development will dwarf the local community currently residing in the area.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The local planning policy was applied to a recent planning application of a local business operating from Stanton Wick. From the information available I believe this application was refused on the grounds that access to via Stanton Wick Lane was not suitable and the increase in traffic movements generated by an expansion of the Filers Coach Yard would have a negative impact upon the residents of Stanton Wick. It therefore follows that these arguments should be consistently applied when examining the impact of the proposed Gypsey and Traveller site at the Old Colliery on Stanton Wick Lane.

Respondent: 3501 / 1 Name: Mr Mark Duncombe Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The land at the Old Colliery is contaminated and is dangerous as it has many mineshafts which would be liable to subsidence. The site is a site of nature conservation interest, and is very close to the Pensford Conservation Area. The site is within the greenbelt and many previous planning applications have been refused because of the greenbelt issues. The

water supply to Stanton Wick is unreliable and is already at capacity for the area, and there is no mains sewerage in Stanton Wick

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO. The site is not suitable as the site is a site of nature conservation and the site has historic significance. The site is far too large to be controlled and the single track lane would be dangerous to use by pedestrians. There is not a sufficient water supply and there is no mains sewerage in Stanton Wick. The site is contaminated and dangerous with many mineshafts.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO. The Old Colliery is far too large and authorised expansion would be difficult to control. The site is within the greenbelt and is a site of nature conservation. The site is along a narrow single track lane which would be dangerous for pedestrians.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

- * The site is greenbelt and should NOT be used for this inappropriate development
- * The site is too large to be controlled and it is known that travellers prefer smaller sites
- * The site is dangerous - mineshafts, contaminated and with a single track lane and no pavements meaning dangerous access for pedestrians
- * There are not sufficient facilities such as shops, the doctors are around 5 miles away and there is no public transport

Respondent: 3503 / 1 Name: Mr+ W Wade Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO. The above site does not comply with planning guidelines. The road access is incapable of coping with the increase in traffic generated by the proposed 20 pitches. It would overwhelm the nearest settlement, even at 20 pitches it would outnumber Stanton Wick residents 2 or 3:1. The above site has no safe walking routes to amenities therefore most people will have to use cars and vans to get about the area.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO. The site has nothing in common with the type of site preferred by the Travellers as shown in the West of England Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Travellers prefer close proximity to amenities and small family sites of up to 5 pitches.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

In an expert report and survey the site was found to be contaminated with dangerous levels of arsenic that has not been removed from mining times. It still has mine shafts, and safety issues have not been considered. It is in the Greenbelt, National guidelines say that gypsy and travellers sites in the "greenbelt" are inappropriate development. Planning permission should not be available in these circumstances.

Respondent: 3503 / 1 Name: Mr+ W Wade Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO. The above sight does not comply with with planning

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3503 / 1 Name: Mr+ W Wade Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

NO.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No, as it is in greenbelt. Planning permission should not be given for the reasons listed below:-
Increase in traffic on inappropriate roads and lanes.
Size of site much too large for the small local community to absorb properly.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO as approx. 100 travellers on this proposed site, would have to use vehicles as it is in an isolated position in greenbelt. Highways Dept. should look at this problem fully.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This proposed site has no safe walking routes to local schools, shops, Doctors only a steep unlit and muddy track how can this be deemed suitable for young families. Policies relating to suitable sites should take into account avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructures and services. The nearest settlement is Stanton Wick a hamlet of 26 dwellings and 60 people. The sheer size of the proposed 20 sites with over 100 people will place huge strain on local amenities. The site has no main sewage, septic tanks for a site of this size may cause contamination of Salters Brook.

Respondent: 3504 / 1 Name: Mr+ A Clark Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site is located in green belt land single track unlit lane. Will cause a large amount of traffic within the village. Limited access to Stanton Wick, no pavement, or streetlights. Site is situated over land which could subside as it is an ex - colliery (mining site).

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3505 / 1 Name: Mr S Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Suitability

All reasonable people accept that travellers should be treated no differently from everybody else in the community. They have the same rights and responsibilities as everyone else, and should not be discriminated against, or ostracised. In that context, it is legitimate to ask why the Council is proposing that families with young children should live on contaminated land; a former waste tip and slag heap, riddled with unstable mineshafts.

As part of a previous planning application, (Reference:10/01429FUL) a Contamination Report was prepared by Sanctus Ltd, on a small part (0.5 hectares) of the proposed site, near the road, and away from the main mine site and the refuse tip; i.e. in that part of the site least likely to be contaminated.

Even here Sanctus found significant arsenic contamination. Within its conclusion it wrote:

Chemical analysis returned levels of Arsenic exceeding the Residential SGV, which statistical analysis confirmed to be significant.

Earlier in the report, Sanctus wrote:

A local authority landfill...located approximately 130m to the east of the site. This is located within the boundary of the old colliery and was indicated on the historical maps as a refuse tip. No information is given on the type of waste deposited or the date of closure of the site.

This landfill site is right in the middle of the proposed travellers' site. Nobody knows what was dumped there, during a time when controls were virtually non-existent.

The mine itself was worked for some 50 years until 1958. The slag remains on site. What hazards it presents, again nobody knows.

In the 50 years since its closure, even during repeated property booms, there has been no serious attempt to develop the site for residential use; perhaps because the houses would be unsaleable on such a site?

Even if remedial work were to be undertaken on the 2.5 hectares to be developed, there is no proposal to clean-up the remaining 7.5 hectares of the site. In any case the costs would be prohibitive.

Children would naturally roam all over it, unwittingly putting themselves at enormous risk.

To compound the problem, the site is adjacent to a working transport depot, and a telecommunications tower.

Yet despite all this, the Council is proposing that people should live here; that children should play amongst the potentially lethal debris and detritus of heavy industry.

Would anyone choose to live there?

Would any responsible person be happy for their children or grandchildren to grow up there?

Who will guarantee the safety of every child on the site?

Travellers are already massively disadvantaged, in terms of health, opportunity and life expectancy, compared to the settled community.

So why is the Council proposing to put them right out of the way, on this dangerous and potentially unhealthy site, where feelings of resentment and hostility would develop and fester?

This is most definitely not the way to promote integration and harmony, and smacks of serious discrimination against gypsies and travellers.

Availability and Deliverability

The site comprises some 10.1 hectares, all of which is being considered, and yet only a quarter of which is proposed to be used as a travellers' site. This raises a number of questions:

20 pitches can be accommodated on just 1 hectare. What are the other 9 hectares for?

Why is such a large site even under consideration, if it is 10 times bigger than required, and 75% of it is apparently unusable?

Why is such a large site being considered, unless there is an undeclared intention to expand the number of pitches in the future?

Even were there no intent, the Council would stand no realistic chance of limiting unregulated expansion on vacant land, already designated as a travellers' site.

So in theory the whole site has a capacity for 200 pitches, if the development challenges could be overcome.

In the meantime, how can it be viable for any Registered Provider, or the Council itself to pay for such a large site, and yet use so little of it to generate revenue? (The site is privately owned, and up for sale.)

Does the Council not have a duty to conduct due diligence as to the economic feasibility of this site? This would need to

consider the likely acquisition price, the infrastructure needed to install the utilities and drainage, and other essential development costs prior to occupation.

The cost of removing contaminated soil will be particularly difficult to quantify, as only 5% of the area (0.5 hectares) has been surveyed to date, and found to be contaminated with arsenic. What deadly poisons will be found elsewhere on a former waste tip?

All of these costs would then have to be recovered from the sale or leasing of just 20 plots.

At market prices, what is the pay-back timescale? Would any commercial lender be prepared to fund such an investment in the current financially risk-averse climate?

These are legitimate questions, which have not been addressed so far. It would be irresponsible for the Council to proceed without detailed answers.

No financial data relating to this site have been published.

One possible result of this process may be a dramatic increase in the value of all 27 acres. If it is decided that, despite being in the Green Belt, the site is appropriate for use by travellers, an important precedent regarding residential development, will have been set.

If it is subsequently found to be unviable for development on a small scale, then it follows that the larger it gets, the more economically feasible it becomes.

If it transpires that it will never pay its way as a travellers' site, because of the inherent inefficiency of land use, (6 traveller pitches need the same ground area as 15 houses. Source BaNES), then what is to prevent the land being put forward in due course for normal residential development?

Under Equality legislation, it is difficult to imagine that land deemed suitable for travellers, who cannot afford to use it, will not eventually be released for residential use by the settled community.

A 10 hectare site could accommodate 400 to 500 houses. How much would that be worth?

The net result would be a loss of Green Belt, a potentially huge increase in the value of the land, and no benefit whatever for the travelling community, or the Council Tax payers of BaNES.

Even a rudimentary financial feasibility study of the site would be instructive and surely imperative before further decisions can be made.

Practicalities

Remedial works just for the 2.5 hectares earmarked for development, given the ground contamination mentioned above, would require a huge number of HGV movements. To remove the slag heap would be a truly mammoth operation.

How would this ever be possible given the single track roads around the site?

To the impartial observer it may appear that, whoever was tasked with compiling a list of possible travellers' sites has been dazzled by the size and apparently immediate availability of The Old Colliery.

To be able to meet so much of BaNES' current and future requirement on just one site, with just one set of objectors to deal with, albeit within the Green Belt, has blinded them to the huge practical difficulties in delivery.

It surely must have seemed too good to be true. And that is just what it will prove to be, once a full and objective evaluation is made.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

In short listing the Stanton Wick site, several other serious constraints seem to have been overlooked.

Green Belt

The site is in the Green Belt. The Government has deemed that travellers' sites are inappropriate in the Green Belt. To suggest that very special circumstances exist that would persuade an Inspector to set aside this constraint seems to be largely wishful thinking. For example, given that the MoD sites been excluded from consideration, how can it be argued that there is really no alternative to this inappropriate site? Similarly, what consultation has taken place with neighbouring authorities to find suitable sites?

This very same Green Belt has been given as the principal reason for refusal of previous planning applications on this and the adjacent site (Filers' Coaches).

Previous applicants and the local community will want an explanation (and compensation?) for this volte face from the Council. Again, the Inspector may well take some convincing. He will surely want to know why the Green Belt is sacrosanct to all, but the very authority responsible for its defence.

Size

Even at the proposed 20 pitch size, the site would be larger than Government guidelines suggest is conducive to good management. The distinction between permanent and transit pitches is spurious. The overall size of the site would dramatically increase the likelihood of uncontrolled and illegal expansion, as happened at Dale Farm.

It would be highly irresponsible of BaNES knowingly to expose its council tax payers to the risk of such huge (and wholly avoidable) costs in enforcing the law.

A 20 pitch site would outnumber the residents of Stanton Wick by at least 2:1. This contravenes national guidelines. In addition, it is impossible to see how the Council will discharge its obligation to ensure integration and cohesion with the settled community, which will be so overwhelmed. Surely this is a recipe for conflict.

Travellers themselves prefer small sites of up to 5 pitches. So, once again, it appears that the Council, in its eagerness to resolve its traveller sites' issue, in as few locations as possible, has been seduced by the availability and size of this site, and chosen to ignore its significant constraints.

Essential Local Services

There are no essential local services within reasonable walking distance of the site. The doctors' surgery is 5 miles away. There are no safe walking routes from the site to the nearest primary schools, or the local shop in Pensford, even if the distances were not a problem. There is no street lighting, and the country lanes are lonely, particularly for young children.

As there is no public transport available, effectively all access to and from the site will have to be by private vehicle, which will significantly increase traffic in the immediate area.

Or, as the author of the site assessment tables rather coyly admits, "the use of this site would be unlikely to reduce reliance on the use of private vehicles"; about as unlikely as winning The National Lottery... twice!

Access Roads

"Access to the site is constrained by the C road, Wick Lane". Yet despite this admission in the Detailed Site Assessment Tables, and the further comment that "the existing poor nature of the highways leading to and from the site (single track in parts and tight bends) may lead to conflicting movements with other road users" the Highways Department has not been asked for an opinion on this site.

This is all the more surprising given that an increase in traffic volume has been cited as grounds for refusal of previous planning applications in the immediate vicinity.

Without huge investment in the surrounding highway infrastructure, (and who would pay for this?), any planning application must therefore fail.

Yet despite this obvious constraint, the site has still made it to the shortlist. How? Why?

Services and Utilities

Whilst there is electricity to the site, the provision of water to Stanton Wick is unreliable, and there is no mains drainage. Septic tanks would not be an acceptable alternative for a site of 100+ residents.

Environmental Impact

Given that the site has lain dormant for some 50 years, and has not been farmed, it has become something of a wildlife sanctuary. No evaluation has been undertaken as to species in residence, nor of the likely impact on them of development.

Local Employment

Being rural, there is very little prospect of employment within walking or cycling distance. Jobs are more likely to be found in Bristol or Bath. Unfortunately the site is not served by public transport. School leavers amongst the travellers will be further disadvantaged by their inability to get to work.

b. Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. Notwithstanding that the site is totally unsuitable as a place to live, to designate an area of over 10 hectares as a travellers' site for 20 pitches, when it has a theoretical capacity for 200, is fraught with danger.

It would be to invite unauthorised and illegal expansion, and /or the use of the site for unregulated business activity such as scrap vehicles or other waste.

If such a large area is being considered primarily because the owner wishes to sell it as a whole, for commercial reasons, this is no justification for such over provision and the inherent risks it represents.

To date, no other explanation for such an overlarge site has been published.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The major concern is that despite coming 17th out of 23, in the Council's own Site Scoring Matrix, this site has been short listed, ahead of those with much higher scores.

This suggests either major flaws in the matrix design or an unexplained reluctance to accept the results, or both.

Whatever the reason, the outcome does not inspire confidence that the Council is either sufficiently competent or perhaps even willing to conduct a fully objective evaluation of suitable sites in the area.

Instead, it has decided that Stanton Wick is a hugely attractive potential travellers' site from the Council's perspective.

Never mind national guidelines, the violation of the Green Belt, the legitimate concerns of local residents, the preferences of travellers themselves, the inadequacy of surrounding roads, the absence of essential local services or employment opportunities, and, crucially, that the site is contaminated and dangerous...never mind all that...it is the will of the Council.

A little humility would be most welcome, please, before more time, money and effort is wasted in trying to put a square peg into such a clearly round hole.

Respondent: 3506 / 1 Name: Ms Jan Ilhali Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

YES: The Stanton Wick Site is not appropriate as it will swamp the immediate local settlement.
The site is known to be contaminated with Arsenic

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO: The site is in green belt land. Planning has previously been refused for large developments on various planning grounds.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO: The site could easily spill over into the available 27 acres, like it happened at Dale farm.
The site is not on any known traveller route.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

YES: The services are poor, Road access, water, sewerage, Electricity etc. The site is known to have a colony of bats. The amenities are poor, No shops, doctors etc. The site is unstable and is liable to mineshaft collapse.

Respondent: 3514 / 1 Name: G Veitch Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No other evidence or information

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Nearest doctor is no longer at Chew magna – practice has moved to Chew Stoke.

Local food store is a tiny post office store not suitable for a large influx of people.

No consideration given to the effect on the hamlet of Stanton Wick.

Highway access is not nearly as good as made out.

Other amenities are not readily available.

Services will all need to be re-instated and upgraded not only for the site but also for Stanton Wick itself.

Access to Pensford down the lane, by walking, is not safe.

Respondent: 3515 / 1 Name: Ms Rosemary Veitch Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I am writing on behalf of myself and my family and as a resident of Stanton Wick of 26 years' standing to voice our objections to the proposal to place the largest travellers' site in BaNES a matter of a few hundred metres from our house. The lie of the land means that although we are in a lane that runs off the access lane to the proposed site we are only two fields away and the site would be visible from the east, lane side of our house which is the orientation of the majority of our bedrooms, [in the past BaNES failed to notify us of a proposed development of a derelict cottage, and its enlargement, because we were just beyond the statutory limit but again because of the lie of the land we now have the redeveloped cottage's security light shining down the hill straight into our bedroom. Because of the local contours this situation could easily be repeated meaning that we would then be overlooked on the two main facades of our home.

You know that all the residents of Stanton Wick object in the strongest possible terms to BaNES' proposal to site a very large travellers' site here for a long list of legitimate and rational reasons; the contravention of national greenbelt guidelines, its size, the lack of sufficient and accessible existing services and employment; the proposal to import services would be tantamount to conjuring up a completely new settlement, the cost to council tax payers and the contradiction of BaNES' own scoring system amongst others. I would like to cite and expand on three; the unsuitability of further traffic along the access lane, (a fact which BaNES must by inference concede as it rejected an application of Mr Pat Filers' to expand his coach parking by a small number), the domination of a small isolated hamlet and the overloading of local services including the possible further degradation of very slow broadband speeds and the consequential, detrimental implications for existing local businesses.

1) As you must know from visiting Stanton Wick the lane to the proposed site has MANY safety hazards. The access onto the A368 is dangerous having very poor visibility turning either way. As a family we have experienced, in the last few weeks' alone, acrs overtaking on the main road - inboth directions - opposite the junction neraly causing serious collisions with the vehicles trying to join the A368.

The lane is single track for the majority of its length, all the way down and through Pensford to the A37, is not gritted, contains two very hazardous corners even before the proposed site entrance, (on one of which my neighbours' daughted had her car written off by an oncoming vehicle whilst stationary waiting to pull around a car parked in a gateway) and from there down to Pensford the road becomes progressively narrower, has even fewer passing places, (with very soft verges that are easy to become stuck in) and is very prone to flooding such that it becomes impassable to pedestrians as well as vehicles. Only two and a half weeks ago I had to leave a Cancer Research fundraising event to rescue my son who was attempting to walk up the lane having alighted from the bus at Pensford. As an agile and fit 22 year old he was unable to negotiate the floodwater even by attempting to scramble up the banks. He had to walk back down to Pensford and I reached him on the main roads. As we experience more and more heavy rain and flooding (and I can certainly attest that this is extremely likely having lived in the same house for 26 years) this is going to become more of an issue on the access road and possibly on the site itself with its mining history and mine shafts.

In addition the lane itself is situated on a higher contour and the traffic on it is visible from our house and so we would be directly impacted by any increae.

2) I come now to the domination and complete change of character of Stanton Wick. We are a hamlet of approximately 26 houses, (which has increased from about 22 in an organic growth in the 26 years we have lived here). We, like many of the residents of Stanton Wick chose to live and bring up our family here for its very specific character of tranquility and repose. I would like here to add a very personal plea. For many reasons I ened my home as a peaceful refuge and am very anxious at the thought that this haven could be irrevocably changed. My grandmother was made a refugee from her home in Nicosia when I was a child in 1963 and was never able to return, (indeed my brother and I following our parents' deaths in

2007 and 2008 still await return to the house built by our grandparents) even up to her death in 1993. I am involved locally in pastoral care some unofficially and partly through my role as a churchwarden and I need the peace and isolation of my home to restore myself in order to continue to be able to support others.

I know - and my father knew, being told to Anglicize his name by his government employers - what it is like to feel part of a minority group and to be bullied for it both explicitly and implicitly but I also know that we could not have integrated as successfully as we did if we had dominated an existing settlement. I noticed that at the BaNES Council Cabinet Meeting held at the Guildhall on May 9th 2012, (which sadly I had to leave before its conclusion owing to another commitment but not before some personal and offensive comments were made unhelpfully by one - and only one - of the speakers which I wish to publicly disavow and distance myself from) the young traveller who spoke specifically said that she and her family did not wish to be moved to an isolated site like Stanton Wick. She said she wanted to stay on the edge of Bath where her children were happy, could walk to school and where services were readily accessible. If BaNES genuinely are listening this surely must carry weight in their decision making process? Living in Stanton Wick is a very definite and deliberate life and lifestyle decision and the very fact that it consists of only 26 houses attests to the truth that it would not be suitable for many people who would actually be unhappy living here and imagine how you would feel if your community doubled, or even trebled overnight.

3) Finally, on the issue of service provision I would like specifically to draw attention to the appalling slow and temperamental broadband speeds that afflict Stanton Wick. From my understanding as our internet services are transmitted down existing and elderly BT lines from the exchange over at Compton Dando, (we were a named Compton Dando number when we bought our house) unless the whole exchange and network were to be completely upgraded and re-installed this could severely and detrimentally impact local businesses such as The Carpenter's Arms, Filers Coaches (who run the buses for Chew Valley School amongst other contracts), a dog grooming business as well as a local GP when he works from home in the evenings and clients who frequently need to contact my husband - all of whom contribute significantly to the local economy and community.

You are our elected representatives; although many of you may not know us well in the outlying areas of BaNES please do not discriminate against us because of that and please listen to us.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3516 / 1 Name: Mr Gerald Kearney Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The proposed site at the Old Colliery, Stanton Wick would swamp the village of Stanton Wick.
The site is very remote and does not have the services within the range set out in the Development Plan Document.
Roads and Public Transport are not sufficient for such a development.
The site is contaminated and the surrounding area would also need to be free of contamination.
The site is dangerous with old mineshafts
The costs of remedial and infrastructure works would be significant and would not overcome many of the shortcomings of the site.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The assessment wasn't well researched and has missed many important facts.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Cannot agree and fail to understand how the Old Colliery Stanton Wick was taken forward when it ranked 17th out of 22 original sites when marked against the Council's own scoring matrix.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Would it not be an important factor to consider sites where the Travelling community had camped in the past. There are MoD sites at Ennsleigh, Foxhill and Warminster Road that have become available since the Council started to identify sites.

I fail to see how the Members and Senior Officers think they will be able to demonstrate Value for Money with likely legal action I look forward to seeing a review by the Council's External Auditors

Respondent: 3518 / 1 Name: Mr Simon Pledge Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site at the Old Colliery is neither suitable nor achievable as a Gypsy & Traveller development as it does not meet the criteria for selection for a potential site & does not comply with planning guidelines – the primary & most vital being that it is Green Belt & is therefore an 'inappropriate development'.

The proposed size of the development would completely overwhelm Stanton Wick.

I believe the site is contaminated with various by products of the historic mining works & I question it's stability in view of the old mineshafts on the site.

The position of the site is not easily accessible due to the unsuitability of Wick Lane to cope with the increased traffic flow. This would also impact upon the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders & other users of this route, including the Gypsies & Travellers.

There is no reliable public transport within safe walking distance of the site.

The local amenities, i.e. shops, doctors surgery & schools, are not within the recommended distances from the proposed site & will not be able to cope with the proposed increase in numbers.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Absolutely not – this site is clearly unsuitable for development into a gypsy & traveller site. The reasons for its unsuitability have been identified & made known to B&NES, who have chosen to exaggerate the opportunities & poorly assess the constraints. If B&NES were to persist with the development of this site, not only would it prove to be prohibitively costly (particularly given the current economic climate), but I would question whether B&NES has given sufficient consideration to the welfare of the community for which it is intended.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No – under no circumstances should this pitch be considered for formal allocation.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I fully support the policy to try & provide safe & healthy accommodation for gypsies & travellers & it appears that the Development Plan Document lays out the process of identifying suitable sites quite definitively.

Had B&NES followed the process laid out in this document, it would have become apparent very early on that the Old Colliery Site is not suitable.

Respondent: 3520 / 1 Name: Ms Katherine Laycock Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I have been a local resident near the site at the old colliery buildings between Stanton Wick & Pensford for over 30 years.

This local knowledge of the roads, the schools, and the facilities available, leads me to regard these proposals with disbelief.

Gypsy and traveller families need legal sites and civilised conditions for their families. This site cannot possibly supply them

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree. The proposed sites –(15 permanent and 5 transit) would introduce an instant population of possibly 80+ new residents.

Try walking on these dark transport-less lanes! Was the impact of safety measures considered?

Local schools have provision based on teacher/pupil ratios. Are these significant additions planned for? Possible?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

It seems that the approval of this site would require:

- 1/ A decent reliable water supply
- 2/ Effective modern sewerage (There are no mains sewers)
- 3/ Road widening (This is an old colliery lane to Pensford – dangerous, unlit and impossible for two cars to pass for much of its length)
- 4/ Medical services 5 miles distant

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Frankly it seems to me that the approval of this site would be in breach of national policy on the green belt.

An alternative must and will be found in order to meet the needs of the travelling community.

I would welcome publication of the reasons behind the selection of this site as one of the 6 preferred sites.

Respondent: 3522 / 1 Name: Stanton
Drew Parish
Council Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Introduction

This statement concerns the BaNES proposal to develop the Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick. The 'Call for Sites', was issued on 21st November 2011, asking the Parish Council to offer any sites matching prescribed criteria.

The Parish Council found no appropriate sites because:

-The Parish is washed over Green Belt and development of traveller sites is 'INAPPROPRIATE IN THE GREEN BELT' –

-there is no easy access to public transport.

-We have no shop in the Parish.

-Doctor & dentist surgeries are 3- 4 miles away, not within 1500 m

-There are no sites in safe walking distance from Stanton Drew Primary School.

The Parish Council first became aware the site was listed as 'preferred' for 15 permanent & 5 transit pitches i.e. 60 caravans on 18th April 2012 via email. If the Parish Council had known about the potential allocation of the above site prior to its public announcement we could have provided necessary evidence to help BaNES officers in the pre-consultation process, preventing the site from being erroneously placed on the list. If gypsy representatives were allowed to see the site in November and asked to make comment then why was the parish council kept out of the loop?

This proposal would totally overwhelm Stanton Wick by 3:1, contravening Planning Policy For Traveller Sites [March 2012]. An independent contamination report 2009/10, states arsenic levels exceed the Residential SGVs and there is much asbestos on site.

The hypocrisy of considering a development of some 60 caravans & associated buildings on site after the refusal of previous private planning applications on highways, sustainability & Green Belt grounds, [however latterly the permission for the building of 1 house & ancillary building, approved in March 2011, with stringent stipulations] is flabbergasting.

The Parish Council organised a public meeting on 2nd May to inform residents of the facts, prior to the Parish Council meeting on 3rd May 2012. Over 250 residents attended, overflowing into the car park. Almost 100% of parishioners have

signed a petition registering their incredulity that the site scored 17th lowest out of 23, yet becoming top 6th preferred site. This gave the Parish Council the mandate to speak on behalf of its residents.

The site is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest with European protected species. This should have been scored in the matrix.

The Parish Council made statements at:

1. 9th May Cabinet Meeting [Appendix 1]
2. Scrutiny Panel on 15th May.
3. 11th June Cabinet meeting [Appendix 2]. Submissions from the Parish Council & parishioners have all received the same answer, that they would be answered at the end of consultation. This reply has created feelings of mistrust that the questions would remain inadequately answered.
4. Two further Parish Council Public meetings on 23rd & 25th May were held.
5. The Parish Council held a surgery on 17th June to help residents complete the consultation response forms.
6. The Parish Council made a statement on behalf of the parishioners at the Special Council meeting on 18th June [Appendix 3]

The PC has attended MP surgeries. In association with Stanton Wick Action Group we asked for contact to be made with Andrew Robathan (PUSS) to consider vacated MOD sites for allocation. This has been done.

The Parish Council attended the consultation roadshows across the district, the public meeting at Chew Magna on 11th July and the Cabinet meeting was attended by the Chair of the Parish Council.

The Parish Council is very concerned about the lack of useful feedback from BaNES received by the many parishioners who have engaged to ask questions, give evidence and express opinions.

Since the Parish Council was given the mandate of its Parishioners to speak on their behalf, we will continue to work to this end in a hope that the Cabinet will listen and understand that the Stanton Wick site is neither suitable, achievable nor available as a Gypsy and traveller site.

Whilst we understand the need for authorised sites in BaNES, the Parish Council is very concerned that this whole process has been ill-thought through, and rushed, creating much anguish and frustration in the Parish. The deeply-flawed scoring matrix produced the deeply flawed list of preferred sites. The whole process needs to be commenced again so that Gypsy and traveller communities are provided with safe, healthy, small sites located close to urban areas (being their preference in the GTAA).

If BANES look at the location of unauthorised sites and we understand 69 tolerated sites throughout the district the Cabinet will see that the major sites centre in or around major road networks and close to urban areas for ease of movement and accessing of services. In the past 10 years the major unauthorised sites have been at;

Former Herman Miller site, Lower Bristol Road, Bath

Lower Bristol Road, Bath

Newbridge Park & Ride, Bath

Odd Down Park & Ride, Bath

Odd Down Playing Fields, Bath

Twerton, A4, Bath

Quen Charlton, Keynsham

Charmy Down, Bath

K2, Keynsham [at least twice]

Hampton Row, Bath [at least twice]

Entry Hill, Bath

Play area, Whitchurch

Freshford Mill, Bath

Clandown, Radstock

Rush Hill, Bath

Swan Lane, Combe Hay, Bath

In other words, NOT in the remote parts of Stanton Drew Parish.

Any sites in the Green Belt should not have passed 'Go' at the outset. Valuable time & money has been wasted and a great deal of stress has been placed on communities across the district. Not forgetting the stress placed on the permanent BaNES officers unnecessarily. Respect & trust in BaNES Council has been seriously damaged and admiration for local democracy is at an all-time low. This is deeply troubling for society as a whole.

The Preferred Sites

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help BaNES Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

AVAILABILITY, SUITABILITY & ACHIEVABILITY.

The Old Colliery Buildings site at Stanton Wick is NOT AVAILABLE as development of gypsy, travellers sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt. [Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Dept. for Communities and local Government, March 2012].

This site is NOT SUITABLE as development of gypsy, travellers sites are inappropriate in the Green Belt.

This site is NOT ACHIEVABLE as development of gypsy, traveller sites are inappropriate in the Green Belt.

No very special circumstances exist to counter the above policy because achievable, suitable & achievable sites have been indicated to BaNES during the May to July consultation period.

The site proposed at Stanton Wick may be available for sale by the landowner, Tom Smart, but it is not available in terms of the proposal for a gypsy, travellers site for numerous reasons of suitability & achievability, these being on the grounds of;

PAST PLANNING DECISIONS.

Allocation would contradict all previous planning applications permitted & refused. Reasons from BaNES Planning Dept. have stated;

1. 'The site is not in a sustainable location for a significant employment use and it is particularly unsuitable for HGV traffic'. Mr Solder, BaNES Economic Development Dept., site meeting 17/06/2005.
2. Aug 2005 – Permitted, Change of use from B2 site to provide one residential dwelling, ancillary residential accommodation, B1 floorspace & garaging for 5 vehicles.

Certain conditions were placed – 'in the interests of appearance of the development & the surrounding area.'

Remedial work was necessary, 'To safeguard the living conditions of future & neighbouring occupiers and to protect the water environment.'

Permission granted for 1 dwelling and 1 ancillary building plus the parking of 5 vehicles is very different from permitting 15 permanent and 5 transient pitches equating to some 60 caravans [using Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document DPD 2012 recommended usage figure].

August 2005 – Imposition of condition 7 – 'To prevent an over intensive use of the site', based on the unadopted Wansdyke Local Plan & policies of BaNES Local Plan, Revised Deposit Draft 2003.

3. 30 December 2010 – Refuse 05/0227/FUL Change of use & conversion of ancillary accommodation [building 1] to a self-contained dwelling & variation of condition 7 of planning permission 05/0227/FUL.

WORKS SITE ONLY.

So potentially if this had been permitted it would have allowed maximum 2 dwellings on site, one from the previously permitted building 1 dwelling. At present only 1 family has permission to take up residence subject to remediation works. With the present proposal for 15 permanent pitches and 5 transient pitches that would mean 15 permanent families plus close relatives and 5 transient families, an estimated number of people to be between 100 – 150 plus people which would totally overwhelm the settled community of 60 people [thus contravening Planning Policy For Traveller Sites, March 2012. The BaNES requested contamination report done by Sanctus [GL10 3UT] 01/04/2010. This report is available on the BaNES website. Sanctus drilled 14 trial pits to the max depth of 3.2 metres below ground level on 11th Nov 2009, monitoring wells assessing gassing & hydraulic regimes on 8th December 2009.

Arsenic concentration levels exceeding Residential SGV were stated as potentially significant. Being harmful;

Via ingestion of contaminated soils

Dermal contact with soils

Consumption of home grown fruit & veg

Via migration of soil gas via permeable/ fracture strata, [associated with the repair, commercial vehicle storage & maintenance facility & also from historic mine workings.

Page 22, 'due to the maximum % of carbon dioxide being >5%, characteristic situation for ground gas protection will be considered, in order for residential development to incorporate adequate protection measures for the gassing regimes present'.

The Sanctus report identified asbestos in shed roofs as hazardous & non-hazardous waste.

Re: ARSENIC [p 23] – 'certain areas are unsuitable for use in garden & landscape areas of the new development'.

The analyses were done in & around the buildings areas only. The present BaNES proposal does not take into account likely contamination on the mine workings & old tip sites that would be accessible to site residents and may be subject to potential expansion in Appendix 5: Detailed Site Assessment Tables, Site Capacity].

Further contamination reports should be undertaken on the mine working & old tip areas now to assess likely harm to human and animal health [the latter in terms of grazing horses].

P 24, Sanctus recommends '600 mm of made ground to be removed from proposed garden & landscaping areas & replaced'

P 24, 'Gas protection measures are required to prevent build-up of gas within confined spaces'. It is known by older parishioners that the site has been subject to spontaneous combustion in the past. Again further investigation should be carried out on the mine & tip areas to ensure that future residents are not put at fire risk.

Lead contamination results varied across the site, the majority of the test point had results between 30 – 60 mg/kg, however;

Test point 02 - 100 mg/kg at 1.2 m depth,

TP 04 – 410 mg/kg at 1.5 m,

TP 08 – 100 mg/kg at 0.3 m,

TP13 – 110 mg/kg at 1.5 m.

On 4th June 2012 at the Planning Control Committee meeting, planning officers once more recommended Refusal but the decision was deferred pending more evidence from the applicant.

ACHIEVABILITY –

In terms of achievability it is very unlikely that this site is economically achievable.

A necessary thorough Environmental Impact Assessment should be done across all areas of the site i.e. the old buildings, the mine & the tip, even if the latter are not intended for use, as a matter of duty of care BaNES needs to insist all areas are covered in case of egress on to the land by residents recreationally or otherwise.

The Parish Council has alerted Cabinet members & officers to the potential cost of decontamination of the buildings area alone, in the region of £1.8 Million [see appendix 2] based on consultation with local expertise in the area. Since contamination examination has not been carried out on the rest of the site yet this figure is likely to be substantially increased. A full contamination survey across all areas needs to be done.

The Parish Council has also alerted BaNES to the fact that the mains water supply is potentially inadequate. Many residents in the hamlet of Stanton Wick experience very low pressure and are unable to run more than 1 water using appliance at a time. Due to lack of water pressure the previous business collected & used water from the roofs, this will not be an option for domestic use thus a new water main should be laid at huge expense.

A full highways report needs to be done and looking at the evidence from planning applications in the area there would be substantial work to be done to make the roads adequate to carry the anticipated extra vehicles.

A mine safety assessment needs to be carried out to ensure that no resident comes to any harm and that work is done correctly.

Ensuring that the heritage brick built buildings are renovated appropriately will be costly and ensuring any bat roost remains undisturbed will also have knock on costs. A full year round bat assessment would need to be carried out to ascertain the exact movements of the bats. Again lead is a known contaminant relating coal mining practices, analysis of mine & tip working would need to be carried out to assess health risks.

18/03/11 PERMIT 10/03029/REN, the Works site only. Renewal of application 05/02227/FUL Change of use from B2 site to provide 1 residential dwelling, ancillary residential accommodation, B1 floor space & garaging for 5 vehicles.

Various stipulations as to finishes were placed 'in the interests of the appearance of the development & surrounding area'. It is very difficult to see how mobile homes & amenity blocks are going to be able to satisfy the above stipulation and be in keeping with the heritage nature of the site brick buildings.

'To ensure the provision of an appropriate landscape setting to the development', stipulations were made for

1. Archaeological work
2. Bat scheme
3. Contamination

'To safeguard the living conditions of future & neighbouring occupiers & to protect the water environment' – with respects to the water environment.

Concerning the bat scheme, bats are known to fly & feed in the area in and around the adjacent Winding House and the Old Colliery site. A copy of the bats' flight path is attached [appendix 4], this was drawn up by the occupants of the Winding house in June 2012 prior to a visit by Dr Nancy Vaughan [doctorate in bats & hares, Bristol University] to identify the bat calls. The hibernarium is located within the boundary of the Winding House property close to the boundary of the Old Colliery building site. The evening of Dr Vaughan's visit she identified piperstrelles and noctules by call. Greater horseshoe bats have been seen in the area but not identified that evening. Dr Vaughan placed a record at the BRERC.

Past planning applications on the adjacent Filer's Coaches site provide pertinent evidence to further illustrate why the Old Colliery building should not be available or suitable for the proposed development.

Past applications to park an additional 8 coaches in addition to the 12 permitted coaches have been turned down on the following grounds;

'The proposed expansion...would be inappropriate use of the Green Belt' [Policy GB 1]

'...increase in the number of vehicles parked at the site would detract from the openness & rural character of this area...' [Policy GB 2].

'likely to increase vehicle movements, including those of large vehicles, on the local road system, which are unsuitable to accept additional traffic by reason of its inadequate width, alignment and junctions...result in congestion & inconvenience to other road users'. [Policy T 1]

'Location remote from services & public transport facilities to enable staff to access the site...likely to increase the vehicle journeys to and from the site...' [Policy T1]

'Benefits of the proposal...do not clearly outweigh the harm by reason of appropriateness.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

1. 'The site comprises a former pit and brick buildings, including workshops and barn.'

We partially agree but the site considerations also included a tip and old mine workings which are known to be potentially unstable.

2. 'The site is outside the housing settlement boundary of Stanton Wick'.

No it isn't. Next door to the north, is the Winding House and directly opposite to the west, is the Bath House, both residences. 0.28 km to the north again are two more properties.

3. 'The site benefits from existing on-site services and utilities'

We disagree. There is a tap and low power 3 phase electricity. There is no foul water drainage, no mains gas. As previously stated the mains water supply is inadequate [page 4, paragraph 5].

4. 'The development of this site would not directly assist the aim of social integration'.

We agree, creating a large 'ghetto' such as proposed would adversely affect any aim of social integration. This remote site could potentially be very isolating for young gypsy/traveller mums with young children as experienced by young mums in Stanton Wick. The lane is too narrow, gloomy and very hilly to be pushing buggies down to the shop in Pensford and particularly uphill back to the site. Elderly residents could also experience isolation, not being able to walk a short distance to a shop for a chat.

It must be noted that the owner of the shop in Pensford has been trying to sell the shop for a couple of years as he needs to retire. He stated to the Parish Council in April that he intended to close the shop in 6 months. The shop may no longer exist very soon.

5. 'However, the site's location outside the main settlement would also limit the impact on neighbouring residents...'

We disagree. As indicated in 2, this is a complete fallacy. The impact on neighbouring residents needs to be assessed in an Equality Impact Assessment. It is not acceptable to make assessments on behalf of one type of community and to discriminate against the needs of the settled community. Residents may be able to demonstrate under the Human Rights Act 1998, that their 'respect for privacy when one has a reasonable expectation of privacy', may be compromised by this proposal.

6. '...ability to obtain primary school place is more likely to be easier than other locations. This is a long term benefit of the

allocation of this land for development.'

It would be interesting to note that Councillor Hartley in his assessments wrongly identified the school as Stanton Drew Primary School to which the site children would go to. That school is way outside the distance criterion of 1500 metres. The Parish Council will discuss the Pensford School location as it is nearest to the proposed site.

Has the number of potential primary school children been assessed properly?

Prior to June 2012 we are aware through discussions with Cllr Hartley this had not been done. So, as a ballpark figure 20 families with an average of 3 children for gypsy families and 5 for Irish travelling families based on Planning for Gypsy and Travellers; The impact of Localism, June 2011 i.e. 60 – 100 children could be walking up & down a narrow, unlit, gloomy, hilly lane or alternatively a public footpath which at its entrance & exit looks feasible but if Councillors walked the whole thing would soon find out that it is incredibly boggy for about 2/3rds of the walk even in the summer! The novelty of such a walk would soon wear off.

BaNES are not being duly diligent in considering their Duty of Care to the children & their parents.

Driving to school along the lane would create huge amount of vehicle movements and chaos as passing places are infrequent. Allocation of sites must reduce reliance on motor vehicles.

Why is secondary school location not even mentioned in the scoring matrix?

As Cllr Ball pointed out in our meeting on June 25th 2012, very commendably gypsy & travellers attaining professional qualification & degrees, something that they can only do if they are able to access secondary education. Teenage gypsy & traveller children prefer being able to walk to school & be in contact with the wider community of their own age.

7. 'National guidance indicates that the re-use of previously developed land can positively enhance the environment with the establishment of a well-planned or soft-landscaped site.

We agree that National guidance [note guidance not law] would be a good 'indication' as a general guidance but not at Stanton Wick based on past private planning applications. How can arguments used in the past by BaNES Planning officers magically disappear to allow a totally inappropriate development in the Green Belt?

How can light industry, the movement of large mobile homes, vehicles associated with light industrial activities, movements of between 100 – 160 plus new inhabitants into a hamlet of 60 people possibly enhance the environment even with screening? No amount of screening will enhance the environment and right to privacy for the residents of the Winding House nor will it give privacy to proposed new residents as the Winding House totally overlooks the site.

8. '...well bounded by its topography, would prevent the allocation of this land being used as a precedent for development elsewhere.'

We disagree because this statement makes absolutely no sense.

However, considering the 'well bounded by its topography', the Parish Council is concerned that BaNES this implies or is aware that the site could suffer from 'creep' or overspill onto the potentially dangerous areas of the mine workings & the tip. This is not acceptable.

What action plan has BaNES in place to prevent harm to the SNCI, the wildlife, the landscape but most importantly the new residents?

9. 'The landscape to the immediate north of Wick Lane is not particularly sensitive and could possibly accommodate such a development'

We strongly disagree. To start the land is part of the SNCI and it is designated Green Belt land.

BaNES officers need to rigorously investigate whether or not disused mine working revert to greenfield description, once mining activities cease, has this been done?

If so, this area cannot and should not be used in any case on contamination & safety grounds.

Noise and light pollution would disturb the bats and this is illegal.

10. 'it may be appropriate to restrict or avoid development at the perimeter of the site to avoid impact on neighbouring properties'

We agree, but this will be require the reduction in pitch allocations as there are residences to the north and west and the coach park to the south meaning less space available. It may be pertinent to point out that due to the problems with spontaneous combustion of land in the past from the build-up of ground gases, the Fire service require full access running along the west-east boundary to the get onto the mine & tip workings. There is concern from the local retained fire-fighters that the water supply would be wholly inadequate in the event of a major fire.

11. Has a detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment been done?

12. Highways 'the reduction in traffic generation from the former industrial use of the site would be of benefit, whilst recognising that the site is not in a sustainable location'

We agree that the site is not in a sustainable location. The quote relates to the planning application for 1 dwelling & 1 ancillary building & parking of 5 vehicles, which would have constituted reduction in traffic. The present proposal for the site would not reduce traffic generation in fact it will constitute a marked increase in vehicle movements, noise & emission pollution and road safety problems.

We also agree with the second paragraph that a full highways assessment needs to be conducted. We are aware that residents have commissioned a full highways report and that this is being submitted to BaNES. The conclusions of the report recognise and uphold all previous BaNES Highways concerns that this is not a suitable or sustainable location due to highways constraints.

13. Site Constraints – we agree with paragraphs 1 and 2, however the nearest doctor's surgery is not Chew Magna but nearly 5 miles away in Chew Stoke, not directly accessible by public transport although a surgery coach does operate once a week, not convenient if one has sick children prone to illness regularly.

14. Concerning PPG2

We agree that the site location is unsuitable as it would not 'safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Furthermore 'development of gypsy & traveller sites is inappropriate in the Green Belt'.

15. We agree that 'the development would harm the openness of the Green Belt'

16. We agree that 'the impact on the openness of the Green Belt would be materially greater than that caused by the permitted change of use to a single dwelling'.

17. 'The site is well contained.....this leads to the conclusion that conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt designation would be of moderate weight'

We disagree. The Green Belt is not weighted it is Green Belt not 'slightly Green Belt' or 'slightly' non Green Belt'. Once again such development is 'inappropriate in the Green Belt and there are NO exceptional circumstances here.

18. Potential for Development and Suitability – 'The site benefits from existing on-site services and utilities.'

We disagree because as already argued the services are partial and inadequate.

19. 'Existing buildings could be converted to form day/utility rooms and a site manager's office'.

We agree but at what cost? The costs will deem the whole site undeliverable.

20. 'and the very special circumstances identified above, the site is considered suitable subject to appropriate contaminated land and highways assessments being conducted'.

We disagree, legal advice from Richard Harwood will be able to demonstrate that there are no very special circumstances to take this site forward.

We agree that extensive and rigorous assessments should be carried out.

21. ' the need to provide a safe living environment'

We wholeheartedly agree that BaNES has a duty of care to provide a safe living environment and should not choose this site just because it is 'large' [as quoted by councillors at the Pensford consultation] and a convenient place to create an out-of-Bath ghetto in a remote, isolating and unsafe place.

The Sustainability Appraisal of the Stanton Wick Site.

Objective 1 –'improve accessibility to community facilities and local services'

There is poor access to local retail services – nearest shop is 1.5 km away- very small & its future existence is uncertain. The nearest supermarket ASDA in Whitchurch or TESCO Brislington – several miles away. No direct public transport to either. Access to Pensford Primary School – 1.5 km nearest.

It is suggested that there could be mitigation by developing existing buildings on site for the purposes of education. Also that there could be teaching supplied by ACTES.

The cost of converting the buildings for this purpose would be very considerable as would the cost of supplying education – presumably paid for by BaNES and therefore through the council tax of everyone?

It would not promote social cohesion.

It would be discriminatory against the settled community who do not enjoy the benefits of education at their place of residence or the potential benefits of a low student to teacher ratio.

Objective 2 ‘Improve the Health and Well-being of all communities’

Access to local health facilities is poor [worse than access to schools]. It is suggested that there could be mitigation in the form of a formal link with a local GP to ensure long term access.

Again, this would be discriminatory against the local settled community who would not enjoy such a ‘special case’ access and have to put up with the existing situation that is cited as a problem for this proposed site allocation.

Objective 4 ‘Promote safer, stronger, more vibrant and cohesive communities’.

Given that this is not a sustainable location due to lack of local facilities and its location from local communities it follows that there would be problems with social cohesion – little opportunity to mix socially with the resident population – and resulting lack of understanding – and the potential for increased tension and fear. The transient nature of travellers using transit pitches would lead to a perceived problem with crime.

Objective 5 ‘Access to Business Employment and Skills opportunities’.

There is very limited employment opportunity due to the location. This is true for any of the local communities. In the past, agriculture & horticulture would have provided local opportunities but this is no longer the case. Most local people have to travel towards the cities for employment.

If conversion of existing buildings is carried out to provide business opportunities for the travelling community this would again be discriminatory against the local settled community [especially young people]. Again, this would work against social cohesion and promote a ‘ghetto’ community. It would also cost a very considerable amount to convert the existing buildings.

Objective 7 ‘Promoting access to sustainable transport’

This site is not sustainable in this respect due to its location. There is little opportunity for safe cycling due to the surrounding major road networks. Walking opportunities could only be for leisure purposes, not to access services – other than the bus route to Bristol.

Reliance on fossil fuels would not be reduced by the site.

Objective 8 ‘Protect and Enhance the district’s distinct historic, environmental and cultural assets’.

If, as suggested, it were a condition of allocation to sensitively redevelop the buildings of historic value, the cost would be very considerable.

Objective 9 ‘Encourage and protect habitats and biodiversity’.

The site is an SNCI [Site of Nature Conservation Interest]. There are significant records of European Protected species on site.

Human habitation would compromise the safety of protected species whose existence in this location will be partly due to lack of human presence.

Objective 10 ‘reduce land, water, air, light and noise pollution’

Although remediation of the contaminated land [suggested as a minimum requirement of allocation] would have a positive impact on land pollution, the costs involved would be huge.

Figures of 600 lorry loads out of the site with contaminated soils, 600 lorry loads into the site with new soils and a cost £1.8 million – just for the dumping of the contaminated soils have all been suggested. As well as the cost, there will of course be highways issues to be considered.

Light and noise pollution would not be reduced by the use of this site; rather it would be worse than the current situation.

Summary of the significant and secondary, Cumulative and synergistic Effects of the Issues identified within the SA.

‘The site performs very well against a number of SA objectives, including protecting and enhancing the district’s

environment. The allocation of this site would assist in the achievement of this objective partly due to the scope to provide a large-scale site on previously developed land with little landscape impact. The allocation of this large scale site would also reduce the need to allocate and develop land elsewhere in the district to meet the identified need; this is a significant positive secondary impact of the allocation of this site.'

Bingo! BaNES creates its out-of-Bath ghetto contravening all the planning policies and guidelines, paying scant attention to the detailed feedback in its own assessment reports. Creating a large site where gypsies and travellers prefer small sites, disregarding their preference not to mix permanent and transit pitches for fear of crime and lack of community cohesion. We, the Parish Council vehemently disagree with the Paragraph 1 of the Summary.

In paragraph 2 of the summary the states 'the site's designation as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest is also likely to be negatively impacted...' Either the landscape & SNCI will be impacted or it will not be. The Parish Council fears the former and is minded to think that paragraph 1 should not have been included or should have more accurately portrayed the situation knowing full well busy councillors would read the first paragraph and consider 'job done'. The job is far from done. The Parish Council feels that it has more than adequately pinpointed areas of concern in question A to promote the need for this site to be dropped from the allocation.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

The Parish Council disagrees strongly with any potential pitch provision at this site for all the reasons outlined in A. The Parish council wishes to demonstrate that the scoring matrix flawed and therefore the site should not have been placed on the preferred list to begin with and should not have got to this stage of the consultation process, therefore further reason why the potential pitch provision should not be taken forward to formal allocation.

OBJECTIVE: Prox. primary school. MATRIX SCORE: 1. AGREE/ DISAGREE: Agree. But walking hazardous

OBJECTIVE: Prox. Doctor's surgery MATRIX SCORE: 0 AGREE/ DISAGREE: Agree

OBJECTIVE: Prox. Transport node MATRIX SCORE: 1 AGREE/ DISAGREE: Agree but walking hazardous

OBJECTIVE: Site screening MATRIX SCORE: 1 AGREE/ DISAGREE: Disagree, impossible to screen from Winding House & vice versa Scores 0

OBJECTIVE: Green Belt MATRIX SCORE: 0

OBJECTIVE: Wildlife designation MATRIX SCORE: 0 AGREE/ DISAGREE: SNCI & EPS should carry as much weight as WHS

OBJECTIVE: European Protected species AGREE/ DISAGREE: This should have been weighted as illegal to disrupt species.

OBJECTIVE: Flood risk MATRIX SCORE: 0 AGREE/ DISAGREE: Agree

OBJECTIVE: Contaminated land MATRIX SCORE: -10 AGREE/ DISAGREE: Agree

OBJECTIVE: Hazardous place MATRIX SCORE: 5 AGREE/ DISAGREE: Disagree Scores 0 as potentially very hazardous

OBJECTIVE: Brownfield MATRIX SCORE: 5 AGREE/ DISAGREE: Agree for buildings only, rest of land questionably greenfield. Score to be determined.

OBJECTIVE: Safe access to public highway MATRIX SCORE: 5 AGREE/ DISAGREE: Disagree, evidence from Highways section show that there would problems of congestion on the C Wick Lane & getting onto A368 is very hazardous. Score 0

OBJECTIVE: On-site parking MATRIX SCORE: 1 AGREE/ DISAGREE: Agree

OBJECTIVE: Existing road network MATRIX SCORE: 0

OBJECTIVE: Noise issues MATRIX SCORE: 0 AGREE/ DISAGREE: Disagree Score -5 as neighbouring properties very close.

Sum of scores MATRIX SCORE: 10 AGREE/ DISAGREE: - 10 at best.

WHS MATRIX SCORE: No /Agree

Conservation area MATRIX SCORE: No MATRIX SCORE: Disagree Yes, significant due to coal mining heritage

The site originally scored 10 to put it 17th out of 23 places but was magically placed 7th then 6th preferred site. If it had been scored properly it should have optimistically scored -10, some parishioners argue that it should have scored even lower. At -10 this would have placed it as the very lowest on the list. Either way, this site should never have been on the preferred list too much emphasis was put on the World Heritage Sites, when that was not an original 'objective' in the issues & options paper.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Please focus your comments on planning issues, national and local policies, government guidance and best practice for Gypsy & Traveller sites.

Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012

Putting this site forward to allocation would contravene;

Paragraph 4 'plan making & decision making should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development'

Paragraph 14 'Travellers sites in Green Belt are inappropriate development'.

Policy B, para 11 a 'Promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community'

Policy B, 11 b, 'Promote, in collaboration with commissioners of health services access to appropriate health services'.

Policy B 11 e.' Provide for proper consideration of the effect of local environmental quality on the health and well-being of any travellers...'

Policy C para 12 '...scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community'

Policy H para 23 ...'strictly limit new travellers site development in open countryside ...'

BANES Core Strategy

Putting the site forward to allocation would contravene;

Policy CP11 a 'Local community services & facilities including shops, schools and health facilities should be accessible by foot, cycle and public transport'

Policy CP11 b 'Satisfactory means of access can be provided and an existing highway network is adequate to service the site'

Policy CP11 e 'Adequate services including utilities, foul and surface water and waste disposal can be provided as well as any necessary pollution control measures'

Policy CP11 f 'use of the site must have no harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers'

Gypsies and Other Travelling People, Policy HG.16

Putting the site forward to allocation would contravene;

Criterion 1 'access to local services, facilities to public transport'

Criterion 2 'safe & convenient access to the road network'

Criterion 3 'capable of being landscaped to ensure that it blends in with its surroundings'

Criterion 4 'adequate services'

Criterion 5 'harmful impact on the amenities of local residents'.

Other Policies this allocation would contravene include;

Green Belt Policy GB1 & GB2.

Landscape Policy NE1

Trees & Woodlands, Policy NE4

Policy NE9

Policy NE.11

Transport requirement Policy T.24

Contaminated Land Policy ES.15

Conclusion

The site at Stanton Wick is totally inappropriate as a gypsy and traveller site as illustrated comprehensively in this document.

It should never have been on the preferred list. The Parish Council requests that it is removed immediately.

Appendix 1

Submission to Cabinet meeting 9 May 2012

Opposition to BaNES proposal to develop the Old Colliery Site, Stanton Wick as a Gypsy, Traveller site.

Speaker Judith Chubb-Whittle, Chair of Stanton Drew Parish Council.

In support of the overwhelming opposition voiced by the residents of Stanton Wick hamlet and Stanton Drew village, at our Parish Public meeting on 2nd May 2012, the parish council vehemently opposes the proposal on the following grounds;

1. The scoring matrix defies logic.

How can a site that was scored 17th out of 23 sites becomes one of the preferred top 7 sites, when alternative sites demonstrated superior access to amenities against the scoring matrix?

2. The proposed 15 permanent pitches & 5 transient pitches will totally dominate the hamlet of 26 dwellings i.e. approx. 60 people, contravening Planning Policy For Traveller Site document, March 2012.

Based on Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites document, a pitch comprises of an average 1.7 caravans but the DPD recommends using an average of 3 caravans. This could mean an influx of 50 to 100 people into the hamlet putting significant pressure on the local community utilities and services, especially the already faltering mains water supply, with existing properties forced to have independent means of pressure boosting.

3. The DPD states that amenities should be accessible by foot, cycle & public transport within 1500 m. The local shop in Pensford is due to close in 5 months' time, financial, retirement reasons. The shop has been on the market for over 2 years. The next shop is over 3 miles away, as is the dentist. The doctors' surgery is 5 miles away. No public transport runs to this site.

4. The scoring matrix does not take into account secondary schools, 4.5 miles away. In consultation with secondary school age travellers, walking to schools & urban areas is important for social integration. So say same age local children in recent Parish plan surveys.

5. Road accessibility – accessing public transport & shop is not ideal to either walk or drive. The lane is narrow, it floods at the bridge, and there are few passing places, no street lighting or pavement.

6. 2011 Filers Coaches [next door to the proposed site] applied for retrospective parking for 8 coaches, which was refused on the grounds of

- 'inappropriate use of Green Belt'

It is a Site of Nature Conservation. • 'vehicle parked...would detract from the openness & rural character of this area'

- 'local road system, is unsuitable in width, & alignment at junctions.

- 'location is remote from services & public transport...

- Benefits ...clearly do not outweigh the harm by reason of appropriateness.

Have Highways been consulted?

- 2005 BaNES Economic Development Dept. turned down an application on the Old Colliery buildings site as

- '...not in a sustainable location for a significant employment use...particularly unsuitable for HGV traffic.'

- Contamination report during winter 2009/10 for the landowner, reported arsenic concentrations exceeding Residential SGV, stating that;

'certain areas are unsuitable for use in garden & landscape areas...600 mm of Made ground would need to be removed & replaced'

Thus creating many HGV movements during remediation works.

Asbestos roofs were also noted as a significant hazard.

Is this a healthy place to live in? What about long term health issues?

The mine workings are known to be unstable, remediation works are taking place now on one of the shafts.

Has a mine survey been done?

Is this a safe place for people to live?

We fully understand that BaNES needs to provide authorised sites but location of unauthorised sites over the past 10 yrs in BaNES indicates that travelling communities prefer to be near urban areas.

Is it fair on the travellers to PUT them in an unhealthy, unsafe remote ghetto, that will put significant pressure on them and existing inhabitants?

Appendix 2

Judith Chubb-Whittle,

Chair of Stanton Drew Parish Council

SUBMISSION STATEMENT TO CABINET 11TH JUNE 2012

UNDER ITEM 7

Firstly thank you to Councillors who attended the consultation roadshows to answer my parishioners' questions.

However, there are many answers still awaited.

You & we agree that the matrix is deeply flawed. Even a secondary unspecified screening process delivered a flawed result. Yet with demonstrable negligence some sites were still put forward on the preferred list.

According to PPT 2012, you are required

1. To reduce tensions....

This has clearly not happened so far.

2. To enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health...

How can they do at GT 2, an unhealthy, unsafe, remote site?

3. Identify and update annually, a supply of deliverable sites...

At Cabinet meeting 9 May 2012 it was suggested that you reassess the need for sites and investigate suitable land i.e. outside the GREEN BELT far south of the district.

Have you done this?

Has the Cabinet understood the consequences of not taking into account the Scrutiny Panel's recommendation?

4. Protect local amenity and environment,

Please explain how development of light industrial employment will safeguard the SNCI & protected wildlife species from light & noise pollution and further hazardous contamination?

5. No very special circumstances will be demonstrable especially where MOD sites are available. [You would lose some 106 levy of course if you replaced some social housing with a couple of pitches].

Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. GT2 is DESIGNATED Green Belt, the description 'brownfield' for the buildings. They are still Washed over GB.

6. Strictly limit new traveller sites...away from existing settlements...do not dominate the nearest settled community ...avoid placing undue pressure on the local infrastructure e.g. water supply, poor highways connections, health etc.

You agree Stanton Wick is the nearest settlement. At the Pensford you said you liked the site because of size, an easy creation of an out-of- Bath ghetto.

Explain how adoption of GT2 will not contravene this policy?

7. Promoting opportunities for healthy lifestyles...what, on an arsenic contaminated site??

Do you realise that remediation costs will be HUGE?

Figures of 600 lorry loads out of the site with contaminated soils, 600 lorry loads into the site with new soils, and a cost of £1.8 million – just for the dumping of the contaminated soils.

How much will highways remediation cost?

Therefore the site is unsustainable at your projected numbers.

Firstly the assault on the Green Belt with Stowey Quarry and now the Stanton Wick Green Belt.

BaNES – Making Bath [but not necessarily North east Somerset] an even better place to live, work and visit.

Appendix 3

Judith Chubb-Whittle,

Chair of Stanton Drew Parish Council

SUBMISSION STATEMENT TO SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING

18TH JUNE 2012

Opposition to BaNES proposal to develop the Old Colliery Site, Stanton Wick [GT2] .

Councillors, are you listening?

-You were voted in by us, your settled community.

-You are paid by us, the settled community.

-Yet with Liberal Un-democracy the Cabinet will not listen to our factual arguments properly.

-100% of the residents of Stanton Wick, & 95% of Stanton Drew residents oppose the proposed development on planning & procedural grounds.

We all agree that the matrix is deeply flawed. Even a secondary unspecified screening process delivered a flawed result.

Yet with demonstrable negligence some sites were still put forward on the preferred list.

According to PPT 2012, BANES is required

1. To reduce tensions....

This has clearly not happened so far.

2. To enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health...

How can they do at GT 2, an unhealthy, unsafe, remote site?

3. Identify and update annually, a supply of deliverable sites...

At Cabinet meeting 9 May 2012 it was suggested that the need for sites be re-assessed and suitable land i.e. outside the GREEN BELT far south of the district be investigated.

Have the Cabinet done this?

Has the Cabinet understood the consequences of not taking into account the Scrutiny Panel's recommendation?

4. Protect local amenity and environment,

Please explain how development of light industrial employment will safeguard the SNCI & protected wildlife species from light & noise pollution and further hazardous contamination?

5. No very special circumstances will be demonstrable especially where MOD sites are available. [You would lose some 106 levy of course if you replaced some social housing with a couple of pitches]. Jacob Rees Mogg is asking Andrew Robathan's [Parliamentary Under Secretary of State] consideration on this.

Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. GT2 is DESIGNATED Green Belt, the description 'brownfield' for the buildings. They are still Washed over GB.

6. Strictly limit new traveller sites...away from existing settlements...do not dominate the nearest settled community ...avoid placing undue pressure on the local infrastructure e.g. water supply, poor highways connections, health etc.

Explain how adoption of GT2 will not contravene this policy?

We agree Stanton Wick is the nearest settlement. At the Pensford Cabinet members said they liked the site because of size, an easy creation of an out-of- Bath enclave.

7. Promoting opportunities for healthy lifestyles...what, on an arsenic contaminated site??

Do you realise that remediation costs will be HUGE?

Figures of 600 lorry loads out of the site with contaminated soils, 600 lorry loads into the site with new soils, and a cost of £1.8 million – just for the dumping of the contaminated soils.

How much will highways remediation cost?

Therefore the site is unsustainable at BANES projected numbers.

Firstly the assault on the Green Belt with Stowey Quarry and now the Stanton Wick Green Belt.

BaNES – Making Bath [but not necessarily North east Somerset] an even better place to live, work and visit.

Appendix 4

[Original includes map of Bat Flight Path]

Dear Paul,

Re; Item 13 Gypsies Travellers and Travelling Show People Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD): Preferred Options consultation paper at Cabinet meeting 05/05/12

Firstly I would like to thank the Cabinet for giving the number of speakers from the floor a chance to make statements at the above meeting. However, on behalf of my fellow parish councillors and parishioners, I wish to express my deep unhappiness and incredulity at the conduct of Cllr Ball at the cabinet meeting.

Each lay speaker gave measured factual statements, questioning the shortlisting of the preferred 7 sites and surrounding issues. Not one speaker exhibited unacceptable xenophobic views yet we were collectively chastised by Cllr Ball as if any one of us had conducted ourselves in such a way. This was unacceptable and unprofessional.

Although the practice of applauding speakers at a meeting such as this is probably unorthodox, it became the norm.

However, Mr Ball applauded one speaker only which at best was misguided as it alluded to bias. I don't deny Tracy Cuthbert showed a degree of courage, many of the other speakers are not used to speaking in public either.

The parishioners that attended the meeting were incensed by Cllr Bellotti's remarks that they took to be a veiled threat of 'accept it as an authorised site or else you will be faced with a Dale Farm scenario'. Surely this must be inappropriate behaviour in this type of meeting?

-If I am correct, Dale Farm had 2 authorised pitches, which then expanded into an unmanageable situation. My parishioners would like to know what action plan would BaNES have in place to deal with such a situation alluded to by Cllr Bellotti?

I, as Chair of Stanton Drew Parish Council, stated numerous serious reasons why the site would be unsustainable, against previous planning decisions, unhealthy and unsuitable for an influx of new parishioners. Not one of these facts seemed to have been taken into account and debated in any way.

-There was no subsequent debate about any information I or any other speaker put forward by your councillors, why not? The Camerton site was magically removed from the list after the briefest of debate, as there had been a mistake in scoring, if I remember correctly.

-Could you give proper account why Camerton was removed from the list and why Stanton Wick still remained, when errors were also made in the scoring at the Old Colliery?

-What weight did the comments made by Maggie Smith-Bendell at the Welfare training session for selected parish councils, determine the removal of Camerton from the list?

-If her comments did have some weight, do her comments weigh more heavily over the 98% of my parishioners? If so why?
The Parish Council requests a transcript of the Cabinet meeting as soon as it is available.
I look forward to hearing from you very soon.
Yours sincerely
Judith Chubb-Whittle
Chair of Stanton Drew Parish Council

Respondent: 3527 / 1 Name: Jitendra Shah Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

1. Greenbelt

The proposed site Stanton Wick (SW) is in greenbelt. National guidelines clearly specify that gypsy and traveler sites in green belt "are inappropriate" development. No planning permission can be granted.

2. nadequate road access

BaNES have already accepted that the road access is incapable of coping with the increase in traffic but claim that the increase will be modest. Approx 100 people will have to use the car in order to get anywhere producing a traffic increase of many times the current level.

All planning applications have been refused where there was likely to be an increase in traffic. The Highways Dept. should be asked to examine this proposal from the view point of safety and increase in accidents.

3. Access to amenities

The site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors etc only a steep, unlit and muddy track.

It is an issue that the schooling for increased number of children will be inadequate. This development is unsustainable as everyone will have to use cars to access the basics of life.

4. Size

The site is over half size of the whole of Victoria Park in Bath.

BaNES have not explained how many people they expect OR how they will deal with unauthorised expansion across the site, OR what business activities will be allowed and volume of lorries etc.

5. Overwhelming the nearest settlement

National guidelines state that the site should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement. Even at 20 pitches the travellers would outnumber Stanton Wick's residents, possibly 2 or 3:1

It is unlikely that BaNES will be able to discharge their duty in relation to social cohesion will be ensuring integration.

6. Contamination and safety

In an expert report and survey the site was found to be contaminated with dangerous levels of arsenic that has not been removed. The majority of the site has not yet been surveyed. It has mineshafts and safety issues have not been considered.

7. Traveller preferences

The site has nothing in common with the type of site preferred by travelers as shown in the West of England Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Travellers prefer close proximity to amenities and small family sites of up to 5 pitches.

8. Cost to Tax Payers

BaNES have not explained who will be paying for any or all of work required to make the site habitable, bring in water, sewage and electricity. They have not explained what the cost is for any mine safety work or roadwork costs or the costs to enable children to be accommodated in the schools.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3528 / 1 Name: Mr Oliver Filer Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. Definitely not.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This is in green belt.
Road access very bad.
No amenities.
No services.
No public transport.
Toxic site.
Overwhelm Stanton Wick.

Respondent: 3529 / 1 Name: Mr Ben Filer Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. Greenbelt, poor access, no services. Overwhelms local villages. No public transport.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No totally inappropriate.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This site falls outside of planning guidelines for many reasons. Being greenbelt and poor access.

Respondent: 3530 / 1 Name: Mrs Carol Jackson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I will focus on the issues that make the Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick an unsuitable and inappropriate location for a proposed Gypsy and Traveller site. I will use my local knowledge and base my comments on the information that is available regarding the proposed site.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I disagree with the Council's assessment of opportunities related to this site and strongly believe that the Council is ignoring the constraints of the site (simply because the size of the site delivers a single large site that makes this proposed site a lead contender for the Council).

Stage 1 with the "desktop analysis of sites" to produce the Completed Site Scoring Matrix was flawed for the Old Colliery Buildings. The proposed site can not score one for proximity to a food shop via a safe walking route or score one for proximity to a primary school via a safe walking route when there is no safe walking route. The Detailed Site Assessment Tables under site constraints state that the local primary school is within the 1.5km walking distance but this is not true - there is no safe walking route from the proposed site to the local primary schools. Therefore the overall score should drop to 8 points and the Old Colliery drops a place in the Completed Site Scoring Matrix to 18th place. When there was the opportunity in Stage 2 to reject this proposed site this did not happen but I can not understand why. See further comments below in the Any Other Comments section.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

I disagree that the potential pitch provision at the Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick, should be taken forward as a formal allocation. I believe that the Old Colliery Buildings should not have got through Stage 1 and 2 of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and made it to the Preferred Options consultation.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Please focus your comments on planning issues, national and local policies, government guidance and best practice for Gypsy and Traveller sites.

The Planning Policy Framework 2.7 states that proposals to provide sites...will be permitted on land outside the scope of Policies GDS.1 and HG.4 and 6 provided that:

- i) the site had good access to local services, facilities and public transport.
- ii) it has safe and convenient access to the road network.

Looking at 2.7 point i) there is further information in the Core Strategy Policy CP11 that states:

a) local community services and facilities including shops, schools and health facilities, should be accessible by foot, cycle and public transport. The only local shop to the proposed site is not safely accessible by foot or cycle and is not linked by public transport. This is also true of the local primary schools. Childrens Services have stated that there is room at local primary schools but what is the opinion of Childrens Services on the mode of transport to get to school? There is no public transport within a safe walking distance.

Circulars 01/2006 and 04/2007 state that locations in or near existing settlements are prioritised. This means settlements that are sustainable and have better access to health and education services, shopping facilities, transport networks and employment opportunities. Also this means settlements that are more likely to reduce the need for car travel. As discussed above this does not apply to the settlement of Stanton Wick which in this context matches a remote area rather than a sustainable settlement.

The nearest doctor's surgery is approximately 5 miles from the proposed site. The Detailed Site Assessment Tables under site constraints state that the nearest local doctors surgery is in Chew Magna and accessible by public transport. This is not fact - the surgery has moved further away to Chew Stoke and there is no public transport, in a safe walking distance, from the proposed site. In the UK the Gypsy and Travelling Communities are known to have a lower than average life span and increased morbidity. The distance to access healthcare will not improve these statistics. What is the outcome of the Health Impact/Needs Assessment that BANES PCT were carrying out with relation to this proposed site? It should also be noted that in trying to improve the short and long term health of the Gypsy and Travelling Communities it is illogical to propose a site that is contaminated. Health and Safety Considerations state that it is essential to ensure that Gypsy and Traveller sites provide a healthy and safe environment for residents. Sites should therefore not be located on contaminated land...The Completed Site Scoring Matrix scores this proposed site with minus 10 (high contamination) which is the worst possible score in the Draft Site Selection Scoring Matrix. Also in the Detailed Site Assessment Tables under site constraints it highlights the risk that site residents may be exposed to, due to the site's former use as a colliery yard.

Looking at 2.7 point ii) there is further information in the Core Strategy Policy CP11 that states: b) satisfactory means of access can be provided and the existing highway network is adequate to service the site. The proposed site does not have safe and convenient access to the road network. Wick Lane, Stanton Wick Lane and the associated junctions cannot support any real increase in traffic numbers without significant investment into the highway network. It should be noted that the Council has cited increased traffic volume in refusing previous planning applications made in the Stanton Wick

area. The use of the site would not reduce reliance on the use of private vehicles and the existing highways are of poor nature as detailed in the Detailed Site Assessment Report. The scoring of zero for the existing road network capacity is correct. The proposed site would lead to conflicting movements with other road users especially as existing road users include coaches from the adjacent business of Filers Coaches. The scoring of 5 in the Detailed Site Assessment Report is incorrect when this means safe vehicular access from the public highway. This takes no account that the increased level of traffic on the road leading to the proposed site will decrease the safety of this route. The Draft Site Selection Scoring Matrix states that sites should not be rejected if they would give rise to modest additional daily vehicle movements but the proposed site is not near any facilities and there is no safe way of reaching the facilities without using a vehicle.

The lack of accessible safe walking and cycling, combined with the lack of public transport, with respect to the distance required to access the nearest facilities, simply means that with a proposed site of 20 pitches there will be a significant increase in traffic that the existing road network can not sustain. The Preferred Sites document states that the Old Colliery Buildings proposed site is heavily constrained by its access which is single-track in parts. The Detailed Site Assessment Tables state under Highways that the use of the site would be unlikely to reduce reliance on the use of private vehicles. This is a huge understatement for all the reasons already covered. The need for a full highways assessment was essential before the proposed site was considered further and should have been part of the process in Stage 2 completing the Detailed Site Assessment Tables.

The Core Strategy Policy CP11 states that: e) adequate services including...foul and surface water...can be provided...The water supply in Stanton Wick is unreliable and struggles with the current residents of Stanton Drew. There are no mains sewage systems in Stanton Wick and the proposed site would have to rely on septic tanks - is this acceptable when the proposed site is for 20 pitches?

The Core Strategy Policy CP11 states that: g) the site should...have no adverse impact on protected habitats and species...In the Completed Site Scoring Matrix the proposed site is stated as having a European Protected Species. What impact would the proposed site have on this protected species? The proposed site is within the Green Belt and the Detailed Site Assessment Report point 3.5 states that Travellers sites in the Green Belt are an inappropriate development. Previous planning applications (including application ref: 05/02227/FUL and renewal 10/03029/REN) for this locality have been refused by the Council citing inappropriate development in the Green Belt as one of the reasons for refusal. There are no "very special circumstances" that apply to this proposed site that can be justified, in combination with all the other factors detailed, to make this proposed site appropriate in the Green Belt.

The proposed site of 20 pitches will overwhelm the existing settled community of Stanton Wick. The Detailed Site Assessment Tables class the proposed site as being outside the housing settlement boundary of Stanton Wick yet there is a residential property adjacent to the proposed site and another residential property close nearby. The Detailed Site Assessment Tables state that the proposed site would not directly assist the aim of social integration for the Gypsy and Travellers Community with the settled community. How can this be classed as "not directly" assisting social integration, when there is no indication of how any social integration can or will be developed? The Council is ignoring the need for social integration in the Detailed Site Assessment Tables and list the negative of not directly assisting integration as a benefit for limiting the impact on neighbouring residents.

Point 3.3 of the Detailed Sites Assessment Report, with respect to rejecting sites, identified a number of significant constraints on development of sites. Above I have detailed three out of the four main constraints i.e. Green Belt, landscape or wildlife designation and contaminated land. Alone these are reason to reject the Old Colliery Buildings as a proposed site but adding in the other considerations detailed above, it is overwhelming evidence that this proposed site should be rejected immediately.

Respondent: 3531 / 1 Name: Mr Dean Jackson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I am going to comment on the fact that in my opinion the Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick is not an appropriate location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. This is based on my local knowledge and my understanding of the evidence

available.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I disagree with the Council's assessment of opportunities for this site and in my opinion the Council has failed to recognise the importance of the constraints that the Council detailed in the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document – Preferred Options Stage – Detailed Site Assessment Report.

See the specific points in the Any Other Section below.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

I disagree that the Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick should be taken forward as a formal allocation as a Gypsy and Traveller site. This site should not have been short-listed from the Detailed Site Assessment Report.

In my opinion the process of preparing the Detailed Site Assessment Report was flawed if a site that scored 17th out of 23 made it through to the top 7 sites to be taken forward to this next stage of the process.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Point 3.2 of the Detailed Site Assessment Report identifies that there are four main constraints on the development of sites and one of them is a Green Belt location. The Stanton Wick site is in the Green Belt and in the Draft Site Selection Scoring Matrix this scores zero. There is nothing in the scoring to allow points for very special circumstances – it is either in the Green belt or not.

Point 3.5 of the Detailed Site Assessment Report states that Traveller sites in the Green Belt are an inappropriate development. The Council tries to justify ignoring this in Appendix 5: Detailed Site Assessment Tables of the Detailed Site Assessment Report. In my opinion the proposed site would harm the openness of the Green belt and it would be materially greater harm than that caused by the previous permitted change of use to a single dwelling (application ref: 05/02227/FUL and renewal 10/03029/REN) which has been highlighted in the Detailed Site Assessment Report. There are no "very special circumstances" that apply to this proposed site that can be justified, in combination with all the other factors detailed below, that make this proposed site inappropriate.

The proposed site would overwhelm the established community of Stanton Wick. To state in Appendix 5: Detailed Site Assessment Tables, of the Detailed Site Assessment Report that the proposed sites location outside the main settlement would limit the impact on neighbouring residents is completely incorrect especially when the proposed site is located adjacent to The Winding House (residential property) and Filers Coaches.

There have been past rejections of planning applications related to the Old Colliery Buildings themselves and the adjacent Filers Coaches. If Filers Coaches (a business bringing employment to the area) can be refused an increased number of coaches due to the Green Belt and the impact on the highways then how can the council back track and allow planning permission in the Green Belt with an inadequate Highways infrastructure when it suits the Councils needs rather than the needs of the existing Local Community?

The Core Strategy Policy CP11 point (b) states that satisfactory means of access can be provided and the existing highway network is adequate to service the site. In the Detailed Site Assessment Report it highlights that the use of the site would be unlikely to reduce reliance on the use of private vehicles and that the existing highways are of poor nature. The scoring of zero for the existing road network capacity is correct. The proposed site would lead to conflicting movements with other road users especially when taken on board that existing road users include coaches from the adjacent business of Filers Coaches. Assessment of the Highways should have been carried out before the Council got to this stage. The scoring of 5 in the Detailed Site Assessment Report is inaccurate when this means safe vehicular access from the public highway. This takes no account that the increased level of traffic on the road leading to the proposed site will decrease the safety of this route. The Draft Site Selection Scoring Matrix (Appendix B) states that sites should not be rejected if they would give rise to modest additional daily vehicle movements but the proposed site is no-where near any facilities and has no safe way of reaching the facilities without using a vehicle so daily vehicle movements will be greatly increased with the proposed total of 20 pitches.

The Core Strategy Policy CP11 point (a) states that local community services and facilities, including shops, schools and health facilities, should be accessible by foot, cycle and public transport – they are not for this proposed site. The Detailed Site Assessment Tables score one each for the proximity of the proposed site to a food shop and a primary school via a safe walking route. How can this score one (meaning within 1500m) when there is no safe walking route? This means that on the scoring matrix no score i.e. zero should be used and the overall score for this proposed site reset to 8, dropping this proposed site to 18th in the table.

The land at the Old Colliery Buildings is contaminated. The Detailed Site Assessment Tables score this minus 10 (high contamination) which is the worst possible score available in the Draft Site Selection Scoring Matrix (Appendix B). It then states that sites should not be located on significantly contaminated land.

In order to reject sites Point 3.3 of the Detailed Site Assessment Report identifies that there are four main constraints on the development of sites - Green Belt, ...wildlife designation, flood risk and contaminated land. For the proposed site I have commented on 2 out of 4 and taking into consideration the other points that I have commented on it is my opinion that the proposed site of the Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick should have been rejected before this stage but most definitely should be rejected now.

Respondent: 3534 / 1 Name: Mr Michael Barbour Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Please see below my comments and further information on the proposed development of a Gypsy & Traveller site at the Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

1. In the detailed site assessment no mention has been made regarding the fact that this proposed development would completely overwhelm the local population of Stanton Wick with the population of this site being vastly higher than that of the village. The report states that it would have 'limited impact on neighbouring residents', which is clearly inaccurate.
2. The road network around this site is very limited and cannot sustain the levels of traffic that this site could bring.
3. The local school and food shop are listed as being only 1.5km walking distance from the site. These amenities are located at the bottom of a steep hill from the site. Furthermore this access is via a single lane road which is one of the only two routes to the site and has no pavements or footpaths. Hence not only will the residents be expected to walk 1.5km up and down a steep hill, in the road, they will also have to contend with extra traffic accessing the new site. This is a wholly unsuitable arrangement for the prospective residents.
4. The local food shop mentioned above, which is "walking" distance from the site, is very small and only stocks a very limited range of products.
5. In the Detailed Site Assessment of this site it states that the site benefits from local services. There is no mains sewage system at the site and the mains water supply may require improvement to service the extensive population proposed. These additional upgrades are not mentioned in the report.
6. As the site is an old mine there is the risk of land slip due to mine shafts under the site. The site report makes no reference to this risk.
7. There is very limited local employment in close proximity of this site due to its rural nature. This will put an unfair burden and cost on the proposed residents of this site, as they will have to commute out of the area to find work and further alienate the proposed residents from the local community.
8. Access to the nearest GP surgery from the site has become even harder since the site report was written, as the local GP practice is now located in Chew Stoke and not Chew Magna as mentioned in the report. This site is even more challenging to access than Chew Magna.
9. In the site report there was no mention of the endangered species of wildlife that live at this site and the significant damage that could be caused by the extensive development proposed at this site.
10. This site is in the Green Belt south of Bristol. If this development is allowed at this site it will set the standard for further demands for development in this area.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, I disagree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation because I believe, based on the points I have made above, that this proposed site is wholly unsuitable as a Gypsy and Traveller site.

The site itself is clearly unsuitable as it is in the Green Belt, has poor access, poor services to the site and the development would overwhelm the current local population and damage the resident endangered wildlife.

The site is unsuitable for any Traveller or Gypsy community as the site is isolated. It will not encourage integration into the wider communities. It has very limited employment opportunities. It has very limited public transport. It has very limited and difficult to access local amenities and the site could be dangerous due to contamination issues or mine collapse.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The fact that the council has proposed such a large site for the Gypsy and Traveller community, in a disused colliery, in one of the most rural and remote corners of the Council's area is extremely concerning.

This approach will clearly discourage integration of this minority community into the wider society. This site will encourage marginalisation of the Gypsy and Traveller community as it is so isolated from any conurbation. It is wholly inappropriate for the Council to have proposed not only the site itself with its specific environmental issues but the volume of pitches in this remote area.

The Council should be aware that history has taught us that placing the minority groups of our society away from the main populous will absolutely lead to segregation.

This I believe should be discouraged and there should be more sites proposed but smaller in nature, in a number of different places throughout BANES so that better integration into larger communities should be made available. This approach would give the Gypsy and Traveller community a choice as to which sites across BANES they prefer to use rather than providing them with only one place to go.

Respondent: 3535 / 1 Name: Ms Nicola Hellin Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I feel the the old Colliery development Stanton wick is an unsuitable site because:

1.Greenbelt

It is in greenbelt. National guidelines say that gypsy and traveller sites in green belt "are inappropriate" development. That means that planning permission would not be available.

2.Inadequate road access

In their assessment BaNES accept that the road access is incapable of coping with the increase in traffic but claim that the increase will be modest. Approx 100 people will have to use the car in order to get anywhere producing a traffic increase of many times the current level.

All planning applications have been refused where there was likely to be an increase in traffic. How are BaNES going to keep everyone safe? How are the roads supposed to cope with the traffic without accidents?

BaNES have not even asked the Highways Dept to look at this proposal.

3.Access to amenities

The site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors etc only a steep, unlit and muddy track.

BaNES have not explained where all the children will go to school. How they will safeguard people walking around with no pavements.

This development is unsustainable as everyone will have to use cars to access the basics of life.

4.Size

The proposed 20 pitches is larger than the government's stated maximum making it "difficult to manage." BaNES report boasts that the site has potential to expand to 50 pitches – more than three times the maximum.

The site is over half size of the whole of Victoria Park in Bath.

BaNES have not explained how many people they expect OR how they will deal with unauthorised expansion across the

site, OR what business activities will be allowed and volume of lorries etc.

5.Overwhelming the nearest settlement

National guidelines state that the site should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement. Even at 20 pitches the travellers would outnumber Stanton Wick's residents, possibly 2 or 3:1

BaNES have not explained how social cohesion will be achieved under these circumstances. They are obliged to ensure integration and cohesion. How are they satisfying this requirement?

6.Contamination and safety

In an expert report and survey the site was found to be contaminated with dangerous levels of arsenic that has not been removed. The majority of the site has not yet been surveyed. It has mineshafts and safety issues have not been considered.

BaNES have not explained what they intend to do about this.

7.Traveller preferences

The site has nothing in common with the type of site preferred by travellers as shown in the West of England Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Travellers prefer close proximity to amenities and small family sites of up to 5 pitches.

8.Cost to Tax Payers

BaNES have not explained who will be paying for any or all of work required to make the site habitable, bring in water, sewage and electricity. They have not explained what the cost is for any mine safety work or roadwork costs or the costs to enable children to be accommodated in the schools.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3540 / 1 Name: Mrs Susan Grimes Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes. I am particularly concerned about the site at Old Colliery Buildings Stanton Wick which on all the evidence available is a wholly unsuitable site for a substantial gypsy site or, indeed, any other form of significant residential development.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

1.I understand that Banes undertook an assessment to determine site suitability. I cannot understand how Banes can justify the selection of a site which was rated 17th out of 23 sites considered.

2.The Stanton Wick site is in the green belt and the proposed site would constitute 'inappropriate development in the Green Belt'

3.It is very close to the Pensford Conservation Area. The Council has an obligation to protect the special character of Conservation Areas and clearly a gypsy site adjacent to such an area would be detrimental.

4.The site is dangerous, contaminated with arsenic and has several old mineshafts which render the land liable to subsidence and old coal seams which create a potential fire hazard.

5.There is no public transport within safe walking distance. The existing, infrequent bus service from Pensford would be

utterly inadequate to accommodate the increased local population.

6.The site is inaccessible. The only means of access to the site from Stanton Wick and Pensford is by a poor single carriage, unlit country lane with no pavements. This would be extremely dangerous for children walking to school or playing on the road.

7.Traffic emanating from the site would cause major problems when it reaches the junction at Old Pensford High Street. Old Pensford High Street is a one-way street and not suitable for use as a through route. It was by-passed by the A37 many years ago and is mainly used for local access only. However, the gypsies would have to use the Old High Street to reach the A37 for Bristol and for Pensford School, both of which would cause major problems.

8.There is only, one small local shop, the Post Office in Pensford; no medical facilities and no senior school in Pensford which would mean the gypsies would have to travel several miles on unsuitable, narrow country lanes to reach all of these services.

9.The primary school in Pensford is accessible along a step country lane without a footpath.

10.The nearest health facility is 5 miles away

11.This proposed large development would overwhelm the existing settled community.

12.The site provides a habitat for many rare species and these must be protected.

13.There are no mains services (e.g. gas, water, sewage and electricity). Putting in the necessary infrastructure would be extremely expensive and would be an unwelcome and unnecessary burden on the Banes tax-payers.

14.The site is much larger than the area earmarked as a Gypsy and Traveller Site. I understand that gypsies and travellers prefer to live in groups and are concerned about uncontrolled expansion.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

I consider the Stanton Wick site wholly unsuitable. It would devastate the green belt and communities in the Mendip Hills; an area of outstanding natural beauty.

There are other more suitable sites available in Bath & NE Somerset which is not in the green belt. There is a large area of surplus land available for residential use at the former MOD site in Lansdown, Bath. This is a brownfield site; it is not located in the green belt or in a conservation area, or in an area of outstanding natural beauty. The MOD land is located near to all amenities, has all mains services and is more easily accessible by road and public transport than the site at Stanton Wick.

Alternatively there is surplus industrial land available in Keynsham following the closure of the Cadburys factory.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Stanton Wick is not on a recognised traveller route.

Pensford was identified as being of special architectural and historic interest and was designated a Conservation Area in May 1988. The Council has a duty to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. I would refer you to Bath & NE Somerset's own "Conservation Area Character Appraisal" approved by the Council in 2008 which states: "Pensford's inclusion within the Bristol-Bath Green Belt signifies the importance of the landscape setting and helps to prevent development which would be harmful to the area".

Respondent: 3541 / 1 Name:

Organisation: Pensford Parish Council

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

B&NES Local Plan adopted 2007:

Policy GB1 :The proposed development of this size would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Policy GB2:The proposed development of this area would detract from the openness and rural character of this area within the designated Green Belt.

Policy T1: The proposed location is remote and far from services and public transport facilities. This would create an increase in vehicle movements to and from the site which will have a detrimental impact on travel journeys and the environment in this area.

National Planning Policy Framework March 2012

a)Core planning principles item 17: the proposed development does not protect the Green Belt or recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside or support the rural community around this site.

b)Supporting a prosperous rural economy item 28: This proposed development does not support the existing local businesses within the vicinity and could be detrimental to them.

c)Travel Plan: This proposed development will generate significant amounts of movement and therefore a travel plan will be required.

d) D:) minimise journey lengths item 37: this proposed development will maximise journeys as there are not immediate employment, shopping leisure, education and other activities in this area.

Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012:

a)Protect the Green Belt, item 4: This states that the Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development. This proposed development is inappropriate development.

b)Provision of suitable accommodation, item 4: This proposed development will have little or no access to education, health, welfare and employment. The local schools are full, the nearest doctors are 5 miles away, no welfare services and there is little employment in the area.

c)Protection of local amenity and environments, item 4: This proposed development will have a huge impact on Stanton Wick and the neighbouring villages. Stanton Wick population will double and so will the traffic on the country lane going through it.

d)Sustainable economically, socially and environmentally, item 11a-f: This proposed development goes against everything stated in this planning policy . There will not be an integrated co-existence between the site and the community. There is no public transport to this site or to the village. The access road is a single country lane, there is no mains services.

e)Policy C, site in rural areas item 12: States that the local planning authority should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community. The proposed development will out-number the existing residents of Stanton Wick.

F) Policy E, traveller sites in Green Belt item 14: Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved. Travellers sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

Policy H, determining planning applications for travellers sites item 23: This proposed site will not respect the scale of the community, it will dominate the local community and will place undue pressure on the local infrastructure. The country lane is unsuitable for this amount of additional traffic, the access into and out of Stanton Wick from the main road is extremely dangerous as vision is impaired in both directions.

Respondent: 3544 / 1 Name: Mr John Spencer Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

There are a considerable number of reasons why this site is unsuitable for development as a site for Travellers and Gypsies (either 'static' or itinerant):

Issues relating to accessibility (particularly poor roads in the immediate vicinity), unsuitability of the site (chemical contamination and physical hazard), the lack of any significant local 'developable' amenities (school, shops, medical centres, etc), and, closely linked with the previously mentioned issues, the quite small existing communities which lie within a mile or so of the old colliery site.

However, looking beyond these apparently surmountable obstacles, there remain underlying issues of Planning not least the fact that the site is within the Green Belt.

So far as I am aware, all previous planning applications in the area have been considered within the context of the Green Belt legislation and regulation. I understand that development, already granted for a single dwelling, on the old colliery site was limited specifically because it lies within the Green Belt.

It would be a seriously retrograde step to abandon all that has been achieved (and hitherto, on the whole, maintained) over the years since the designation of the Green Belt in this part of the county.

Whatever may be the feelings of obligation to assist Gypsies and Travellers in their desire to have accessible sites, the fact remains that Green Belt legislation and regulation has been of enormous benefit in helping to maintain not only beautiful countryside, but countryside near to urban areas and accessible to those who live in those areas. In these stressful times it is becoming obvious that accessible open areas of countryside are acquiring not less importance, but more, as 'breathing spaces' for all: country-dwellers and town-dwellers alike, but particularly the latter.

Were the proposals to develop the Old Colliery site to be carried forward the damaging results would be two-fold:

1. The immediate environment of the Old Colliery would become a non-Green Belt area itself and the associated issues would seriously damage the amenity value of a considerable portion of this part of Bath and North East Somerset.
2. More insidiously, the principles hitherto applied to planning applications and development would have been 'fatally' undermined. If that site were to be granted permission to develop on the lines suggested, what hope is there for any other site in the area to retain the benefits and advantages to all of the existing Green Belt designation?

My wife and I wish to express our very strong opposition to the proposed development of the Stanton Wick Colliery Site.

Respondent: 3547 / 1 Name: Mo Abolkheir Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes

This site is not in a sustainable location. It is too remote, has poor access to public transport, employment, shops, doctor's surgery and therefore there will be a reliance on private cars which will add to traffic and noise pollution.

The location is within Green Belt which is not appropriate development according to both national and local guidelines. Local residents struggle to obtain planning permission for much smaller developments.

Roads are inadequate for any increase in traffic. The road is narrow, with reduced visibility on three 90 degree bends, there are very few passing places and it is steep, especially down into Pensford. Wick Lane also runs straight into the Pensford Conservation Area which is already congested at peak times.

The size of the proposed development will overwhelm the nearest settled community of Stanton Wick which is only approximately 60 residents.

There is little infrastructure – no mains sewerage, no gas, poor water pressure and the electricity supply will need to be upgraded.

The area has significant ecological and historical significance for the area and a large development will impact on this and potentially put this at risk.

Any development must be undertaken extremely sensitively otherwise it will change the character of the area.

The site is contaminated with arsenic.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

I don't think that the constraints have been properly or fully assessed by the Council.

This site is very inappropriate for a development any larger than 1 dwelling as per the current permitted plan.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

This is a large unsuitable development in Green Belt. Local residents would not get planning permission for such a development and therefore I do not see why a certain section of society should be given preferential treatment in planning terms.

There must be other appropriate sites outside the Green Belt that will satisfy the needs of Gypsy Travellers and have less of an impact on the settled community and not harm the Green Belt.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Bringing an such an inappropriate site into a consultation phase has had a big impact on the settled residents. I understand that the proposal contradicts many local and government guidelines in the provision of Gypsy Traveller sites and therefore the Stanton Wick site is highly unlikely to receive planning permission for all the reasons stated above.

I therefore urge the Council to remove the Stanton Wick site from the list of considered sites..

Respondent: 3547 / 2 Name: Mo Abolkheir Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Green Belt – This is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to national and local guidelines.

Highways – The roads are inappropriate due to their alignment, junctions, visibility, narrow width, unlit and no pathways, as per planning refusals in the area. The roads cannot sustain an increase in traffic and I estimate that 20 pitches will produce 60 – 80 cars. One exit through Pensford to the A37 crosses 2 old narrow bridges that will require a survey.

Unsustainable location – There is poor access to amenities including schools, employment, shops, GP and transport. Heavy reliance on private vehicles which is contrary to national guidelines and BaNES own DPD.

Overwhelming development – The size and scale of the development will dominate the nearest settlement of Stanton Wick, which consists of 26 houses and approximately 60 people. The proposed development will consist of up to 200

people, 60-80 cars and 60 caravans.

Contamination/Hazardous - The site is contaminated with arsenic (please see Sanctus report filed with the current approved Planning Permission 10/03029/REN) and is hazardous due to it is an ex-mining site.

Achievable –the roads are substandard for an increase in any type of traffic, let alone large towing vehicles; there is no mains sewerage or gas and the water and electricity supplies will need to be upgraded. A cost has been estimated at anything between £2-4 million, including mains sewerage; remediation; upgrade to highways and utilities costing between £100k - £200k per pitch. This is not affordable unless the number of pitches is expanded considerably which is totally inappropriate.

Site of Nature Conservation – A large proportion of the site is designated SNCI, which has been ignored in this process. There is evidence that the area is the habitat of a European Protected Species and there are tree preservation orders in the area of woodland. This is a precious environment for the local wildlife and any large development will impact upon it.

Pensford Conservation Area – One of the exits of Wick Lane is through this designated Conservation Area which will undoubtedly be impacted with an increase in traffic.

Social Integration/Cohesion – This can never be achieved because residents persistently and consistently have planning refused for minor developments/extensions that would be far less intrusive than this proposed development. Planning permission granted to one section of the community when it is denied to others will cause resentment within the community. Planning Policy for Travellers – Equality Impact Assessment March 2012 states:

‘The Government’s overarching policy aim is fair and effective provision of authorised sites for travellers to facilitate the traditional and nomadic way of life of these groups whilst respecting the interests of the settled community.’

The suggestion of converting the buildings to educational facilities and for business use is unfair when the settled community does not have access to such educational facilities in Stanton Wick and the Coach Depot next door has been consistently refused planning permission to expand. This approach is hardly likely to foster good relations within the community.

Brownfield – There is some dispute as to whether this is indeed a brownfield site and how much of the site is brownfield. I believe that B2 was not granted for the concrete works after mining was abandoned on the site and that only the buildings can be considered brownfield. Any development in between the buildings will not protect the openness of Green Belt.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. I do not agree with the Council’s assessment of the opportunities and constraints on this site because 1) the data published by the Council contains numerous basic errors regarding the site (please see attached letter). And 2) I am still unsure of the full assessment of the opportunities & constraints, because the consultation is based on misleading data:

The criteria scoring matrix is inappropriate and the scores have been inappropriately applied.

Information that was available to the Senior Planning Officer in February and March via your Internal Consultation Process was ignored (Highways, contamination, Ecology) and led to inappropriate scoring.

Public Consultation was not a proper consultation and I am still waiting for answers to questions which will help me understand what the opportunities and constraints are.

Staff from Planning Services were contradicting each other

I still don’t know how many people, children, cars, caravans will be on the site

I still don’t know which part of the site will be used

I do not think that the Council or its officers know what the constraints are because this site shouldn’t have been considered as a Gypsy Traveller site after the first stage as it is totally inappropriate.

The site has been made to fit the scoring matrix, not the other way around.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I do not agree that this potential pitch provision should be taken forward as a formal allocation.

There are far too many constraints on this site as pointed out above and in my very detailed letter.

Other sites were rejected earlier on in the process for far fewer constraints than the rejected sites.

This site is only achievable if the highways infrastructure is upgraded and this would mean changing the whole rural character of the area, which would be unacceptable in Green Belt and would impact negatively on the settled communities of Stanton Wick, Stanton Drew and Pensford, who chose a rural area to live.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am deeply concerned that the process has been so flawed. Planning issues have been ignored as have both the national and local policies.

Planning Policy for Travellers March 2012 – states clearly that it is important to include early consultation with both Gypsy Travellers and the local community. In addition it states that Gypsy Traveller sites are inappropriate development in Green Belt.

Very Special Circumstances through lack of sites in non-Green Belt cannot be argued. There are 3 MoD sites and further sites coming forward that are not in Green Belt. This negates your argument as sites are available to be put forward. In addition other sites were rejected for less substantial constraints than the Stanton Wick site.

The Equality Impact Assessment March 2012 states that Gypsy Traveller sites should not be granted planning permission where the settled community is refused permission because of the perception of unfairness. Residents consistently and persistently have planning permission refused. Please refer to the site's own planning history and that of Tia Filer Coach Depot next door.

The proposal in contrary to national and local policy because of its size, its location, its inappropriateness and its unsustainable location.

The process is not robustly evidence-based contrary to national & local guidelines.

It is highly unlikely that the proposal would be granted planning permission due to its constraints and therefore should not have been considered as a Gypsy Traveller site.

Respondent: 3547 / 3 Name: Mo Abolkheir Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes – please also refer to attached letter.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the above proposal due to the total unsuitability of the site for a large Gypsy and Traveller site and for the deeply flawed process.

I wish to confirm that I am in favour of authorised gypsy traveller sites in appropriate locations and my objections are on the following grounds:

- a flawed and less than transparent process;
- a substantial number of fundamental errors within your documentation, which contrary to National guidelines was not robustly evidence-based; and
- the substantial and valid planning grounds.

I am concerned by the phrasing – 'Preferred Options' in the 'consultation' documentation, which also includes a picture of the Stanton Wick site in the DPD and the Call for Sites Leaflet. Someone made a 'preferred' choice which, together with the photograph of our site, suggests pre-determination and I note that without all these preferred 6 sites the Council is unable to fulfil its commitment for the provision of the total number of Gypsy & Traveller sites.

In addition the Council is working on the presumption that the GTAA 2007 figures are appropriate and these should be reassessed at the earliest opportunity to ensure that they are robust figures. If they are not then the Council has an opportunity to either lower the number of required pitches or increase the number of pitches in order to fulfil Gypsy Traveller needs.

Council's documentation

There are a number of fundamental errors within the documentation and some of these errors should not have occurred as the information was known to the Senior Planning Officer in March, according to your internal consultation which appeared to begin in February 2012. Indeed in March 2012 the following departments pointed out the significant constraints with the site: Highways, Contamination & Ecology. Highways even pointed out that "The only site that would be rejected at this stage on highway and sustainability grounds is the Old Collier (sic) Buildings, Stanton Wick."

Criteria Matrix Scoring

Your criteria matrix should have been robust enough to objectively compare the sites enabling you to take the top scoring

sites onto the 2nd stage. Instead you have a subjective matrix that you have made the Stanton Wick site fit within, in addition there is a photograph of the Stanton Wick site in the DPD and the Call for Sites leaflets. This begs the question from many residents 'is this site pre-determined?' You state in the DPD Criteria Matrix that: "Note: This scoring system is for comparative purposes and will not be decisive in selecting preferred sites". Why bother having objective scoring criteria? Meghan Rossiter stated at the Stanton Drew Public Meeting that the criteria matrix did not produce the result required, which result was that?

I also understand that a second phase of selection was undertaken but if so:

- Why was this not mentioned when the validity of a site coming 17th out of 23 but on a short list of 7 was questioned? The second stage selection process only came out in early June at the Council's public meetings. Apparently the selection criteria matrix was a 'desk top exercise' according to Cllr Ball.
- When was the second level of criteria devised?
- When will the criteria be made available for residents to assess themselves?
- There was an opportunity to publish the other criteria within the DPD why was this not published?

Your scoring matrix is deeply flawed and instead of scoring 10 points the site should score -9 points (minus 9) as per the table and explanation added as Appendix 1.

Three of the errors in the matrix were known through the original Internal Consultation process:

- Food shop is identified as a Post office in the original Internal Consultation Detailed Assessment table which I believe was issued by the Senior Planning Officer.
- Hazardous (potential risks identified from mining).
- A member of staff commented on the ecological issues including the fact that the site is SNCI designated: "Big issues here! Site designated and significant records for European species. Would be a difficult site to develop without significant ecological impacts."

Food shop should be 0 not 1, SNCI should be -5 not 0, hazardous should be 0 not 5. This is a difference of 11 points and the issues were known in March 2012. I do not consider this to be high quality work.

I do not believe that the site is brownfield. Mining is designated sui generis and we are unable to find any evidence that B2 use was permitted for the concrete works. The spoil heap and disused tip are now grown over and provide a wildlife habitat; the site is not a large derelict area ripe for development, it is a site within the Green Belt it is only the buildings that can be developed, which is confirmed by the restrictions on the current single dwelling planning permission. Therefore it is possible that only a small part of the site could be designated as brownfield and no development could be permitted outside the current footprint of the buildings, which would make the current proposal of 20 pitches unachievable. If the site is not brownfield then the scoring matrix would be further reduced by 5 points to -14.

Preferred Options Document

This document is undated but forms part of the Council Cabinet papers for the meeting on 9 May 2012.

The document states that "The Council is only seeking views on the seven identified sites, and not the principle of allocating sites".

The Council also claim that the "preferred sites identified in this document as being suitable, available and achievable for development".

I object to both these statements as the principle of allocating sites is deeply flawed (otherwise how could such an unsuitable site be on the short list together with two other inappropriate sites – Radstock and Keynsham?) and residents have an extremely strong case that the site is NOT suitable and any development will only be achievable at a considerable cost, both in terms of money and impact on the local area and on the local community.

GT.2 – potential pitch provision – states that the site benefits from extant planning permission (05/02227/FUL & 10/03029/REN) – this is correct but I would like to point out that it is only the buildings that have planning permission NOT the whole site and that even the permission granted is restricted and conditional. It would be highly inappropriate if the Planning Department suddenly removed those restrictions for the proposed development of a Gypsy Traveller site. In addition the only part of the site that can be considered to be previously developed are the buildings. The greater part of the site is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. The site is also within the Green Belt.

The site is not well screened from its neighbours – The Winding House is a structure of three floors, is one metre from the north boundary of the site, and is bordered on two sides. It will be impossible to screen the site effectively, and the proposed residents will not enjoy privacy.

I note that the existing buildings on-site present an opportunity for reuse as utility blocks and community space including educational facilities and space for business. I am extremely concerned about the use of buildings for these purposes given

that current local residents do not enjoy the same facilities. I feel it unjust that one section of the community obtain facilities not available to others, this will not aid social integration and is more likely to increase divisions between the communities. Indeed the Planning Policy for Travellers – Equality Impact Assessment March 2012 states:

‘The Government’s overarching policy aim is fair and effective provision of authorised sites for travellers to facilitate the traditional and nomadic way of life of these groups whilst respecting the interests of the settled community.’

I note that the site would require remediation works and there is evidence in the Sanctus Report, which is available with the current planning permission documentation on the BaNES website that this is due to arsenic contamination on the site, which will be costly to rectify and must be subject to proper scrutiny by an expert in this field.

The document also states that “The site is heavily constrained by its access which is single-track in parts. Your statement is incorrect – the lane is not just single-track ‘in parts’ – it is substantially single track with few passing places.

The Highways agency has refused far smaller developments on the basis of BaNES Local Plan Policy T24 as well as the inappropriate “width, alignment and junctions”.

Preferred Options Stage - Detailed Site Assessments

The Council could not have assessed the site’s suitability, nor was it assessed “taking into account policy requirements, physical site constraints and potential impacts arising from development of sites” as stated in point 2.9 of the document. I note that “this removed a number of sites from consideration due to incompatibility with national planning guidance”. The Stanton Wick site is incompatible with national planning guidance – Green Belt, size, unsustainable location due to reliance on cars, no facilities, no amenities, local residents refused planning permission persistently and consistently, impact on Conservation Area etc, etc.

Point 2.12 of the assessment also states that “to assess achievability all known constraints were identified to draw out site delivery costs such as infrastructure and remediation works”.

Had the Council assessed the Stanton Wick site objectively this site would have been removed from the list due to incompatibility with national planning guidance, Green Belt, size, appropriateness in the rural environment, strain on the infrastructure, physical site constraints – not to mention contamination, and costs of remediation. Taking all this into account the site is NOT achievable.

Detailed Site Assessment Tables

There appear to be a number of inaccuracies in the table as well as in some of the statements. I have asked where the information contained in the table came from but I understand from S de Beer that site specific questions will be incorporated into the report to the Cabinet in September and residents’ questions will not be answered.

You state in the Detailed Site Assessment Table that the “site benefits from existing on-site services and utilities” which is incorrect. Some utilities are non-existent (mains sewerage & gas); some are overstretched already (mains water & electricity) and septic tanks in that area will pose a serious threat to Salters Brook at the bottom of the hill, which in turn flows into The Chew River in the Conservation Area of Pensford.

I have already pointed out that the current planning permission for one dwelling is subject to conditions and restrictions and I trust that the Council will adhere to these, whatever the development.

You have acknowledged that the development of the site would not directly assist the aim of social integration and I strongly agree. You state that it provides “a site capable of accommodating several families and, potentially, future household growth” (my italics). As I object to 20 pitches naturally I would object to any further development. The only sensible number of pitches is one as there is currently planning permission for the one dwelling, however the pitch would need to be contained within the building granted approval for the dwelling and any other use of the subsequent buildings should be ancillary as per the current planning permission.

I am concerned that you believe that the introduction of caravans or mobile homes behind a well-designed boundary scheme (please refer to the current planning permission 05/02227/FUL & renewal 10/03029/REN for conditions on landscaping) “will have little impact.” On the contrary it will impact on The Winding House which is a three storey residential building and it will be impossible to screen the site so as to give the site residents privacy, or the site from the house.

Impact in the area will not just be visual – there will also be noise in what is an extremely quiet rural area.

I was extremely surprised that you believed that “the landscape to the immediate North of Wick Lane is not particularly sensitive and could possibly accommodate such a development”. I refer you to the BaNES Planning Services Brochure – Pensford Character Report – containing a map of the area to the North of Wick Lane which is a designated Conservation Area with sixteen structures on the statutory list of Buildings of Special Architectural and Historic Interest in Pensford and one scheduled ancient monument. Surely this is a gross error.

In the section on Highways you recognise that “the reduction of the traffic generation from the former industrial site would be of benefit, whilst recognising that the site is not in a sustainable location” and

that “use of this site would be unlikely to reduce reliance on the use of private vehicles” and that “a full highways assessment should be conducted to assess this need and assess the level of development that the site and surrounding highway network could accommodate”.

I would like to point out that:

traffic movement is significant in the lane;

planning permission for Tia Filer Coaches has been refused – one of the reasons being traffic;

that you state that this is NOT a sustainable location;

in the DPD you state that “Reducing reliance on car travel is an important objective of local and national policy”

Given the above why is the site on the short list, let alone in the 8 week consultation process? Surely if a highways assessment was required for a severely constrained site, wouldn't it have been better to get an idea of what the approximate needs were and whether they could be accommodated? Or does the Council propose to compulsorily purchase land to widen the road to accommodate the development? Such a move would be highly inappropriate in the Green Belt, not to mention changing the rural character of the area and impacting on Pensford's Conservation Area. In the Site Constraints section you point out that remediation works are required and a land contamination survey is required and available from the land owner. There is a survey on the BaNES website which accompanies the planning application number 10/03029/REN. Contamination of the site will be covered in a later section.

Sustainability Appraisal

This document is dated April 2012 but was not available to the public until after 15 May 2012. It would have been helpful to have had access to this document before the Cabinet meeting on 9 May and the Scrutiny Panel Meeting on 15 May.

Objective 3:

“Would provide a large site as well as potentially permanent and transit needs”. Large sites are contrary to National guidelines, please refer to the Government's EIA March 2012 and I understand that Gypsy Traveller communities do not like a mix of permanent and transit pitches because the permanent residents cannot be sure who is on the transit pitches. You also state that ‘Condition of allocation to make provision for affordable accommodation to meet identified need’. Local residents have estimated the cost of providing the site at anything between £2-4 million, including mains sewerage; remediation; upgrade to highways and utilities costing between £100k - £200k per pitch. This is not affordable unless the number of pitches is expanded considerably which would be totally inappropriate.

Objective 4:

Promote safer stronger and more vibrant and cohesive communities. You state “Not in a sustainable location due to lack of facilities and access to local settlements. Would be isolated from local settlement which may give rise to tension with local communities due to allocation of site in rural location and adjacent to residential properties” – you have no recommendations to mitigate.

You also state that the “existing site does suffer vandalism so occupation of the site could be beneficial” – I have spoken to residents who have lived in the vicinity for a long period and no one that I have spoken to remembers any vandalism, apart from some graffiti on the Dabro sign by the entrance to the site.

You also acknowledge that the allocation of the site “may give rise to criminal offenses regarding protected habitats”. The site at the rear of Churchlands in Clutton was next door to an SNCI and this was one of the reasons that the site was rejected, yet you acknowledge that the Stanton Wick site is the habitat of a protected species which could be impacted so how will this environment be safeguarded?

Objective 5:

You state that there is ample provision of primary and secondary education in the area but I dispute that the sort of numbers that are estimated – up to 80 primary school age children cannot be accommodated in the nearby schools. There is little employment in the Chew Valley and permitting business use on the site would be unfair especially as Tia Filer coaches next door has been refused planning permission to park 8 extra buses.

Objective 6:

Whilst I totally agree with sustainable construction principles I believe that only the buildings are ‘brownfield’ not the whole of the slag heap and tip. The current planning permission restricts the use of the ‘ancillary buildings’ to prevent over intensive use of the site. This suggests that only the buildings/footprint of the buildings can be developed, this does not including the spaces in between the buildings nor the rest of the site be developed.

Objective 7:

You state that the site is “not sustainably located for access to public transport” and you have no recommendations to mitigate. I do not believe that there is a public footpath from the site to Pensford. There is a public footpath on the land owned by the Winding House next door but this is a challenging walk, muddy, steep, unpaved and unlit.

There would be an increase in the reliance on fossil fuels arising from the use of private vehicles.

Objective 8:

This is a historically sensitive site being the last red brick colliery in England and should be treated with the sensitivity that the site and the local community deserve. There are numerous restrictions with the current planning permission which must be adhered to. Whilst redevelopment of existing buildings may well improve the existing setting, siting caravans amongst historic buildings will surely detract from the character of the area as an old colliery? Surely a single dwelling would be a far more sensitive development?

Objective 9:

Protect habitat and biodiversity – there is a real risk that the habitat of the greater and lesser horseshoe bat could be diminished, the TPOs compromised and the SNCI ignored. There has been no attempt to survey the area to ascertain the extent of the habitat of the horseshoe bat. This area is of real importance to the local wildlife and the local community.

Objective 10:

A large development on a quiet rural lane will have a real impact on the air and noise pollution even in the short term. On Wick Lane there are houses very close to and even right on the very narrow lane. The significant increase in traffic (60 cars plus) will produce air pollution and increase the level of traffic noise for the settled community. In addition, the increase in population including a significant number of children playing outside will increase the amount for noise for the residents of Wick Lane who chose to live in a quiet rural area, away from built up areas. This will significantly impact on our quality of life.

In summary, the Sustainability Appraisal is based on unfair mitigation/enhancement (education and business facilities on-site that would not be permitted for the settled community) and does not seek to maximise the protection of the historical setting not the ecological habitat which are of great importance to the settled community. In addition there is no mitigation for the unsustainable location and the reliance on private vehicles which is contrary to both your own and national guidelines.

Consultation

I have been extremely frustrated by the whole process thus far and, after speaking to numerous residents, including those in Radstock, Keynsham and Whitchurch, they appear to have the same view.

Development of any nature in Green Belt is a particularly difficult balancing act and the development of Gypsy Traveller sites can be emotive. I would have thought that B&NES would have sensibly recognised this and behaved accordingly. There was no reason for the process to be so fraught and to have piled huge amounts of stress onto the local populations in Stanton Wick (including Stanton Drew & Pensford & Publow), Ellsbridge House & Snapdragons Nursery and Radstock. I feel that the consultation has been barely addressed, both in the pre-planning stages, when the government's March 2012 guidance included early consultation with the settled communities, and up until now.

Consultation Documentation

The DPD and call for sites has a picture of the Stanton Wick site taken from the next door field showing the telephone mast and the top of one of the buildings in Filers Coaches – this seems to suggest that the site was pre-determined.

The consultation documentation is of extremely poor quality with numerous errors as detailed above. How can proper consultation take place when it is based on erroneous material?

The claim by the Council with regard to consultation is disingenuous. I understand that there were no advertisements in local papers but there were press releases which were picked up by the Bath Chronicle & the North Somerset Guardian, two papers that are not that widely available within the Chew Valley – the area of the largest site. It is also claimed that Parish Councils were consulted. Again, disingenuous as they were only consulted on the DPD not the individual sites until 17/18 April 2012.

I cannot understand why there wasn't any proper pre-consultation on each site – at least with the Parish Councils – for such a sensitive issue and to at least check the validity of the data to be used. The Parish Councils would have been able to point out missed data (impact on Pensford Conservation Area) and incorrect data. Early and effective consultation is clearly advocated within the March 2012 government guidelines.

It is not acceptable to hide behind the phrase 'this consultation is in addition to the statutory consultation'. I reiterate that the subject is sensitive and has impacted negatively on numerous families and caused great harm. The Council has not adhered to the spirit of a proper consultation process. This has led to mistrust of the Council.

It is clear that the March 2012 government guidelines were not included in the process as there are considerations that have not been referenced by B&NES:

Planning Policy for Travellers Sites – Equality Impact Assessment, March 2012:

- that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development
- 'A more permissive policy for traveller sites in relation to Green Belt can create perceptions of unfairness amongst

people, which can in turn lead to community tensions. Aligning the policy, where effective, with those for general housing may help decrease the view that traveller sites receive favourable treatment in the planning system and thus reduce the community tension this view can cause. Ensuring consistency between policy for traveller and settled communities should help to address views about unfairness in the planning system. This will help to promote community cohesion which will have benefits for both the settled and traveller communities.'

- There is a potential risk that local planning authorities will only bring forward large parcels of land for sites rather than the small ones that are desired by travellers.

Council Meetings

The Cabinet meeting on 9 May to discuss the 7 preferred sites picked from a shortlist of 23, was a picture of flawed democracy. I was expecting the Cabinet to be properly briefed and to actually listen to the representations that were made by local residents. What I was not expecting was for the Councillor responsible to read from a prepared statement which must have been printed before the meeting, nor was I expecting a lecture on equality or being labelled as anti-gypsy. I was absolutely appalled, especially when Councillor Ball also stated that the sites on the original shortlist which had been discounted would not be revisited.

I was also appalled that the Scrutiny Panel's recommendation was completely ignored by Cabinet and that not one member of Cabinet attended the meeting. Roger Symonds claimed on 13 June meeting that he did attend but this is disingenuous. Attending 15 minutes of a long meeting with representations from residents and Councillors is not attending a meeting.

At the Cabinet meeting on 13 June and again after representations from the public and Councillors, Councillor Ball read from a prepared statement that the Council was listening and would take the statements into consideration when making the decisions in the September Cabinet meeting. How can the Cabinet have listened when evidence that the Stanton Wick site was so inappropriate had already been put before the Cabinet on numerous occasions, only to have our valid and substantial planning issues dismissed?

The Special Council Meeting on 18 June again the decision was pre-determined and the Liberal Democrats gave a pre-printed statement which was available before the meeting. This is in response to valid planning concerns of residents and the legal concerns made by Richard Harwood, which makes a mockery of a democratic process.

This makes it quite clear that the Council are not listening.

Public Consultation Meetings

I was particularly unimpressed with the quality of the information available at the Public meetings and the lack of knowledge of the officers.

Hardly any questions were answered in the meetings and those that were are open to challenge. The issue of brownfield site provoked a number of different answers:

- Meghan Rossiter stated that we have classified the site as brownfield. When challenged as to how much was brownfield Meghan stated that the 'shale' was brownfield.
- Simon de Beer stated that only the area within the developed boundary (ie the buildings and yard) will be developed and that the caravans will fit in between the buildings.
- Tim Ball stated (after a challenge on the legalities by Clarke Osborne) that the caravans would only fit within the current building footprints.

Most of the residents found it difficult to obtain any useful information from your officers. In fact Meghan Rossiter was challenged on the Selection Criteria Matrix – why was the SNCI ignored on the scoring matrix and she replied that she didn't see it on 'her computer' when it is clearly marked on the Local Plan – a copy of which we brought along to the meetings. I subsequently learnt that the SNCI was brought to the Senior Planning Officer's attention in March 2012. In addition when challenged on the 'landscape to the North of Wick Lane not being particularly sensitive' when it is Pensford Conservation Area – Meghan replied that it was the Landscape Department and I was more than welcome to contact them. I came away finding it very difficult to understand why our site had been chosen as a 'Preferred Option'.

Had this been a proper meaningful consultation process the officers would have made every effort to take notes and listen to the substantial and valid concerns and errors that were pointed out to them.

Green Belt

The proposed site of the development is well within the Green Belt. Even though there are buildings on part of the site, this does not make the whole site (or even 2.5 hectares) 'brownfield'.

Development of the site contradicts the government guidelines (Planning Policy for Travellers March 2012 & National Policy Framework March 2012); local guidelines (BaNES Local Plan) and BaNES own Planning Department (Planning

Permission refusals for Tia Filer coaches.)

Some of the relevant policies are as follows:

B&NES Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007:

Policy GB1: the proposed development of this area would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt

Policy GB2: the proposed development of this area would detract from the openness and rural character of this area within the designated Green Belt. (This is irrespective of how the site looks at present)

National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012

Core planning principles, item 17: the proposed development does not protect the Green Belt or recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside or support the rural community around this site.

Green Belt, item 87: this proposed development is inappropriate and will be harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved.

Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012

Introduction, Protect the Green Belt, item 4: this states that the Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development. This proposed development is inappropriate development

Policy E, traveller sites in Green Belt, item 14: "inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

Planning Policy for Travellers Sites – Equality Impact Assessment, March 2012

that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development

And

'A more permissive policy for traveller sites in relation to Green Belt can create perceptions of unfairness amongst people, which can in turn lead to community tensions. Aligning the policy, where effective, with those for general housing may help decrease the view that traveller sites receive favourable treatment in the planning system and thus reduce the community tension this view can cause. Ensuring consistency between policy for traveller and settled communities should help to address views about unfairness in the planning system. This will help to promote community cohesion which will have benefits for both the settled and traveller communities.'

We have plenty of evidence that there have been Planning Refusals for the settled community, the reason given is Green Belt:

11/03051/FUL 13/07/11: Extend area of coach/bus stationing for an additional 10 vehicles (resubmission).

1. The proposed expansion of the area to be used for coach parking would represent 'inappropriate development' in the Green Belt, and without any very special circumstances applying, and the proposal is contrary to Policy GB1 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007.

2. The proposed expansion of the area used for coach parking and the increase in the number of vehicles parked at the site would detract from the openness and rural character of this area within the designated Green Belt, contrary to Policy GB2 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007.

09/02418/FUL 30/09/10: Extend area of coach/bus stationing for an additional 10 vehicles

1. The proposed expansion of the area to be used for coach parking would amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would harm the openness of the Green Belt and encroach into the countryside. All of this would be contrary to Policy GB.1 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including waste and minerals policies) adopted October 2007.

2. The proposed expansion of the area used for coach parking and the increase in the number of vehicles parked at the site would detract from the openness and rural character of this area within the designated Green Belt, contrary to Policy GB2 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007.

09/2418/QUASH 14/07/2012: High Court Judgement Quashing permitting stationing for an additional 10 vehicles.

A recent pre-planning enquiry from my next-door neighbour has been deemed by your Planning Department as 'harmful to Green Belt' (June 2011).

Green Belt & Very Special Circumstances

The Council claim that the proposed development in this case falls under 'Very Special Circumstances' in the government's Planning Policy March 2012. Policy E, traveller sites in Green Belt, item 14: "inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

The use of the word 'very' and the removal of the word 'normally' from the latest issue of this guidance means that it is to be interpreted narrowly and will only be found to apply in extremely restricted circumstances.

The council asserts that the lack of traveller sites in BaNES, the need for sites to be provided and the relative scarcity of

non green belt land, which is approximately 1/3rd of the Council area, constitutes "very special circumstances." I am strongly opposed to this interpretation as I believe that this does not constitute "very special circumstances." The Council are not legally obliged to provide traveller pitches and in addition I have calculated from the Council's documentation that the whole process from 'consultation' to the publishing of the short listed sites took no more than four months (October 2011 to February 2012). There are 3 substantial MoD sites that are earmarked for housing. The reasons for not including pitches in these developments, that social housing is required and more houses can be supplied than pitches, is a choice rather than a necessity. This contradicts the fact that the Former Canteen in Radstock is proposed for 2 pitches when a housing project was turned down as it was of poor quality.

There are also a number of tolerated unauthorised sites, why were these sites not included in the process? I understand that 3 sites have been put forward in Radstock and there were sites rejected for less substantial reasons than Stanton Wick. This proves that there are sites available outside Green Belt therefore Very Special Circumstances cannot apply. It cannot be claimed that the Stanton Wick site is so good that it contributes to very special circumstances. It contravenes too many guidelines on the provision of traveller sites. It is too large, too remote, the infrastructure cannot cope and it is contaminated. The costs of remediation work; providing utilities etc, will be prohibitive and therefore will not lead to affordable pitches. Any widening of the highways would be prohibitively expensive and would impact on the rural character of the area.

Brown field sites in Green Belt

I would like to comment on the Council's preference for building on land where there are/have been old buildings. There will be some locations where this is entirely appropriate, however this does not make it appropriate in all locations. On the contrary the site is still in Green Belt and again I draw the Cabinet's attention to the fact that only a very small part of the site consists of old buildings.

I refer you to planning application 10/03029/REN dated 18 March 2011, point 7. "The guest accommodation, spa and stable shall only be used for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the main dwelling. Reason: To prevent an over intensive use of the site."

Planning Department also acknowledge in the conditions and restrictions laid down, that the site is of special interest with regard to the materials to be used; the hard & soft landscaping required; the archaeological programme to be undertaken; the Protected Species Survey (for Bat protection); and to provide lighting that ensures the preservation of the bats natural habitat. The Council must adhere to these restrictions for any type of development on the site otherwise this will surely be inequitable.

Scale of the site & Social Integration

Stanton Wick is a small hamlet of approximately 26 houses with 60 residents. The hamlet is spread out and starts a few hundred metres from the A368 finishing at Broadoak Cottage. On Wick Lane from the proposed site to The Lilacs (after the Old Railway Bridge) there are 6 residences with approximately 21 residents using approximately 15/16 cars.

Size & Scale of the site

The size of the site planned is 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches on 2.5 hectares (approximately 6 acres – similar in size to Dale Farm in Essex which ended up with 1000 residents). Using the GTAA 2007 the average pitch is approximately 3 caravans and anything from 200m² to 500 m². Despite asking the question I have no indications of actual numbers so I have calculated the headcount as approximately 200+ people with approximately 60 vehicles and 60 caravans.

I also note that the Council's documentation states that 2.5 hectares are available for development – enough for 50 pitches or 500+ people, 150 vehicles plus and your own Detailed Site Assessment (Appendix 5 of your Preferred Options Stage) explicitly states that:

"However, the site's location outside the main settlement would also limit the impact on neighbouring residents and facilitate the Gypsy way of life by providing a site capable of accommodating several families and, potentially, future household growth."

The size of the proposed development of 20 pitches will dominate the local community by as much as 3 new residents to 1 local resident, contrary to the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites March 2012 Policy C point 12. In terms of the immediate residents, the proposed community will overwhelm them. Even 4 families, irrespective of their ethnicity, will have an impact on the current immediate residents and their rural lifestyle due to increase in noise and traffic.

In addition to ignoring the impact that the size of the proposed community will have on local residents, the Council are ignoring the fact that the recommended maximum size of site is 15 pitches which is deemed to be manageable.

Social Integration

In considering this site as a serious option there is an obligation on B&NES to consider the risks and threats to the social cohesion and peaceful and integrated co-existence between the travelling community and the local settled communities. (Policy B 11a refers).

The domination of one particular group over another well established rural community will not lead to social integration. The Detailed Site Assessment Table states that the “development of this site would not directly assist the aim of social integration ...” which is a key factor to ensure the success of the development.

The rest of the sentence in The Detailed Site Assessment Table quoted above reads “However, the site’s location outside the main settlement would also limit the impact on neighbouring residents”. The Winding House is only 1 metre away from the site and the boundary is on two sides. From the house it will be impossible to avoid overlooking the proposed site. This will mean that screening for both the site residents and the occupants of the Winding House will be impossible.

Highways

The proposed site is on Wick Lane which is a C classified substantially single track road running from the A368 through Stanton Wick straight into Pensford’s Conservation Area and past 11 listed buildings. In essence the lane has changed little over the years apart from the growth of the vegetation and the increase in traffic movements.

- The Lane is rural, narrow along almost its entire length and has few passing places.
- There is restricted width of 6’ 6” from the proposed site to Pensford.
- In places the lane is quite steep especially between the site and Pensford.
- There is no footpath along its entire length.
- There is no lighting.
- In wet periods the land is muddy, making it even more difficult to reverse into the few available passing places.
- In winter the lane is even more hazardous due to icy conditions. It would be easy for cars to get stuck on the ice and block the lane.
- There are three 90 degree bends with extremely limited visibility.
- There have been a number of accidents on the lane, fortunately no one has been injured.
- Access onto the A368 at the T-junction has very limited visibility and is very dangerous. It has been the subject of many near misses and accidents.
- Access to the A37 at Pensford is difficult at peak times. When turning right onto the A37 visibility to the left is limited.
- There are 2 old and narrow bridges from the site to Pensford. Any increase in traffic will have some impact on the medieval bridge in Pensford which has Listed Buildings status. The Old Railway Bridge is fragile with obvious cracks.
- There is already pressure on the lane from traffic movement. All Stanton Wick residents rely on their cars to access shops and healthcare. There are 26 houses each with a minimum of 2 cars, some with 3 cars if young adults are living at home. Conservatively I have estimated that there are some 55 cars in the hamlet and this does not take into account the drivers who work at the Coach Depot who drive to work; the coaches from the Coach Depot; the tractors;

horse owners driving to their paddocks; visitors – especially to the very popular Carpenters Arms.

- If a vehicle gets stuck on the lane it can be hours before the road is passable. In November 2011 a Downton Logistics Lorry got stuck on the Old Railway Bridge. It took 10 hours to get it to a safe area where it could turn around.
- Congestion in the Conservation area of Pensford is already high at peak periods.
- A Coach depot adjacent to the site already places a heavy traffic burden through to the A368. This has been previously recognised by your Planning Department. Indeed the Coach depot has had 2 planning applications turned down in the last 2 years and one is still pending, please see more details below. One of the reasons for refusal was given as “due to an increase in vehicle movements on the road system which is unsuitable to accept additional traffic by reason of its inadequate width, alignment & junction”. It was also deemed to add to congestion and inconvenience for road users contrary to Policy T24 of the BaNES Local Plan.

In January the owner of the proposed site formally objected to the recent Coach Depot’s application to extend this Depot to park 8 additional coaches retrospectively quoting increased traffic movements as one of his reasons.

Your own documentation states that the site is heavily constrained by its access and that ‘reducing reliance on car travel is an important objective of local and national planning’.

This site is not in a sustainable area for development as all residents in Stanton Wick rely on their cars to access shops and healthcare. Any significant increase in the existing traffic on Wick Lane cannot be accommodated.

We have plenty of evidence that the settled community has been refused Planning Permission for the reason of inadequate Highways:

11/03051/FUL 13/07/11: 3. The proposal would be likely to increase vehicle movements, including those of large vehicles, on the local road system which is unsuitable to accept additional traffic by reason of its inadequate width, alignment and junctions. The proposal would therefore be likely to result in congestion and inconvenience to other road users, contrary to

Policy T24 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007. 4. The proposal is in a location remote from services and public transport facilities to enable staff to access the site, and would be likely to increase the vehicle journeys to and from the site both by coaches and other vehicles. This is contrary to Government Guidance in Planning Policy Guidance. Note No 13 and the objectives in respect of reducing the adverse impact of travel on the environment, set out in Policy T1 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007.

A recent pre-planning enquiry for infill the railway cutting was deemed unsuitable by your own Planning Department. The letter stated that 'the proposed access and highway network from the A368 to the site is wholly unsuitable for the type of traffic this development would generate' (4 May 2012).

These examples are only two of a number of applications that have been refused due to poor highways.

Pressure on Local infrastructure

In your document Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) you state:

a) Local Planning Policy Context, item 2.7: the proposed site does not have good access to local services, facilities and public transport, it does not have safe and convenient access to the road network (Stanton Wick junction is notoriously dangerous), it will not blend in as the proposed site is on an elevated position, there are not services for foul and surface water drainage and there will be a harmful impact to local residents and local businesses due to the close proximity of this site. There are no local services within easy walking distance or served by public transport.

B&NES Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) adopted 2007

a) Policy T1: the proposed location is remote from services and public transport facilities. Therefore there will be an increase in vehicle journeys (not a reduction) to and from the site which will have an impact on travel journeys and the environment in this area.

Utilities

There is no mains sewage or gas. Water pressure is extremely low already impacting on the hamlet of Stanton Wick. The electricity is subject to power outages and would need to be upgraded.

Public Transport

As mentioned above the public transport network consists of two buses per hour along the A37. It would be possible to reach a bus network to Bath but only on a road with no footpath.

Schools

An influx of 50-80 children would negatively impact on the local primary schools of Pensford and Stanton Drew, increasing class size. I understand that there may technically be spaces available in the schools but reaching those capacity levels may not actually be possible due to restricted playground space in Stanton Drew and on Health & Safety grounds (fire regulations) in Pensford. This is something that you will need to investigate further rather than relying on statistics.

Healthcare

The closest GP in Chew Stoke is approximately 5 miles away from the site and there are no direct buses. In addition it is already difficult for locals to obtain appointments. Any further impact on the current facilities will require in depth investigation and resolution. Your documentation states that the surgery is in Chew Magna which is incorrect.

Shops

The closest supermarket is probably the Asda in Whitchurch which is approximately 4.5 miles away and not on a direct bus route. There is a Tesco express on the A37 on a bus route but this is not likely to be sufficient for a weekly shop for a family.

Planning Permission for local residents

As mentioned earlier, planning permission for local residents is persistently and consistently turned down due to the Green Belt and inadequate highways. This includes the pre-developed site of Tia Filers Coach Depot next door to the Old Colliery Buildings. Surely a huge development next door to the Coach Depot cannot be considered in light of this? In addition the government's Equality Impact Assessment (March 2012) recommends that Planning permission for Gypsy Traveller sites should not be given where local residents are denied permission.

03/01/12: Erection of extensions, removal of lean-to store to barn, internal alterations and extension of accommodation into attached barn

Withdrawn on advice of Planning Dept

03/01/12: Internal and external alterations for the erection of extensions, removal of lean-to store to barn, internal alterations and extension of accommodation into attached barn

Withdrawn on advice of Planning Dept

25/11/11:

Variation of condition 4 of application WC 6174/E to increase number of coaches kept on site from 12 to 20

Still pending

13/07/11: Extend area of coach/bus stationing for an additional 10 vehicles

Refused – Green Belt - highways

30/12/10: Change of use and conversion of ancillary accommodation to self-contained dwelling and variation of condition 7 of PP 05/02227/FUL

Refused – Policy ET9, Green Belt, fails to demonstrate that bats won't be affected

30/09/10: Extend area of coach/bus stationing for an additional 10 vehicles

Refused – Green Belt - highways

14/12/07:

Change of use of land from B2 to parking and storage of vehicles

Green Belt, Highways, remote from services, employment

The above cases are examples of planning permission refused.

Hazardous Site

The site is hazardous there is evidence that it is contaminated with arsenic, has mine shafts (one of which has recently fallen in and required recapping) and potentially unstable slag heaps, in addition the land is of poor quality. I find it difficult to believe that The Old Colliery Buildings will benefit gypsy/travellers' health and wellbeing and make a suitable site for them.

Contamination

There is a Sanctus report, commissioned by the current owner of the site, which is on the B&NES planning area of the website. This report accompanies the current planning permission of

10/03029/REN. It appears that this report was not taken into consideration in the early stages of the process.

Mining Hazards

There is known to be one mine shaft on the site and it is possible that there are other shafts. A full investigation will need to be undertaken.

Remediation Costs

The remediation costs have been estimated at in excess of £1 million to remove the arsenic contamination from the whole site (to a depth of 600mm as per the recommendation in the Sanctus report). The site will require a full survey and possible remediation, not only of the contamination but of other hazards such as the mineshafts and any vertical and horizontal tunnels, to ensure that the site can be made safe.

This surely will impact on the 'affordable housing' claims within your documentation.

Traveller Requirements

Sites & Best Practice

I refer you to the Government Guidance – Designing Gypsy Traveller Sites. I do not believe that the site will adhere to the Government's Best Practice Guidelines, especially in relation to the Health & Safety aspects. There will need to be an efficient water supply and good access for Fire vehicles to comply with fire regulations.

I also believe that the restrictions on the development of the small 'brownfield' area will not allow Best Practice layouts and turning areas.

Routes

in the last 10 years I believe that the vast majority of the 18 unauthorised sites in BANES have been around the Bath area, in order to take advantage of the proximity to the motorway network. The Stanton Wick site is remote and far removed from the motorway networks.

Gypsy Travellers needs within BaNES

The GTTA 2007 states that the majority of the Travellers within BaNES are New Age Travellers, with some smaller numbers of Irish Travellers.

I would like to understand which group of Gypsy Travellers would be allocated to the Stanton Wick site, as the different

groups are unlikely to share sites. I know that the Irish and Roma Gypsies have protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010.

The Senior Planning Officer responsible for this project has stated that the individual who brought forward the site in November 2011 was Maggie Smith-Bendall.

I would like to understand whether the site is likely to be allocated to either New Age Travellers or Irish Travellers – the two Groups identified with needs in the GTAA 2007, or whether the site will be allocated to the Roma Gypsy community – a group that has not been identified with needs in the BaNES area. If the latter is the case then what impact will this have on the former groups who will still have a requirement for settled and transit pitches?

Summary

The national policy documentation published by government in March 2012 puts Gypsy Traveller site development on a par with other housing development. There is a real risk that once a Gypsy Traveller site is approved (in the Stanton Wick case in Green Belt) there will be nothing to stop a landowner then thanking the Council for the planning permission before they submit a new planning application for a large housing development that the Council will find difficult to refuse, potentially leading to a damaging legal challenge.

This project could have been sympathetically implemented with a robust evidence-based selection criteria matrix and properly researched foundations, which residents would have been unable to challenge legally. Instead there is a flawed process which is open to legal challenge by the current residents in the 3 areas of Stanton Wick, Keynsham and Radstock. The process may even be challenged by residents in Whitchurch and in areas where you identify new sites.

The Council have failed to objectively and fairly assess the site. The Council failed in their duty to the local residents to protect their rights, listen to them and withdraw the site from the short list prior to the 8 week consultation.

It is such a shame that the very section of society that you have sought to protect and assist will now be much further away from authorised sites than they were in November 2011 due to the flawed process. In addition settled communities are now at more risk of unauthorised sites than they were before the process started due to the Council's promotion of various inappropriate sites.

The Council has had many opportunities to step back and review the process but this they have spectacularly ignored, they have failed their settled communities miserably and have raised the expectation of Gypsy Traveller communities.

The Council should recognise that the process has been inappropriate and that they are culpable, they should review and amend the process so that other communities do not bear the stress that we have had to bear.

I hope that the Council will now truly sit back and listen to residents and that the inappropriate sites, including Stanton Wick, will be removed from the Preferred Options list.

The Cabinet must listen and do right by both the local communities and the Gypsy Traveller communities.

Respondent: 3548 / 1 Name: Mr Martin Blackwell Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick colliery should be rejected on planning grounds.

1/ Travellers sites in green belt are according to national guidelines inappropriate development.

2/ Road access is mostly single track and incapable of supporting the volume of cars, vans, lorries etc belonging to the occupants of such a huge site. Further more, BANES states that the site has potential for expansion to 50 pitches. The roads could not possibly cope with such an overwhelming increase in traffic.

3/ There are no safe walking routes, only a muddy, steep track. How could residents take their children to school? They would have to use cars and there is no parking in Pensford at all.

4/ The site is miles from all amenities such as doctors' surgeries, shops etc, so again all journeys would have to be by car. There are bound to be accidents with so many vehicles attempting to use such tiny narrow roads.

5/ The site is huge. Banes proposes 20 pitches which is larger than the government stated maximum. If it expands to 50 pitches it will be more than three times the maximum size.

6/ Even at 20 pitches, the site would completely overwhelm the nearest settlement by 2 or even 3 to 1. BANES has a duty to ensure social cohesion and integration. How could this possibly be achieved?

7/ There's a danger that unauthorised expansion could occur and BANES has not said how this could be prevented, or what businesses would be allowed on the site.

8/ The site is dangerous. It is contaminated with arsenic, and apparently other poisonous substances. The site also

contains mineshafts which would be a danger to the residents.

9/ Travellers themselves do not want to live on large sites. According to the West of England Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Association Assessment, travellers prefer small family sites of up to 5 pitches. Also, they like to be near local amenities. The site is not on a recognised traveller route.

10/ BANES council tax payers could face enormous costs in order to provide the site with drainage, water and electricity. There would be the costs of roadworks and of providing schooling. Who is going to pay the costs of cleaning up the site?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The constraints on this site are huge – it should never have been considered.

Presumably the council like it for its size – but that in itself should rule it out.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Certainly not. It is completely unsuitable and inappropriate on planning grounds.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

All of the objections listed should rule out the Stanton Wick site. Furthermore, the development of Green Belt land should be ruled out on environmental grounds, and for the sake of nature conservation.

Respondent: 3550 / 1 Name: P Harrison Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Chelwood shares its water supply with Stanton Wick and the pressure is often inadequate. 2 recent house fires have forced the fire brigade to haul water from Clutton to fight fires.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. The only part of this site that has planning permission for development is that detailed in 05/02227/FUL. The road access is very bad as detailed in planning refusals adjunct to this site.

This would be a very inappropriate development in the green belt.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The local plan (2007) states that "sites for use by gypsies will be permitted on land outside the scope of policies GDI and HG4 provided that "the site meets requirements (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v)." This site fails (i), (ii), (iv) & (v).

Respondent: 3551 / 1 Name: Ms Karen Lyne Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes, I do have information about the site at Stanton Wick.

My information is that the site is entirely unsuitable for the proposed gypsy and traveller site in both location and capacity planned, for a large number of reasons:

-It is inappropriate development in green belt

-A site of this size would overwhelm the existing settled community (up to 3 to 1)

- How can BaNES provide a guarantee that unauthorised and uncontrolled expansion of the site would be prevented, given that the actual site is much larger than the area earmarked?
- How can this development suddenly be appropriate when planning applications have been refused in the past, with inappropriate green belt development being cited as the reason for refusal?
- The roads to the site can't support any real increase in traffic volume without considerable alteration. (Traffic volume has also been cited by BaNES in previous refusals)
- No safe walking route along the roads to either local schools
- Nearest Doctor's surgery is in Chew Stoke, 5 miles away, with no public transport. I am a village agent for the Chew Valley, and the biggest issue for us in our work is isolation and lack of transport, particularly to medical appointments. The voluntary community transport is already under considerable strain just serving the existing communities in the Chew Valley.
- No public transport within safe walking distance
- Limited employment in the area
- The only shop in Pensford not within safe walking distance
- The land at the site is contaminated, and unsafe with uncapped mineshafts liable to subsidence and would require significant financial funding from the council to make it safe.
- In effect the council would be creating a ghetto, which would not be in the interests of the travellers community nor the existing settled community

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO, I don't agree with the Council's assessment that this site represents a viable location to establish a gypsy and traveller site, for all the reasons I have stated in the previous question.

I think that the constraints far outweigh any perceived opportunity, and the council seems to have underplayed the constraints.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO I don't agree that this Stanton Wick site should be taken forward as a formal allocation.

This is a remote and isolated site, which would require a huge amount of money spent on it to make it in any way fit the government recommendations for these sites, but even if this money was spent, that does not change the fact that it is not close enough to schools, transport, doctors, and with insufficient transport. The effect of putting this site here would be to create a ghetto, with no social integration into the local existing community, and perpetuate the health and education issues for the travellers community.

This is a very bad idea, not thought through at all.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I do agree with and accept that there is a need for proper provision for gypsy and traveller sites, and that this is a section of our society whose needs are not currently met. I support BaNES in their stated intention to further this aim, but I don't believe that putting them into sites that are not at all suitable will help the gypsy and traveller community. Quite the opposite. And at the same time, create a negative impact on the local settled community here.

The selection of this site seems to fly in the face of the government guidelines for provision of gypsy and traveller sites, as it runs contrary to all the guidance given. It is difficult to understand why this site was identified as an opportunity at all.

Respondent: 3552 / 1 Name: Mr Stephen Hodson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I consider this site to be wholly inappropriate for a development of this type and size, the village would be overwhelmed by the new population from the site and the roads would become dangerous with the amount of additional traffic.

It is believed that the site has dangerous materials on the ground and is liable to collapse into the old mine shafts.

Other points: local employment, schooling, shops, the local community and the impact on the conservation area.

Respondent: 3553 / 1 Name: Mrs Hilary Padfield Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes, the site at Stanton Wick

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Certainly not

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Reading as I have done I thought that to put a gypsy & traveller site in the green belt was not recommended. On this particular site there is no infrastructure to maintain it. Have BNES looked at the affect this would have on the local schools, doctors surgeries, public transport (the little that there is) & many other things? The access to the site is appalling. & I would have thought that highways would object strongly, why not look at Brownfield sites that are more central, & certainly more convenient for the gypsies themselves.

All the information I have read I have yet to see the plans that BNES have for the extra facilities which will be needed for these extra people which will dwarf the residents in an extremely small hamlet, they have also not stated who would be responsible for paying for the sewerage & electricity to the site- This idea is preposterous as is the Stowey Quarry application in my opinion another way to fill the coffers at the expense of the people who live in our beautiful valley, which if BNES get their way will be completely spoilt. BNES listen to your council tax payers & remember the councillors who will vote for these applications were put there by the public so listen to them please!!!!

Respondent: 3554 / 1 Name: Ms Sue Osborne Organisation: Stanton Wick Action Group

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The argument proposed for Old Colliery is that it is 'large', with the capacity of 50 pitches. Based on GTAA statistics this equates to nearly 200 mobile homes/caravans and c600 people.

No strategy for containment to the proposed 15 permanent and 5 transit pitches has been offered.

The Summary of the Significant and Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Effect of the Issues Identified within the SA states:-

' This site performs well against a number of the SA objectives, including protecting and enhancing the districts environment. The allocation of this site would assist in the achievement of this objective partly due to the scope to provide a large-scale site on previously developed land with little landscape impact. The allocation of this large scale site would also reduce the need to allocate and develop land elsewhere in the district to meet the identified need'

There is no planning policy to support a strategy of a large site to protect the remaining district environment. This is not a greenbelt purpose.

The whole site is in greenbelt and only a small section where the disused buildings are located can be categorised previously developed land, and not necessarily the whole curtilage (see later comments)

LPA's must plan for social cohesion and not overwhelm the next nearest settlement - (see later comments). This proposal will be vast and segregated .

It is not clear that Old Colliery would be deliverable as there are significant constraints to highways; land contamination, remediation and safety; inadequate utilities and the difficulty in sewage management; together with the threat to SNCI and European Protected Species. None of these issues have been properly acknowledged , let alone researched to enable a reasoned and justifiable decision to bring forward Old Colliery as a preferred option.

Old Colliery is not in a sustainable location and fails against the following SA objectives:-

1. No access to services
2. No access to health
3. Land of a very poor quality - probably only suitable for extant planning permission.
4. Segregated, and consequent raised tension. Pressure on highways and increased accidents engendering bad will.
The site does not suffer vandalism - there was an isolated incident of defacing of the old Dabro sign directed at site owner.
5. Not sufficient educational capacity at Stanton Drew and Pensford Schools. Their ability to take the theoretical number is constrained by physical playground sizes. Both schools are landlocked and are operating at near safety capacity. Nathan Hartley has been informed of the playground calculation criteria.
6. Inadequate utilities and no sewage system in Stanton Wick. Constraints on the land are likely in view of unstable composition of ground and environmental contamination. (see later comments)
7. Not sustainable. No footpaths or lighting along lane. There is a difficult, unlit , often muddy ramble footpath to A368, up and over the railway embankment
- 8 Will not protect Pensford heritage site which belongs to the community in spirit. Extant planning permission is appropriate good planning to fully restore these red brick mine buildings.
9. Threat to SNCI and EPS
10. Huge increase in vehicle journeys

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Highways

David Horne , Highways DC, responded 20/3 to the internal consultation as follows (from FOI response):-

Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick – Outside general development boundary. Poor access to local facilities. Remote from public transport. Will result in increased reliance on the use of the private vehicles. Unsustainable. Poor nature of highways leading to and from the site (single track in parts and tight bends). Immediately adjacent to a coach depot, conflicting

movements likely on narrow roads with only limited/poor opportunity for vehicles to pass.

Highway recommendation would be one of refusal.

Adrian Clarke, Transport Policy, responded to the internal consultation as follows (from FOI response):-

The only site that would be rejected at this stage on highway and sustainability grounds is the Old Collier Buildings, Stanton Wick.

The Old Colliery DPD assessment has not included the internal consultation recommendations. It has been economic with the view offered by Highways Dept

The DPD does not acknowledge the considerable concerns that Highways have in respect of coach movements up and down Stanton Wick Lane by Filers Coaches, next door to Old Colliery. There is an extremely difficult planning history in part centred around the inadequacy of the road capacity and size.

Nearly every household in Stanton Wick has sustained vehicle damage or write off at some point, including myself and my neighbour. It is an extremely dangerous single track road with a blind double splay to the main road which has been subject of Parish Council concern for many years.

Richard Harwood, Barrister, commented that the denial of additional planning permission for the subsequently evicted part of Dale Farm was due to highway constraints. He noted that Wick Lane highway was a worse proposal.

Utilities

Old Colliery is served by a 3" water main only. The supply is restricted and has necessitated The Carpenters Arms installing header tanks to store water to ensure a sufficient supply. Header tanks for residential properties are no longer an option. The mains water supply is over a mile away by Hillmans Transport on the A.368 - it is laid along the road network.

There are no sewers at Old Colliery or in Stanton Wick and the locality. The concentration of septic tanks for the size of development proposed would be problematic and have an impact on Salters Brook.

Sanctus report dated 21/5/10 - 'due to the nature of the ground (colliery spoil) Sanctus recommends that a soak away be constructed away from any slopes and existing or proposed buildings due to potential stability issues'

The scale of the proposal of c60 homes would generate significantly more sewage processing demand than the extant planning permission of 1 home. There is clear constraint to achieving this safely and environmentally appropriately.

Contaminated Land

The internal consultation has graded Old Colliery as high risk .

The Officers at the Roadshow in Pensford were unable to assist the local residents as by their own admission ' it was not their area of expertise'.

The contamination report on B&NES own website investigates the small front area only and reveals high levels of arsenic and methane.

As the children will undoubtedly range across the whole site there should have been assessment and acknowledgement of this considerable risk within the SA.

There have been events of spontaneous combustion in the past - this is not uncommon on old collieries with quantities of coal and slag remaining. This is dangerous and the risk is heightened if the gypsy way of life includes fires. There is understood to be at least 300.000 tonnes of waste on site which the owner had previously attempted to secure planning permission to remove to the Second Severn Bridge crossing

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

The process of matrix assessment was flawed. The following adjustments should be made:-

SNCI -5 (whole site designated for G&T in DPD. Mine and tip SNCI)

Hazardous Place -5 (by virtue of contamination in mine and tip areas or from the mineshaft . In close proximity of steeply sloping and unstable sides)

Noise for very close neighbours -5

Adjustment to meet established distance criteria to local services (not B&NES adjusted criteria distance) -3

Total reduction to score -18

If Old Colliery were correctly scored, the out turn would be -8, making it the lowest scoring site in the DPD assessment and therefore not appropriate for pitch allocation.

Planning Policy for Travellers Site March 2012 requires the LPA to ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community.

The people capacity of 15 pitches has not been clarified . Nathan Hartley has estimated there will be 80 children. It is reasonable therefore to assume 150-200 people.

A development of this scale will dominate Stanton Wick by 3 :1 and therefore contravenes the policy directive.

It is acknowledged that G&T prefer site of a maximum of 5 pitches. Old Colliery therefore fails to satisfy the preferences of the G&T travelling community.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Greenbelt (GB)/Previously Developed Land (PDL)

Old Colliery is situated in GB and is subject to NPPF GB policy p79-92 . The area is washed over greenbelt - there is no inset.

Travellers sites are residential in planning terms. Using GTAA average pitch sizes, the Old Colliery proposal is equivalent to 58 single storey homes, with 15 garages (utility buildings) and sundry paraphernalia plus a further 5 (unquantified volume) for transit travellers.

It is appropriate to consider this proposal against the high number of planning refusals along Wick Lane , including the extant permission that has been heavily conditioned and an earlier refused permission to decouple the buildings to develop 2 residences.

Filers coaches has been subject to refusals and enforcement. The Inspector upholding the openness of greenbelt obligation on the enforcement appeal.

NPPF 79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

Placing caravans/mobile homes at Old Colliery will not maintain openness .

NPPF 80. Green Belt serves five purposes:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Placing caravans / mobile homes at Old Colliery will not safeguard Stanton Wick from encroachment . Old Colliery is not an urban location in the context of 'recycling of derelict land'

NPPF 89. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt.

Exceptions to this are:

- the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;

This will allow the re use of Old Colliery buildings, but not the placing of caravans/mobile homes

- the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;

This will allow a rebuild with caveats in respect of use.

- limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

Placing caravans/mobile homes at Old Colliery will contravene this policy and cannot be relied upon as weight for the allocation . There will be a significant impact on openness.

NPPF Annex 2 states

Previously developed land: Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes: land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill purposes where provision for restoration has been made through development control procedures; land in built-up areas such as private residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time.

PDL definition does not 'assume' development of the whole curtilage. A significant area of Old Colliery is curtilage

The DPD has misleadingly represented the entire c23 acres as 'brownfield'. The mine and tip are dormant/closed and have regenerated (SNCI) - this land falls outside the scope of PDL.

The DPD brownfield argument is misleading to Councillors and the Public as is unsupported by NPPF as presented..

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012 Policy E directs that 'traveller sites in the GB are inappropriate development'. This directive having been strengthened by the removal of the word 'normally'. The DPD paper has explicitly ignored the strengthening of this directive, relying on now obsolete circulars.

Planning Policy for traveller sites - Equality impact assessment clarifies the rationale for removing the word ' normally' from

policy:-

Green Belt

There is a difficulty with Green Belt policy in the two circulars that are being withdrawn.

The policy in the Circular 01/2006 is at odds with broader Green Belt policy, set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Circular 01/2006 says that traveller sites are “normally” “inappropriate development” in Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework states that all development (with some exceptions that do not include traveller sites) are (rather than normally are) inappropriate development in Green Belt.

The inconsistency of the circulars with wider policy is potentially confusing. In a system based on locally agreed targets and one in which local councils and communities have power returned to them, the clarity and streamlining of policy is important.

In addition, much development of traveller sites under the circulars has not been in appropriate places but has instead been on Green Belt. Data from the Planning Inspectorate suggests that between 2006 and 2009, 60 percent of planning appeals for traveller site development in the Green Belt were allowed. This is compared to just 19 per cent over the same period for minor housing appeals. There is a risk that this would, therefore, continue if the circulars were to remain in place.

A more permissive policy for traveller sites in relation to Green Belt can create perceptions of unfairness amongst people, which can in turn lead to community tensions. Aligning the policy, where effective, with those for general housing may help decrease the view that traveller sites receive favourable treatment in the planning system and thus reduce the community tension this view can cause. Ensuring consistency between policy for traveller and settled communities should help to address views about unfairness in the planning system. This will help to promote community cohesion which will have benefits for both the settled and traveller communities.

The new policy, therefore, removes the word “normally”. This aligns it with general policy on Green Belts set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and tells local authorities that traveller sites, whether a permanent or temporary permission is being considered, are inappropriate development in Green Belt.

The policy also clarifies that there is no presumption that a temporary permission, including those in Green Belt, should become a permanent one.

In order to overcome this restriction very special circumstances (VSC) must be evidenced .

There have been no grounds presented to demonstrate why there may be very special circumstances. For instance there has been no attempt to collaborate with adjoining authorities in view of the high proportion of GB land in B&NES (as directed by NPPF P.179), there has been unlawful ruling out of sites by Cabinet on 9/5/12 brought through the flawed assessment process and resistance to plan for allocation in developments like the MOD.

Unless caravans/mobile homes were to be positioned inside the existing buildings, these would all constitute new build in planning terms and in the volume identified in the second paragraph of this ' any other comments' section.

Any infill development will be heavily restricted by Stanton Wick and Pensford classification in the Local Plan 2007 as R3 Rural Settlements and would also be subject to GB protection of openness obligation.

Conversion of Rural Building Policy ET9 Local Plan 2007, requires that conversion of use of buildings to residential must not be in a position isolated from public services and community facilities, which Old Colliery is. All of the criteria of ET9 apply and therefore any development, in addition to conversion of the existing buildings, would fall foul of GB policies for new build in GB.

The Old Colliery is a key part of the villages' very important mining heritage and is significant to the local community. This is the last red brick mine in the UK. The extant planning permission to sympathetically renovate and convert the buildings to residential use (ref: 05/02227/FUL and 10/03029/REN) is well planned and appropriate alongside the fully restored Bath House and The Winding House. This recognises B&NES own Pensford Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

NPPF P.135 The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Summary

As presented to Cabinet on 9/5 and Scrutiny on 23/5 Old Colliery is in an unsustainable location by policy definition, with very limited utilities, inaccessible safely by highways as Highways Dept responded, contaminated as revealed by Sanctus report, unmanageable given not LA owned and no strategy to control offered, overwhelming by number, segregated and therefore not socially cohesive, and located in greenbelt which is heavily controlled by policy .

The site is not previously developed land to the extent offered by the DPD process, and no VSC have been offered to overcome the considerable encroachment and threat to openness.

Respondent: 3557 / 1 Name: Mrs Sandra Hurrell Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Greenbelt

The Old Colliery, Stanton Wick is in greenbelt. National guidelines state that gypsy and traveller sites in such areas are inappropriate.

The site is very close to the Pensford Conservation area.

Inadequate road access

Based on the number of pitches planned, possibly 20, the number of cars using the site could be in excess of 40, maybe more if the site is extended. The local roads cannot cope with such an increase in traffic. Previous planning applications have been refused where there was likely to be an increase in traffic.

Access to amenities

The site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors etc only a steep, unlit and muddy track. There is no public transport within safe walking distance.

There is limited employment in the area.

The nearest doctors surgery is around 5 miles away.

Overwhelming the nearest settlement

National guidelines state that the site should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement. Even at 20 pitches the travellers would outnumber Stanton Wick's residents, possibly 2 or 3:1.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No, the whole process is flawed, BANES have not considered the overwhelming affect of this site on the local community and area.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, for the reasons outlined above

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3559 / 1 Name: Ms MARILYN DUMARS Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree with the Council's assessment. Stanton Wick is a tiny hamlet. Such a large development as the one proposed would overwhelm this small community. And who is to say that it might not be further extended in the future. The lane leading to the proposed gypsy/ traveller site is narrow and limited. It is not a safe walking route and there is no public transport nearby. My understanding is that the water supply to Stanton Wick is at capacity and there is no mains sewerage connection. Consideration of the infra-structure alone would render this application invalid.

This is a rural site and there is limited employment in the area. The site itself is said to be polluted and the old mine shafts make it dangerous.

Aside from local considerations the Stanton Wick site is in the Green Belt and as such is an inappropriate development. Wherever possible we must not nibble away at it. Yesterday we learned from the official census that Britain's population is growing. The Green Belt is an easy target, but ironically, this must be resisted. We need these breathing spaces.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

I do not agree that this proposed pitch provision should be taken forward for stated reasons.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Council's duty to promote racial equality should not be a factor in this decision. This is not a racist issue. The only Romany gypsies I have ever seen in the Valley were the ones who occasionally stay with us and were made welcome at Dumpers House in Chew Magna. Our objection is solely based on the inappropriateness of this proposed development in a small, isolated community in the Green Belt. Please let us protect this heritage.

Respondent: 3561 / 1 Name: Ms Julie Vipond Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site at Stanton Wick is unsuitable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision due to the fact that it is within a green belt area.

It is on the site of an abandoned coal mine which contained mine shafts and slag heaps which are likely to contain hazardous chemicals eg. Arsenic and previous buildings with corrugated asbestos rooves.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

In the document "Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites – A Good Practice Guides." it clearly states that chosen sites should have good access to facilities and medical services. This site has neither.

This document also states that successful sites are small and fully integrated within the community. The proposed site at Stanton Wick is isolated and will constitute a large development within a hamlet of a few houses. Government advice is

that 'sites should respect the scale of and not dominate the nearest settled community'.

Circular 01/2006 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites provides advice on site location and selection. It identifies factors which are important for the sustainability of a site

-“Means of access, availability of transport modes and distances from services”

The site at Stanton Wick has poor access, it is down an unlit single track lane with no pavement and any services, education or medical facilities are remote and can only be accessed by car.

Respondent: 3562 / 1 Name: Ms Sarah Trevelyan Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I do not agree because I think BaNES desire to pursue Stanton Wick Old Colliery Site is misguided as it does not satisfy legislated planning criteria.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I do not agree.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Stanton Wick site is in the Green Belt and the proposed site is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

The proposed Old Colliery development is very large and would overwhelm the existing community.

The site is immediately adjacent to, and overlooked by, one residence and is very close to another.

There is a long history of planning application refusals, both at the Old Colliery and the adjacent site (Filer's Coaches). The only permission granted in recent years is for a single dwelling. Inappropriate development in the Green Belt has been cited as reason for refusal.

Wick Lane, Stanton Wick Lane and the junctions cannot support any real increase in traffic volume without substantial road widening and junction alteration. BaNES have cited traffic volume in previous refusals.

There is no safe walking route along the roads either to Pensford or Stanton Drew schools. The public footpath from the side of the Winding House to the A37 is not safe, even in summer.

There is no public transport within safe walking distance.

There is only one local shop in Pensford which is very small and only stocks essentials which are insufficient for a family's food shopping requirements. In addition there is no safe walking route to the shop from the proposed site.

The nearest doctor's surgery is approximately 5 miles away and there is no public transport.

The water supply to Stanton Wick is very unreliable and is at capacity for the infrastructure. There is no mains sewerage in Stanton Wick and septic tanks are not suitable for a development of the proposed size.

The land at the Old Colliery Site is contaminated and would be very expensive to remedy causing huge disruption including heavy vehicles driving along Wick Lane.

The site is dangerous due to several old mineshafts which could collapse at any time.

There is limited employment in the area.

The Old Colliery is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest providing habitat for many important species and is very close to the Pensford Conservation Area.

Respondent: 3564 / 1 Name: Mr Joe Carnevale Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

This land is GREENBELT and therefore is unsuitable for this development and the site needs to be removed from the list.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This needs to remain a green belt area – We have very little of this left in this area

Respondent: 3565 / 1 Name: Mr Anthony Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

The Pensford Colliery site contravenes nearly all the GOVERNMENT guidelines, and I do not understand how it can be logically recommended as a suitable site.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The site:

- Is Contaminated (to be cleaned at whose expense?).
- In the Green belt.
- Has inadequate road access.
- Will overwhelm the nearest village.
- Has no safe walking route to schools or shops (and these are not close).
- Is not compatible with traveller preferences.
- Is a habitat for bats.

Respondent: 3566 / 1 Name: Miss Hannah Cross Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

It is inappropriate development for several reasons:

1. The site is located within the 'Green Belt' and national planning policy considers Gypsy and Traveller sites to be inappropriate development on Green Belt land.
2. The land is isolated from local services and facilities and does not meet distance criteria for food shopping, schools or a doctor's surgery. Nor is the site served by a safe footpath network linking it to such facilities.
3. The existing road network is not suitable for a large increase in traffic volume. The lane down to Pensford is narrow (only one vehicle wide for much of its length) and steep and for these reasons is currently not a regular choice of residents of Stanton Wick. The lane to Upper Stanton Drew is also narrow (again only one vehicle wide for much of its length) and has several sharp corners. The junction from Stanton Wick onto the A368 is not easy, especially if turning right.
4. The site is designated as a site for Nature Conservation Interest so any development of it should take account of this designation and not ignore the ecological constraints.
5. Whilst the land benefits from planning approval for conversion of the existing buildings into a single dwelling, it is my understanding that other proposals for residential development for three and ten dwellings have been rejected by Development Control at pre planning application stage on the grounds that they were considered inappropriate and unsustainable development within the Green Belt.
6. I feel that if this site is considered unsustainable for small scale residential development then it is not suitable for a large number of Gypsy Traveller pitches and their associated facilities either.
7. The number of traveller pitches currently proposed would dwarf the existing hamlet of Stanton Wick. Such a large development would immediately and significantly alter the character of the area which has evolved over centuries.

Respondent: 3573 / 1 Name: Ms Mary Rogers Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Ex MOD site. Outside Green Belt.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Old Colliery Stanton Wick is in the Green Belt and the proposed site would constitute "inappropriate development in

the Green Belt". The site is dangerous, has several old mineshafts within it these could be liable to subsidence at any time. The site has historic significance. Its also very close to the Pensford Conservation Area. No mains sewerage at Stanton Wick. The proposed size would not be able to be supported by septic tank.

Respondent: 3574 / 1 Name: Mr Geoffrey Rogers Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Ex MOD site outside Green Belt.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The site is dangerous, has several old mineshafts within it and could subside at any time. The land is contaminated and remediation would be uneconomic without a significant contribution from the Council and would involve an intolerable number of heavy vehicle movements along Wick Lane.

Respondent: 3575 / 1 Name: Mr Stephen Rogers Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Ex MOD sites, outside green belt.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Stanton Wick site is in the green Belt and the proposed site would constitute 'inappropriate development in the Green Belt'.

The site is dangerous, has several old mineshafts within it, these could subside at any time.

Respondent: 3577 / 1 Name: Ms Jane Flower Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

My home is grade 2 listed – we have frequent problems with traffic negotiating around it and the overhanging front has been subject to damage. Any increase in traffic using Wick Lane will be problematic – this traffic will also have to use ancient very narrow river bridge to access Church Street (very narrow) – this leads to shop, school and main Bristol Road.

Previous planning applications for Stanton Wick site have been refused on Highway issues. The lane and roads are used for walking recreation – this only increases the risk of accident.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No to opportunities.

Opportunity has been refused for other applications for development because they conflicted with greenbelt designation – this would set an unacceptable precedent for development in other greenbelt areas – I see no reason why this site should be given priority. I have not been made aware of any constraints listed by council – should like information.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No absolutely not.

I see no reason why any greenbelt sites with conservation issues should be taken forward.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am aware that those supporting this site are unable to provide when questioned a single legal argument why this site should be on the short list – the people to be housed deserve a safe site with easy access to amenities. The local residents should not be overwhelmed by a new community which far outnumbers the small hamlet. The cost to provide utilities must be excessive – surely this is a consideration

I am extremely concerned at the prospect of increased traffic along our narrow lanes, roads around my house and street through centre of old Pensford village: as you will no doubt be aware, we are on the very busy cycle I hiking route from Bath to Chew Valley lakes this will all be compromised/ at risk if there is increased use of the roads.

Similarly, the elderly and young, who walk and cycle the roads (including my own mother aged 92) will be particularly at risk ... the elderly are often hard of hearing and will not be expecting more traffic.

My objections have nothing to do with whether the Old Colliery site is used for Travellers/Gypsies etc ... I should object to ANY planning proposal there.

The residents of a site in Stanton Wick will have to travel or walk to schools I local shops etc and either of these options will constitute a danger along the narrow routes available.

I do not consider the proposal of the Old Colliery is in any way following Best Practise on behalf of the Traveller Community and breaks all guidelines I rules on Conservation and protection of valuable Greenbelt amenity .

Surely the proposed new Community should be given every opportunity to make a new, happy and safe life without having to confront a local community who believe this to constitute a risk to everyone involvedif a suitable site were found I should be quite content and be very willing to welcome new faces to our areai have lived amongst many nationalities/ cultures and certainly have NO objection to Travellers or anyone else joining our village area.

Respondent: 3579 / 1 Name:

Organisation: Kites Transport Services

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Inappropriate development in the green belt

The site is much larger than earmarked as a gypsy/traveller site and uncontrolled expansion must not take place, can BANES reassure residents of this?

Respondent: 3580 / 1 Name: Mrs Daniels Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

A large development such as the proposed Old Colliery would overwhelm the existing settled community (in the region of 3 to 1)

There is a long history of planning application refusals both at the Old Colliery and the adj site (coach park). The only permission being granted for a single dwelling. All refusals on grounds of inappropriate development in the green belt.

Respondent: 3581 / 1 Name: Organisation: MIDAS waste Clearance

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The overall Old Colliery site is much larger than the are earmarked, can BANES reassure residents that uncontrolled expansion will not take place.

The Old Colliery is a site of nature conservation interest and provides a habitat for many important species

Respondent: 3582 / 1 Name: G James Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

PTO

Use Army and RAG sites that have been closed by government. Good access. Run ways. Ideal hard standing for travelling showpeople. Sites not contaminated like Stanton Wick and would be safe for children. All services are on site. This would SAVE BANES money.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No to Stanton Wick site it is in a green belt. The council has already turned down a development for more than 1 property.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No to Stanton Wick site has bad road access. The site is contaminated, NOT good for human health. Old mine shafts on site which have a habit of open up not safe for children. Poor water supply NO sewerage supply for the number of pitches proposed.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The government has closed army and RAF sites why not use these sites.

They are secure with good access. Hard roads and air strips. Ideal for siting the caravans etc. as all services are already there.

Respondent: 3583 / 1 Name: Mrs Felicity James Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I would suggest GT8 - Lower Bristol Road, Twerton, Bath. It seems an ideal site with good access and amenities. It is screened. There is unauthorised encampment, tolerated by the Council already, so easier to allocate 15 pitches with a capacity for an on-site site warden to ensure management of the site.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The site is outside the housing settlement boundary of Stanton Wick, it is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Why should they allow travellers residential use in the area of the Green Belt when other people cannot develop outside a village fence in Green Belt. It only has planning for one house with one family. I do not believe there are existing on-site services & utilities, I do not think there is mains water & sewage. It was a former colliery many years ago when health & safety were considered completely differently. The buildings left are hazardous. There is nothing much more dangerous than an old coal mine to human health. Old mine shafts can easily open up, creating danger to humans, in particular children.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

It is not suitable for any pitches. It is in a Site of Nature Conservation. Local roads are unsuitable in width & alignment at junctions. The location is remote from services & public transport. The site is certainly not in an area where there is any employment. The development would overwhelm the little hamlets and villages nearby. The assessment report implies because it was an old colliery and used by human beings, it must be OK for people from now onwards - 2012 onwards. Please remember this colliery was built many years ago when the owners of coal mines did not worry about the health & safety of their employees. I believe it has been closed 60 years now. Things have moved on!! BANES need to ensure a SAFE SITE not a VERY DANGEROUS ONE.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I appreciate the government has asked all councils to provide Gypsy and Travellers sites. But I cannot see where all these gypsies and travellers are going to come from. They have existing sites unauthorised or otherwise, so they can stay there. Likewise, the government want councils to designate areas for house building. The Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick is not suitable for housing, as I have previously stated so it is not suitable for a gypsy or travellers site for the same reason. When reading the Preferred Options Assessment Report, I was amazed at the sites considered, most totally unsuitable. Surely there must be better sites available in BANES rather than an old, dangerous, hazardous redundant coal mine!

Respondent: 3584 / 1 Name: Mr Raynor Nixon Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO. The contaminated lane and its constrained access, situated in the greenbelt mean that this site should never have been included. Add to this the size of the site proposed, overwhelming the local population, and the likelihood of the numbers being even greater, since strict controls will be impossible, and we have a recipe for disaster on the scale of Dale farm. Is that what the council wants?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The whole process is seriously flawed and ignores the guidelines for travellers sites on so many grounds. If a local transport firm, which have been operating for well over a century, cannot expand because of traffic concern, why does the council feel that the traffic generated by the site will be safer?

Respondent: 3585 / 1 Name: M Westrops Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes. The Old Colliery Site in Stanton Wick is in the greenbelt and the proposed development would constitute inappropriate development in the greenbelt. I therefore oppose it.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. The opportunities are minimal and the constraints are enormous. The land is contaminated and remedial action would involve an intolerable number of heavy lorries along narrow country lanes. Also the site is dangerous and littered with old mine shafts.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. The large proposed development would overwhelm the existing settled community. Furthermore, there is a long history of previous planning refusals at this site because it is in the Greenbelt.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Yes. There are no local amenities.

The site itself is unsafe.

There is no public transport and inadequate footpaths.

Furthermore, the OC at SW is a site of historic significance and is very close to the Pensford conservation area.

Respondent: 3586 / 1 Name: Mr M J Naunton Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site at Stanton Wick is in the greenbelt and is inappropriate development at the Old Colliery Site. The site is contaminated and has several old mienshafts within it. And liable to subsidence.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. The site is in the greenbelt.

Traffic Volume without substantial road widening

There is no public transport within walking distance

No local Shop

No nearby Dr's surgery - 5 miles away

No safe walking routes along roads either to Pensford or Stanton Drew - schools
No public transport.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

As above

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Old Colliery Site Nature conservation interest
The site has historical interest
The site is immediately adjacent to and overlooked by one residence and is very close to another
And gypsy cannot get on with travellers on the same site.

Respondent: 3588 / 1 Name: C Robinson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

SAVE OUR GREENBELT

Respondent: 3589 / 1 Name: S Sampson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

SAVE OUT GREEN BELT

Respondent: 3591 / 1 Name: Mr Roger Taylor Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3593 / 1 Name: Mr Peter Clouting Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Whilst I feel there is a need for BANES to provide suitable site allocations for Travellers, in this case the Stanton Wick Site and its 'proposed size' would overwhelm the existing community. The infrastructure (water, sewage, poor roads lack of public transport, and limited retail outlets close by) make it a very poor choice, and a lot of money would have to be used to make this old colliery site safe for habitation - especially if the ground is prone to subsidence and has mineshafts nearby. It has long been thought of as an area of ecological and conservation interest, and any planning applications in the past nearby have been turned down, citing no development in Greenbelt areas. I don't think the site should be considered 'very special circumstances'.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I note that the council have taken note that the Pensford Colliery Tip is a designated ecological site - which would impact the environment.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. The possibility of 100+ travellers on this site is not suitable in this area.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Having read all the information - preferred option paper and proposed DPD - I wondered if the Gypsy Traveller communities should be asked if they would want to live in such an exposed, poorly located site, away from many amenities.

Respondent: 3602 / 1 Name: Mr KG Sheridan Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Old Colliery Stanton Wick - I object to the choice of site as there is evidence that it is on greenbelt land. It has difficult access and is remote from local services.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No, as I understand the correct processes were not followed in this instance.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3603 / 1 Name: Mrs Penelope Sheridan Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Objection -

1. On greenbelt land
2. difficult access
3. remote from local services.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I believe the correct processes were not followed in this instance.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3604 / 1 Name: Ms Tara Auery Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No - The land is in Greenbelt, it is not safe with very old historical buildings and mines. Also, if the planning for a dwelling wasn't passed, how can the council allow 20 pitches for travellers.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No - This site is far too big, Pensford and Stanton Wick could not cope with the increase of cars, vans etc., coming in through such a small lane. Also who's to say it will stay 20 pitches the land has potential for more.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Old Colliery site is really not suitable, it's in the middle of a small rural village which has no amenities such as Doctors, shops schools within easy walking distance.

There is no public transport there would make it difficult to find employment, as we ourselves have found with our children who are looking for work. I also feel very sorry not only for the villagers but the residence who will be next door and overlooking what was rural views to a gypsy site.

Respondent: 3605 / 1 Name: Ms Jane Garner Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site at Pensford has very little access
There is arsenic in the ground
It is very unsuitable for human habitation

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3606 / 1 Name: Ms Sheila Cobb Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site at Pensford has very little access
 There is arsenic in the ground
 It is very unsuitable for human habitation

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3608 / 1 Name: Bruce and Milkard Sam Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

They're in Bath, leave them where they're happy.

Respondent: 3610 / 1 Name: Ms Jennie Wade Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes, only information about Stanton Wick proposed Travellers Site. The size and location of this site is not acceptable to many of the local residents and it would outnumber and swallow up the immediate rural community. 15 permanent sites and 5 transit pitches over 80 vehicles and approx 100 people.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No, as it is in Greenbelt Planning Permission should not be available.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, as approx 100 travellers on this proposed site would have to use vehicles or public transport which is 2 miles away from the site. Highways Dept should look at this problem.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The proposed Old Colliery Site at Stanton Wick has no safe walking routes to local schools, shops, Doctors only a steep unlit and muddy track. An expert report on this site claims to have found to be contaminated with dangerous levels of arsenic that has not been removed. Travellers prefer close proximity to amenities and small family sites of up to 5 pitches.

Respondent: 3611 / 1 Name: Mr John Langdon Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

With reference to the lane to and from the above proposed site how can families be expected to walk to school, to shops or bus stops when there is no footpath on this very narrow lane. There are no street lights and in the winter months there is a high likelihood that a child or adult could be injured or even killed. Have the council considered that they could be held responsible for this disaster waiting to happen.

There are many more reasons why this Travellers site should not go ahead which have been outlined to you in the many letters which you must have received. You must by now know the feelings and anxieties of all the villagers in this area.

My family and I are one hundred per cent against this proposal as are so many local people and we ask you to listen to the voice of the vast majority.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3612 / 1 Name: Mr Philip Stevens Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick Old Colliery Site not suitable

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

It is a green belt site and should not be developed. There is a real risk of subsidence due to the old mine shafts. The lanes are very narrow and cannot support a lot of extra traffic.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Our family having farmed in this area for over one hundred years and know the possible risks of working on old coal mining sites as subsidence is a real possibility. I'm sure the Gypsy & Travelling community won't be happy living on this site.

Respondent: 3613 / 1 Name: Miss Eleanor Richardson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I believe the site to be unachievable for a number of reasons, primarily: The site is within the Green Belt. Government Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012, Paragraph 14 states "Travellers sites in Green Belt are inappropriate development." and "Inappropriate development is harmful to Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances." BaNES have not provided any reasoning to they might consider there to be very special circumstances.

I believe the site is unsuitable for a number of reasons, including:

BaNES emerging CP11 includes criteria against which G and T proposals are to be assessed, one of the criteria states "Use of this site must have no harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers", there are two adjacent residential occupiers (the Winding House and The Bath House, 2 families totalling 10 occupants) whose amenity would undoubtedly be compromised by the proposed scale of development. Another states "The site should avoid areas at high risk of flooding and have no adverse on protected habitats and species, nationally recognised designations and natural resources.", the site is in part designated for nature conservation. Government policy also states the "When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, the Local Planning Authority should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community." Stanton Wick is the nearest settled community, a very small Hamlet of just over 20 houses, it would be unacceptably dominated by the site.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site. I believe that the assessment matrix is flawed, in that it has incorrect weightings/scores for proximity, nature conservation, contamination, highways accessibility, safety, noise, and Green Belt. If the evaluation matrix was properly scored, the Old Colliery Buildings Stanton Wick would not have been designated as a preferred site.

There is a discrepancy between BaNES estimated number of vans per pitch (1.7) and the government's estimates (3.2). BaNES Issues and Options Report refers to: "The need for smaller sites in Bath & North East Somerset district is supported by the West of England GTAA which found that most surveyed respondents expressed a preference to live in smaller family-sized sites of no more than five pitches." Both local councillors and planning officers have on numerous occasions stated that in their opinion the major benefit for the Stanton Wick site is its "large size", they are clearly at odds with their own documentation!

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No for all the reasons listed above!

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3614 / 1 Name: Mrs Catronia Ree Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I have information about the Stanton Wick site.

It is plainly unsuitable. Development here will completely change and overwhelm our small local community. There are few local facilities, one small shop, no doctors, little employment and access to and from site by foot or road is dangerous with narrow lanes and many bends etc.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I do not agree, The site is plainly a poor choice. The assessment is one sided in favour of the site. The scoring of this site is incorrect. There are no local facilities. The traffic implications are huge. All the reasons given for rejection of other

planning applications in the locality still stand for this site. There is little mention of the precarious water supply. I am amazed that consideration is being given to a site contaminately arsenic!

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

The size of this development would completely swamp the local hamlet. It would be impossible to restrict expansion and I would like to know how BANES proposes to restrict illegal expansion.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The proposal to site a G&T development in Stanton Wick flies in the face of national planning guidelines on green belt policy, "sites should not be contaminated", "sites should not overwhelm the local community", reasonable access to shops, schools and doctors. By BANES own scoring matrix it performs poorly.

Respondent: 3618 / 1 Name: Ms Janette Stephenson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Ex MOD sites
Outside the Green belt

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

In the green belt and this would be inappropriate development as stated by BANES
A large development such as this will overwhelm the existing settled community

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

There is a long history of planning permission refusals both at Stanton Old Colliery and Filers Coaches
Green belt has been cited as reason for refusal

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Yes

There is no safe walking route along the roads either to Pensford or Stanton Drew Schools. The public footpath from the Winding House to the A37 is unsuitable, even in Summer.
The nearest doctor's surgery is around 5 miles away and there is no public transport.

Respondent: 3618 / 1 Name: Ms Janette Stephenson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Ex MOD sites
Outside the Green Belt

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

In the green belt & this would be inappropriate development as stated by BANES.
A large development such as this will overwhelm the existing settled community.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

There is a long history of planning permission refusals both at Stanton Old Colliery and Filer's Coaches.

Green belt has been cited as reason for refusal.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Yes.

There is no safe walking route along the roads either to Pensford or Stanton Drew Schools. The public footpath from the Winding House to the A37 is unsuitable, even in Summer.

The nearest Doctor's surgery is around 5 miles away and there is no public transport.

Respondent: 3620 / 1 Name: Mr Roger Stevenson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

It should confirm with government policy and be outside the green belt. There are plenty of suitable non green belts within City of Bath eg MOD at Foxhill

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

- 1) Green belt
- 2) Insufficient local amenities
- 3) Local schools all ages > 1 mile distance
- 4) No public transport at site
- 5) Unsafe mining area contaminated land

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

BANES council has failed to consider any sites to the North, East or Centre of Bath. This strikes me as a political rather than rational decision. To dispel the suspicion of political bias it is vital that the decision process is conducted in the public domain.

Respondent: 3622 / 1 Name: Mr Richard Lyons Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Inappropriate for green belt area
Too large for existing community
Poor road access/dangerous junctions
Part of conservation area

Respondent: 3623 / 1 Name: Mrs JF Denis-Meira Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No, none whatever

Many reasons why it should not go ahead at Broad Oak Colliery Site, Pensford

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No
Ref: Local Government Planning Policy for Travellers Sites March 2012.
See Note 4, Note 9, Note 10
Policy D. Rural Exception Sites
Note 13
Policy E Notes 15 & 18 (green belt)
(Planning already refused for other applicants)

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No! I do not

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

All guidelines laid down by the government, appear to be ignored completely, questions unanswered and local public opinion, the people that should count seem to be totally ignored.

Respondent: 3625 / 1 Name: Mrs G Tidcombe Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Definitely not. NO!

This site should never have got through the ranking system to the final 6. Now the whole community must distrust the Council running BANES. Changimng things to suite there political aims.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

There is no way on earth that this should go any further.

Come to your senses and look for more sustainable sites not in the Green Belt.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Why should the Green Belt be sacrificed?

I was born in Pensford and enjoyed the developing fauna and wildlife on the site. You have to be careful due to the very, very steep slopes around the site, this could be especially dangerous for adventurous children.

Pensford is a close community and do not take to interlopers, especially on this scale.

Our children have moved away from the village. There is nowhere for them to buy homes, is it fair that they have to move away yet help is given to this project. No.

Mr. Filer could not get planning for additional coaches which ferry school children around, providing a local service. Why is that less important than these developments. You are saying that this is more important than local needs.

Respondent: 3625 / 1 Name: Mrs G Tidcombe Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Definitely not. NO!

This site should never have got through the ranking system to the final 6. Now the whole community must distrust the Council running BANES. Changing things to suite there political aims.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

There is no way on earth that this should go any further.

Come to your senses and look for more sustainable sites not in the Green Belt.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Why should the Green Belt be sacrificed?

I was born in Pensford and enjoyed the developing fauna and wildlife on the site. You have to be careful due to the very, very steep slopes around the site, this could be especially dangerous for adventurous children.

Pensford is a close community and do not take to interlopers, especially on this scale.

Our children have moved away from the village. There is nowhere for them to buy homes, is it fair that they have to move away yet help is given to this project. No. Mr. Filer could not get planning for additional coaches which ferry school children around, providing a local service. Why is that less important than these developments. You are saying that this is more important than local needs.

Respondent: 3626 / 1 Name: Mr L.G Tidcombe Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Earlier mining practices failed to extract all the coal so the spoil contains a fair percentage, if a fire on the site were to take hold of this viable coal then it is not inconceivable that the area could burn for a considerable time. This has been corroborated by friends who mined there.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The only opportunity is that BANES can dump gypsies here from the illegal sites, in the areas where they actually want to be. They will just migrate back to new sites around Bath perhaps embarrassing the World Heritage site more than it does now.

You are currently constraining the number of pitches. If this goes ahead what are the future constraints within a 26 acre site? It will become completely unmanageable and more Tax Payers money will be wasted

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Absolutley no way.

If it does a Judicial review will show the errors being made.

Why are you wasting your time and our taxes pursuing this flawed and inappropriate proposal?

If a private person proposed anything on this site it would be and has been turned down. Does that mean you will override what your own planners would be advising as their normal procedures?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

BANES has a duty to protect the Green Belt, which it has done, in the main, except when suddenly it suits them to disregard, hypocrritical.

Filers have been refused extra coach movements yet in Council you have stated that coshed ill be used to take the children to school as there is no safe passage, hypocritical.

Nearby a Velux Window was deemed inappropriate for visual amenity, it could not be seen from virtually all angles, hypocritical

Planning turned down on the site - check the reasons given yet this proposal is deemed worthy of the consultation process, hypocritical.

etc etc etc

Respondent: 3626 / 1 Name: Mr L.G Tidcombe Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Earlier mining practices failed to extract all the coal so the spoil contains a fair percentage, if a fire on the site were to take hold of this viable coal then it is not inconceivable that the area could burn for a considerable time. This has been corroborated by friends who mined there.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The only opportunity is that BANES can dump gypsies here from the illegal sites, in the areas where they actually want to be. They will just migrate back to new sites around Bath perhaps embarrassing the World Heritage site more than it does now.

You are currently constraining the number of pitches. If this goes ahead what are the future constraints within a 26 acre site? It will become completely unmanageable and more Tax Payers money will be wasted.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Absolutley no way.

If it does a Judicial review will show the errors being made.

Why are you wasting your time and our taxes pursuing this flawed and inappropriate proposal?

If a private person proposed anything on this site it would be and has been turned down. Does that mean you will override what your own planners would be advising as their normal procedures?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

BANES has a duty to protect the Green Belt, which it has done, in the main, except when suddenly it suits them to disregard, hypocritical.

Filers have been refused extra coach movements yet in Council you have stated that coshed ill be used to take the children to school as there is no safe passage, hypocritical.

Nearby a Velux Window was deemed inappropriate for visual amenity, it could not be seen from virtually all angles, hypocritical

Planning turned down on the site – check the reasons given yet this proposal is deemed worthy of the consultation process, hypocritical.

etc etc etc

Respondent: 3627 / 1 Name: Mrs M Ezekiel Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Having talked to travellers near Bath and Avonmouth, they were of the opinion that this site is too far from where they want to be, in fact the consensus was (in their words) that it was more likely the 'old bus brigade' (or new age travellers) that might be attracted but apparently they would not want permanent pitches or to pay taxes.

Furthermore small sites where family units can prevail was preferred.

Another comment was 'diesel ain't cheap, and time is money'. Meaning they did not want to travel far to where they could earn money.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO -

If the Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople' feel the need to be integrated into society then moving onto a remote piece of land with inadequate amenities cannot be considered anything advantageous to what they already have. In fact in this instance it would probably be of a disadvantage so why would they bother to even go there.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO -

I am at a loss to understand why, as the very words 'Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople' suggests they wouldn't want permanent sites but transit ones, why we are suggesting providing 15 permanent and 5 transit pitches in the first place!

Surely if they wanted to have permanent pitches they should be offered proper accommodation and get on a housing list like anyone else or live on residential caravan sites with full amenities.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

'On a private site, we can return to our traditions, for to have an outside fire to cook upon and sit around is forbidden on authorised sites as a hazard. If you sing and dance on a council site, you're likely to get your marching orders for making noise; if you bring a horse back to the site you're causing a nuisance to others. I feel that if every family has a little piece of land of their own, their culture will be preserved. They can send their children to be educated, have access to healthcare and have some security and dignity.'

Quote from a 'real' gypsy – who has married an Englishman, only had two children and has lived as a non-gypsy since but still wants to preserve and practice the gypsy ways.

You can't have your cake and eat it!! What do they really want. Do they want to be integrated and so live like the rest of us under the same rules and regulations or do they want to remain an ethnic minority and preserve their past heritage and customs. Have we asked them what they want or is it just following a Central Government directive?

Respondent: 3628 / 1 Name: Mrs E Allen Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

NO

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

J~O - They need to be where. they will really want to be, near Bath

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No
 Unsustainable and totally inappropriate.
 Throw it out and start looking for proper sites that are likely to work

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

A site of this magnitude is inconceivable in this location. It should be near facilities within walking distance to reduce feelings of isolation.
 There is little or no employment locally, so easy access to suitable jobs must be a concern.
 How is the significant infrastructure to be financed and monitored?
 As the site seems to be appropriate for the travellers could it not also be appropriate for low cost housing which is desperately needed in the area.

Respondent: 3629 / 1 Name: Ms Victoria Blackie Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Clearly homes for traveller need to be close to urban areas where employment, education, medical services are readily available. Space and a safe environment are essential.
 The Twerton site would be ideal. The downs at Lansdown would provide suitable space and the necessary infrastructure.
 The three MOD development sites all offer a suitable opportunity.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Total unsuitable
 - Contaminated land, unsafe former industrial site
 - Inadequate transport:- buses and by vehicle access
 - School and Medical facilities insufficient
 - Will be rejected on appeal as a greenfield site and as it will alter the environment of the hamlet of Stanton Wick

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Certainly not
 There is a strong danger of this developing into another roman baths fiasco which we have all had to pay for over the past 6/7 years. It must be hoped the council have learned the lesson of this affair.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The matrix used to establish the suitability of site clearly indicated the Stanton Wick site is unsuitable with 16 other sites more appropriate and securing higher marks.

Respondent: 3630 / 1 Name: Ms Jane Lyons Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No
 Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Proposed site is within green belt and would not be a suitable development. Very close to local residence and far too large for the surrounding community. Roads and services not suitable to support such a development.

Respondent: 3631 / 1 Name: Ms Amelia Lyons Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Too large for local community and too close to immediate residents.
 Not suitable for greenbelt area.
 Site has historic interest and is a site of nature conservation interest.
 Roads and services not suitable to support a development of this size.

Respondent: 3632 / 1 Name: Mr Haydon Lyons Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Land at the site is contaminated and the site has several old mineshafts on it. Remedial costs would be expensive and would probably require contributions from the council.
 Development in a green belt area and an area of historic interest.

Respondent: 3633 / 1 Name: Mr J.R Debis-Meira Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Definitely not

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. Definitely not

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, there are no amenities, few school places, no safe access to either, no other services except library and dust cart, bad access, others in Stanton Wick outnumbered. No regular bus service. No shops. This area is not on the usual travellers route, not Chew Valley Area.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

No. Only the fact that a previous applicant was refused planning on the Colliery site (many excuses given) yet you see fit to put 20 sites here on 8 acres. (There is more land here) and state that any problems arising would be dealt with by police. I haven't seen a policeman around in over a year, except one who dwells near by, but that is when off duty.

Respondent: 3634 / 1 Name: Ms Joyce Stevens Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The site has poor road access and no facilities or services.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

The proposed size of the site is way too larger and would dwarf the local community.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3635 / 1 Name: Miss E.B Sampson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Inappropriate development in green belt
Lack of infrastructure
Inadequate access
Contaminated land subject to subsidence
Lack of mains sewerage
Pensford Colliery site totally unsuitable for this use

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No totally unsuitable

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Absolutely not

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

MOD Bath

Respondent: 3636 / 1 Name: Mr Roger Stephenson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

It should conform with government policy and be outside the green belt. There are plenty of suitable non green belt sites within City of Bath e.g. MOD at Foxhill.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

- 1) Green belt
- 2) Insufficient local amenities
- 3) Local schools all ages >1 mile distance
- 4) No public transport at site
- 5) Unsafe mining area contaminated land

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

BANES Council has failed to consider any sites to the north, east or centre of Bath.

This strikes me as a political rather than rational decision.

To dispel the suspicion of political bias it is vital that the decision process is conducted in the public domain.

Respondent: 3637 / 1 Name: Mr Norman Scott Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

M.O.D. sites.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Lane not suitable for traffic to facilities. Green Belt.

Respondent: 3638 / 1 Name: Ms Sarah Kelly Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Ex MOD and other sites our with Green belt ignored.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. Assessment process flawed.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Stanton Wick is inappropriate for a number of reasons. These include

It is Green Belt contravening Govt guidance

it will dominate local community contravening Government guidance

Previous (and smaller scale) planning has been rejected and nothing has changed

Increase in traffic would be dangerous

There are no safe walking routes to schools

There is no nearby public transport

Respondent: 3641 / 1 Name: Ms Jean Timson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Should not be on Green Belt land, inappropriate development

Unsuitable road access

This development would overwhelm the surrounding villages

Respondent: 3643 / 1 Name: Mr Anthony Balzan Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Preferred options would be 'non Green Belt' sites or ex-M.O.D. land.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The site is on Green Belt and a development here would disregard the reason for having any Green Belt land. If it was to be built on, especially at the scale proposed, then it would surely set a precedent for any other proposed developments applied for within the BANES region. This would be a slippery slope and open up the flood gates for inappropriate building developments, especially in rural areas.

Respondent: 3645 / 1 Name: Mrs Rosemary Langdon Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The choice of location for the proposed traveller site at the Old Colliery, Stanton Wick seems totally inappropriate. The population of the hamlet of Stanton Wick is small and would be completely submerged by such a large Traveller community. When housing or settling families it is important to encourage them to blend in and become part of the local community but this large influx of families to such a small community would totally overwhelm the local families. Rural values of care which maintain the essence of the countryside could be swept aside.

A Traveller site housing such a large number of families needs to be housed in an area where there is suitable infrastructure - wider roads, easier access to amenities and appropriate space to allow locals and newcomers the change to

live together in harmony. This proposition would not allow the newcomers to blend in and gain from village life, it will overwhelm the locals and ruin the existing village.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

No

Respondent: 3647 / 1 Name: Ms Sara Evans Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Please see below, particularly the point regarding the greenbelt development.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. Other planning applications for this and adjacent sites have been refused to inappropriate development if the greenbelt. Why is this apparently no longer an issue?

What schooling provision will there be and how will that impact the local schools?

The local community is small and could easily be overwhelmed.

The infrastructure - roads, utilities etc. Do not support a large site.

The land is to prove to subside with several mineshafts.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

See above.

There is no public transport available for schools, shopping, GP surgery etc.

Respondent: 3649 / 1 Name: Ms Sandra Clarke Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Old Colliery Stanton Wick is not suitable

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree with the assessment of this site being suitable

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No! The site is in Green Belt.

Long history of planning applications have been refused. Why?

There is limited employment in the area.

No shop in the area.

Increase in traffic and people.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3650 / 1 Name: Mr V.J Clarke Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Old Colliery, Stanton Wick is NOT a suitable potential site

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

This site is not suitable as a gypsy/traveller site

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO, for many reasons including

- 1) It is in the Green Belt & would constitute an inappropriate development
- 2) The proposal would overwhelm the existing settled community
- 3) BANES would NOT be able to give any meaningful guarantee that uncontrolled expansion of the site would not take place
- 4) The land is contaminated and remedial works would inevitably be at the expense of COUNCIL TAX PAYERS
- 5) The site is dangerous with several old mine shafts
- 6) Roads, amenities etc are insufficient

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3651 / 1 Name: Mr Christopher Approah Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Suitable sites would be the three MoD development sites, as all required facilities would be available. The Twerton site is clearly the preferred site, as it already accommodates traveller community. The downs at Lansdowne offers ample space to employment, education and medical centres.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

This site is totally unsuitable. It has none of the required amenities and security and is situated in the Greenbelt. It is also unsafe.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The process is clearly flawed and there is little likelihood of this passing planning laws and possible judicial review.

Respondent: 3652 / 1 Name: Mrs Jane Shephard Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Stanton Wick site is in the green belt and the proposed site would constitute inappropriate development in the green belt. The development proposed at the Old Colliery would overwhelm the existing settled community 3 to 1. The Old Colliery site is much larger, than the area earmarked as Gypsy and traveller site so can B&NES reassure residents that

uncontrolled expansion will not take place. There is a long history of planning application refusal at the Old Colliery. The only permission granted in recent years is for a dwelling - inappropriate development in the green belt has been cited as the reason for refusal.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No because Wick Lane, Stanton Wick Lane could not cope with increase traffic without substantial road widening and junction alterations. B&NES have cited traffic volume in previous refusals.
There is safe routes to walk to Pensford/Stanton Drew schools and there is no public transport within safe walking distance.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO - due to contaminated ground - old mine shafts. There is no water supply + no main sewerage and the development of the proposed size cannot be supported by septic tanks.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Old Colliery is a site of Nature Conservation interest and provides a habitat for many important species. The site is also very close to the Pensford Conservation Area. The site has historic significance. It is also very close to a residence and is very close to another who would be overlooked.

Respondent: 3653 / 1 Name: Ms Mary Whitcher Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

- 1) The site at Stanton Wick is in the Green Belt.
- 2) The lanes are most unsuitable for an increase in traffic and are too narrow and unsafe for walking
- 3) The Colliery site is contaminated and would be very expensive and would require many large vehicles to clean it up
- 4) There are no community facilities nearby
- 5) The colliery has historic significance
- 6) No main drains

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Use of Filers coahces for more parking and use of lanes was turned down by planning. The same reasons apply to proposed travellers site at Stanton Wick.

Respondent: 3654 / 1 Name: Mr Simon Rustom Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

YES - The Stanton Wick site is in Green Belt land, it is in a very narrow lane so increased traffic will be a danger. Also the site is in the middle of no-where and has no amenities, public transport or safe foot paths to shops. I understand the site itself is also unsafe. It is a ridiculous proposal!

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No - The council is not following Government guidelines or its own rules. The constraints on this site make it completely impractical, dangerous and unsuitable

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Council is clearly not following Government guidelines or a proper assessment process. Having refused numerous planning applications locally BANES is being completely inconsistent!

Respondent: 3655 / 1 Name: Mr Clive Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Stanton Wick Site is not a suitable site because it is an inappropriate development of the Greenbelt.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The Council have not listened to any objections anybody has put forward.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Gypsy and Travellers like small sites, why don't the council listen to what they want?

Respondent: 3656 / 1 Name: Mr+ M Cross Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Planning permission on this site has been refused in the past for various reasons including access and the suitability of the highway. We fail to see how any planning application should be successful now, when it has failed in the past. Also, the site fails to meet any government guidelines regarding best practice i.e. proximity to schools, GP's surgeries or public transport. Finally, the site falls within the Greenbelt, would be very costly to make safe and we understand there may be some protected species there.

Respondent: 3657 / 1 Name: Mr Richard Stevens Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

This proposed site is way too large for the area and could not be supported by the inadequate road network, water supply and other services.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. This site is within the Greenbelt and other local planning applications in the vicinity have been refused on these grounds!! A development on this site would dwarf the existing local community.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I feel it would be much preferable to incorporate any required gypsy and traveller sites into new development sites as a percentage of the development as is currently happening with low cost/starter houses.

Respondent: 3658 / 1 Name: Mr John Goodyear Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Stanton Wick site is wholly unsuitable:
Contamination of land. Unsafe mine shafts, no local schools, doctors, shops public transport, jobs within a walking distance. No safe lanes or footpaths. Erratic water supply. Roads and lanes could not support an increase in traffic. This is a nature conservation site - it must remain.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No - The council has got this all wrong. This is Greenbelt land and planning proposals have been denied because of this. Without massive road re-structuring this hamlet would not cope with the increased traffic which would include many lorries and transporters.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No - this pitch must not be taken forward as a formal allocation. It fails on far too many counts in the criteria tests. It is totally unsuitable. This is precious Greenbelt land. Once it has gone, we can never get it back. We must keep this area as it is.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Fails on so many 'best practice' issues. Schools/doctors/shops/transport (public not within safe walking distance) this proposal with dwarf the existing community. The land is contaminated and dangerous. The lanes are impractical and unsafe for large volumes of vehicles/pedestrians. This is a conservation site. Planning not approved several times as not appropriate.

Respondent: 3659 / 1 Name: Ms Alison Goodyear Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Gypsy and Traveller sites are not supposed to overwhelm the nearest population. The Stanton Wick site would dwarf the tiny hamlet of Stanton Wick. The sites are supposed to be within safe walking distance of schools, shops and doctors surgeries etc. There are none of these accessible. There is no easily reached public transport. Stanton Wick has an unreliable water supply. The site is dangerous as the land is highly contaminated and also contains several old mine shafts - one of which recently collapsed. The single track lanes are totally unsuitable for increased traffic which would be immense. These lanes and footpaths are not safe in winter as there are no street lights and can be dangerous to walk even in the summer.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree with the councils assessment of the Stanton Wick site. This site falls within the Greenbelt and the council, on numerous occasions, have declined planning applications citing inappropriate development within the Greenbelt. How was

this situation suddenly changed? The single track lanes will not cope with the massively increased volume of traffic without a scheme of road widening and junctions. Surely this should be avoided at all costs. This beautiful area of Greenbelt must be protected and not destroyed.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

I do not agree that the Stanton Wick pitch provision should be taken forward as a formal allocation. It is as unsuitable for the gypsy and travelling folk as it is for the extremely small community that it would dominate by its presence. The vehicles used by the travelling Showpeople are huge and would cause tremendous problems using these very small roads. A huge overwhelming site would not promote peaceful integration.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Best Practice for gypsy and travellers sites state that doctors surgeries, schools and shops should be within safe walking distance of the sites. There are no such facilities that comply. It states that the proposed site should not dominate the existing local population - it would dwarf Stanton Wick. The Old Colliery site is a site of nature conservation that would be destroyed if this proposal went ahead. Also affected would be the Pensford conservation area. This site proposal fails on nearly all counts in the 'criteria tests' as must not be allowed to proceed.

Respondent: 3660 / 1 Name: Ms N McKean Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Disagree.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Disagree.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3661 / 1 Name: Mr Alan Burbridge Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Forgetting the political requirements to provide Gypsy and Traveller sites, The Stanton Wick Old Colliery Site is totally unsuitable (for the reasons below) for a caravan park, residential Development or habitation as voices by BANES officials historically in response to planning applications.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. They have show a disregard for the fundamental assessment criteria and he points system - in putting forward the site.

In particular;

- Greenbelt
- Contamination of Soil
- Infrastructure (roads, local services, water, sewage)
- Danger-old mines and subsidence
- National Conservation area.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Definitely not.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The consultation process, too date, has produced such a strong feedback and new information regarding alternatives that I strongly believe the cabinet should go back to the drawing board and propose a new list of sites that more properly meet the selection criteria.

Respondent: 3662 / 1 Name: Ms Samantha Cliffe Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The proposed site, Old Colliery, Stanton Wick, is situated on an extremely narrow lane that struggles with traffic at the moment. Adding additional traffic to this road is totally unsuitable – the road does not have the capacity for any more traffic, and an increase in traffic is more than likely to result in an increase in accidents on this road. As well as this, the site also sits on top of disused mines. Building on this ground is extremely unsuitable – the ground is contaminated with arsenic. It is unacceptable for the council to suggest this as a suitable site when it is clearly detrimental to peoples' health if they were to live there. There is also no doctor within easy reach and no access to public transport. There is one small shop situated down the narrow single track road that is barely within walking distance. It would not have the resources to cope with such a large increase in residents. Most importantly, the site lies within the greenbelt, a designated conservation area.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Absolutely not, for the numerous reasons detailed above. The site is highly unacceptable.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. I cannot find a single reason why the site should be taken forward as a formal allocation.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This site has always scored poorly in suitability, yet has still made it to one of the final choices. At a meeting with local councillors they all admitted that the site was the only factor. This highlights the flaws in the selection process. It is not only essential that the council rule out this site, but that they re-evaluate the entire selection process.

Respondent: 3662 / 1 Name: Ms Samantha Cliffe Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The proposed site is situated on an extremely narrow lane that struggles with traffic at the moment. Adding additional traffic to this road is totally unsuitable - the road does not have the capacity for any more traffic and an increase in traffic is more than likely to result in an increase of accidents on this road. As well as this, the site also sits on top of disused mines, Building on this ground is extremely unsuitable - the ground is contaminated with arsenic. It is unacceptable for the council to suggest this is a suitable site when it is clearly detrimental to people's health if they were to live there. There is also no doctor within easy reach and no access to public transport. There is one small shop situated down the narrow single track road that is barely within waking distance, it would not have the resources to cope with such a large increase in residents. Most importantly, the site lies within the greenbelt, a designated conservation area.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Absolutely not, for the numeruos reasons deatiled above. The site is highly unacceptable.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. I cannot find a single reason why the ite should be taken forward as a formal allocation.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The site has always scored poorly in suitability, yet has still made it to one of the final choices. At a meeting with the local

councillors, they all admitted that the size was the only factor. This highlights the flaws in the selection process. It is not only essential that the concil rule out thos site, but that they re-evaluate the entire selection process.

Respondent: 3663 / 1 Name: Mr Paul Nixon Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO. Planning refusal for development of this site has always included traffic and unsuitability of the roads. This must apply equally to this development. There is little public transport and none within safe walking distance. There is no mains sewerage and the water supply is inadequate.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The consultation process has been most inefficient.

Respondent: 3664 / 1 Name: Mr Richard Westropp Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes. The Stanton Wick site is in the Greenbelt and the proposed site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. The site is completely unsuitable. The land is contaminated and remedial actions would involves an intolerable number of heavy lorries along narrow country lanes. Also the site is dangerous and littered with old mine shafts.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. The large development proposed would overwhelm the existing settled community. Furthermore there is a long history o previous planning refusals at this site because it is in a Greenbelt.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Yes. There are no local amenities, the site itself is unsafe there is no public transport and inadequate footpaths. Furthermore, The Old Colliery at Stanton Wick is a site of historic significance and is very close to the Pensford conservation area.

Respondent: 3665 / 1 Name: J Vickery Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I have returned a response form, but would be grateful if you could answer the following questions please so that this comment with it's comments and answer may also be included in the collated responses.

1. How does the council intend to Manage the Project ?

If there are currently no authorised traveller sites in the B&NES area then the council has no experience whatsoever of running one.

Would it be better to start small/ on one site, and learn the best practise, consider it a prototype, get it working well, before developing more and larger sites, so that mistakes can be rectified on a small scale first. Taking on vast sites and bullishly hoping they won't get messed up¹ is risky. It wouldn't be an approach taken if you were in the private sector¹ would it? There is not always a pool of unspecified public money behind you. It would be wise to begin by seeking authorisation on an existing, tolerated site and running that demonstrably well.

2. Can we Co-operate with Other Authorities who have more experience ?

How are we working in cooperation with other planning authorities on planning issues like this that cross administration boundaries given that there is a Needs Assessment on a West of England wide basis for gypsy and traveller accommodation? What is the outcome of the collaboration with North Somerset Council and it's review of need update to GTAA and South Gloucestershire Council's DPD?

3. Why is the 'Preferred Options' Shortlist seen as a good way of producing suitable gypsy and traveller sites ?

To suggest that the way to find suitable sites is to propose seven unsuitable ones and force the potential victims to suggest other possibilities just produces sites that are simply the least well defended, not that are the most suitable. It is a blunt and brutal way of trying to solve a problem. Would you hold up a Constable painting and threaten to deface it unless someone hurriedly handed you a different one to deface?

4 .. How will it make jt easier to evict from illegal sites ?

To apply the principle that it is hard to evict from illegal sites as there are no legal ones is like saying that it is okay for a youth to commit crime because the youth club is closed¹ it is okay to drop litter because there are no bins to hand or it is okay to park on the pavement because there is no car park within minutes walk. No¹ these things are illegal, socially not acceptable/ just excuses. There are legal sites, if not in this county boundary. Anyway~ what happens when all your new legal sites around Bath become full? Are we back to square one?

5. Isn't this making it easier to create an illegal site?

By developing such a large site as Pensford Colliery it will grow to a size impossible to manage or contain. Even if the number of pitches were reduced, the fact that it has been illustrated that it is physically possible to fit so many pitches there means that it will grow to at least that size. There are few robust existing developments or natural boundaries around the site that would restrict further growth again. Planning permission may not be sought so you would not know until there was a problem. You may technically be able to remove unauthorised extension but it will be very difficult on a site so large, so remote and so easy to fortress. Eviction would be costly and painful. In effect, you are creating a Dale Farm situation.

6. If the problem has not been solved in 17 years how likely is it to be solvable?

At the cabinet meeting, the councillor was keen to state that the previous administrations had not accommodated traveller numbers on legal sites. Previous administrations could have achieved this if they had been prepared to steal greenbelt and amenity space/ as the current council members intend to do. That's cheating isn't it? Perhaps there are no new permanent caravan sites created because it is truly not possible to place caravan sites in the BaNES area without

upsetting a great number of citizens and without making life misery for innocent people. It is not possible to send manned flights to Venus so we do not continue to pursue this as a scientific aim, it would be a waste of resources. If a reason for tackling this issue is that it hasn't been resolved in 17 years, perhaps it is better to live with the problem than make innocent people suffer an imposed, impractical solution. Why seed a cumulo-nimbus and create a flood when living under a bit of drizzle has been tolerable for 17 years?

7. What will be the result of stealing Green Space and Green Belt from Communities ?

If you sacrifice the green belt and the restorative green spaces in our communities, you compromise the very soul of this land and country. Green spaces are essential to quality of life, to health and happiness. Priority should be to sustainable quiet recreation and amenity use. If the identified sites are 'spare' it may be the most fitting use in this location. If you develop the small part of the plot that you refer to as 'Brown field; you will damage one of the primary purposes of the greater 'Green Belt' part which is visual amenity and habitat protection. The protection of the environment and climate change considerations are everybody's concern. Why put people in a position where they are dependent on social services and transport for every need and existing residents have to travel further to find open space for recreation activities like walking and cycling that used to be safely provided on their doorstep? Land that is currently benefitting all, is not appropriate to be given to any minority lifestyle choice/ or for their caravans and commerce. How is the commercial activity going to be regulated? If the green belt is allowed to be sacrificed to the housing and commercial uses of a few while spoiling the landscape and the lives of the existing community/ it creates a belief in the status of gypsies as outlaws. Little chance of integration there then

8. Why Build on the Green Belt when there is No Proven Need ?

Development in the green belt is tightly controlled. Green belt is structure not decorative and the boundary is part of the plan-making process not an option for a planning application. Prior refusal of planning was on grounds of green belt. It is a fact for respect that planners with more self discipline have left alone the green belt to do its job and got creative with what they had. Could the council fulfil its other obligations to encourage the recycling of derelict land and urban regeneration by refusing to surrender the green belt? Encroachment might be a relevant purpose here but not the only one. The green belt also has a very important protective effect on habitats and protects a setting and sense of place for the historic features and heritage How is the green belt to do it's job if it is so much damaged and reduced. Far from preventing neighbouring towns merging and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment the proposal for mobile homes, installs a whole new settlement in the middle of it. It will be the seed for an unrestricted sprawl and become a large built up area. Thankfully, as there is no lack of alternative sites outside green belt for the number of travellers that have to be accommodated there are not circumstances in which gypsies and traveller development would be permitted, are there? A modern development of mobile homes, would impact adversely on the national landscape designation of green belt. The fabric of caravans and their accompanying paraphernalia is most unnatural to the beauty of this site, far more damaging than such a development in an urban setting. Installing a new 'township' is not acceptable as adhering to the spirit of having a 'green belt'.

9. Is this a Sustainable Location ?

If this quiet scenery is destroyed, it will damage the health and vitality of the area and the people. How much will it cost, in time and resources, to provide a replacement space for rural recreation? Will the development of a new 'township' improve this location? All this destruction of important green spaces/ all this consuming of resources expertise, planning, meetings, hollow justifications and focus creating a negative effect on thousands just to benefit an estimated 18 and 22 households. Can the resources be better spent on renovating existing property? Money spent this way would house many more people and the effect on the rest of the population would be positive, as they see run down areas improved, not negative as they see green spaces defaced.

10. Why is This Site Selected when it Can Only Suffer Environmentally?

Prior planning refusal was on grounds of sustainability. This site cannot provide a settled base that reduces the need for long distance travelling' or prevent possible 'environmental damage caused by unauthorised encampment'. This site

cannot provide for 'due consideration' of local environmental quality, such as noise, air quality, soil quality and stability as a result of new development. It adversely affecting the health and well being of travellers and existing residents. How was it intended to monitor this site to minimise environmental impact? How can we be sure a site manager was maintaining a good standard? It is too remote for regular checks by BaNES and risks being a closed community. How would this be prevented? Everybody modifies their environment either by intention or neglect to good or bad effect, but there is nothing to prevent this site becoming a major eye sore because of the topography. Once the site was occupied it would be pulled about as the inhabitants wished. The fact that it is acknowledged that it would have required sensitive site design to prevent significant visual intrusion into the countryside is an admission of it's potential negative impact. It does not have permanent screening. The council would not be able to preserve any intended design limits.

11. What Regard has been given to its unique history?

Previously developed only for rurally acceptable use this reuse cannot possibility enhance the environment. Planting schemes cannot protect it, the residential pitch could grow in size and number to overwhelm the little protection offered by it's topography. The colliery buildings were allowed on this site in the exceptional circumstances, because the coal was there, it did not mean that the site could suddenly be considered 'industrial'. It has high risk of uncontrolled commercial growth and is liable to alteration. It would give an undesirable precedent for development elsewhere. Among the site constraints must be considered it's history. We like the history - we don't want it overwritten and homogenised.

12. Is a 'C' Road deemed Safe and Satisfactory for Frequent Caravan Movements ?

Regarding previous planning applications, Highways consultation recognised the site as not in a sustainable location due to it's 'C' class lanes. Increased vehicle movements, including caravans, trailers, mobile home transport would bring about much destruction to the single tracks and tight bends, and have conflicting movements with other road users. As a site constraint this safety aspect is paramount. The winding lanes currently act as traffic calming measures - to widen them will cause more accidents by increasing speed. The unique gentle charm and quiet character of the lanes would be lost.

13. How was this Site Put onto the Preferred Options List when It Fails Criteria ?

How can the enthusiasts for this project project themselves from 'Group think' - not taking account of outside opinions and lessons so far and forcing a square peg into a round hole. Perhaps you are tolerating the unhappy force due to a belief that whatever you do will be unpopular? Are you aware that the process of site consideration seems highly prejudiced in favour of travellers and infringes the rights of the settled communities! Many sites put forward have no relation to recognised criteria. Some shortlisting sites contain play equipment. The removal of which is contrary to SR.1A Can we understand Socially, Financially; Environmentally and Legally the collateral damage that will be caused, and add these to a scoring matrix? There is an assessment of travellers needs without a corresponding assessment of settled community needs. How is it even meeting the travellers needs. A Stanton Wick location would have meant that a great number of vehicles would have to travel many miles on rural lanes to do anything and everything for their isolated community or an almost worst alternative is that they become insular, self serving and ghettoised. Where is the sustainability appraisal of social, economic and environmental effects of plans for the Stanton Wick site?

14. What Opportunities and Revenue Streams are being Lost by developinq the Old Colliers Site as residential ?

Are you stopping a far more appropriate use of land in such a position? The government grants available for new forests could be to enhance the historical and nature significance of this site while also providing employment and leisure opportunities.

15. What js the Budget for The Developments of Each Site ?

Unsuitable development of this site will damage the local economy. From next April local councils will be able to keep half of business rates. If the council surrender such a site as the old colliery to residential use, they will lose that opportunity as well as the local economy missing out on the capability to create rural employment. Are achievability costs considered along with achievability criteria, and the ongoing costs taken into account when assessing sites? There is an ongoing loss to the council from lost business rates; reduced council tax; litigation; road traffic accidents; reparation to damaged communities; enforcement costs if pitch numbers are exceeded; loss of earnings because focus and attention is not with

other projects, and the return both financially and socially that the site may have generated if put to other use. Compared this with amount currently spent on enforcements. In fact, how much has been spent so far on the entire project of servicing the GTfS SA requirements? Would it be sufficient to buy all these good, patient people fair homes? Will the council tax charged to the new traveller communities reflect what is charged to the rest of the residents of the area? Will it reflect the additional services such as education, transport health, waste recycling that need to be installed for their benefit alone on this remote green field site?

16. Can the caravan site proposals come into the Planning Policy framework ?

Some sites in the 'list' have previously had planning applications turned down. It looks rather arbitrary and prejudiced if BaNES then develops these sites for residential caravans and commercial vehicles. Will not the council be answerable to the legal teams of the firms with business plans that were suppressed by such past decisions? Are you really considering setting a dangerous precedent and trampling over the established working practices and proven planning policy to accommodate the lifestyle choice of a few? The planning policy intention for all new developments is 'integrated co-existence, to guard against the destabilising effect of shifts in the character and culture of a place, filtering out those projects that will cause social disharmony'. Why is BaNES not following the new government guidelines published with the national planning policy framework? We should have a variety of housing stock and if a family wants to reside in a caravan that is fine but they should as individuals, find suitable land like everyone else and apply for planning permission like everyone else. To obtain permission to build a caravan pitch or a cottage foundation should be a fairly applied due process that applies to one and all. To suggest that gypsies need not or cannot follow this process is treating them like dependent children and being disrespectful to them and their abilities.

17. To Allow Planning Permission Now would be Inconsistent wouldn't it ?

The DPDs are there to serve the aims of the local development framework. A traveller caravan site has not been part of the long term spatial planning strategy for the area and therefore cannot be bolted on in this fashion. Are these proposals not already covered under residential and commercial planning rules? Lack of suitable sites outside the green belt land to meet identified needs can NOT be considered very special circumstances. What would be the implications for such a precedent in the planning system. if 'special circumstances' were used as an excuse? How will that be weighed up? The individuals desire to live in a caravan does not mean they can pitch up in the green belt. It's not about isolating gypsies and travellers, it's about applying the law fairly to all. Prior refusal of planning on grounds of only one house and ancillary was approved. You cannot in all fairness, reject this site for residential developments and business expansions in the past and now find it acceptable for a large scale and growable trailer park. A caravan pitch could never be a 'very special circumstance' given the recognised universal benefits of the green belt against the singular individual's benefit in setting up residence there. Everything about caravans is functional, synthetic and hard edged. These aren't cottages which can look as if grown from the soil, they are obviously incongruous and visually violent in such a setting mobile homes would introduce unsympathetic elements into open countryside. Success dependent on things you cannot control in the long term such as any mobile homes and caravans being located away from the visible edges planting schemes etc. etc. There is no good level of site screening in this location that cannot be easily damaged or removed over time. As we know, planning and design can have a huge effect on the anti-social behaviour and criminal activity that arise in a development. The riots in the Paris suburbs are one of the many testimonials to that. What are the specifics that the planning department are looking to achieve in site design, location and placement? The new township residents will be highly visible as individuals and in their significant number and size of vehicles in their commercial activities. There would be a volume of noise that such a large site would generate just by normal human activity, let alone business enterprises. It will be the source of constant irritation on both sides, explosive given the new inhabitants extendable position within a huge 10 hectare site. Screening with trees is not enough the new residents will not be living as hermits, they will be met in lanes in big vehicles, road rage will be endemic. But planning means that conflict is more or less likely, monitoring site usage, including overcrowding/ commercial use antisocial behaviour, criminal activity are Not outside the planning policy and you cannot ignore the social responsibility to support children and families. You cannot surrender liability for this if it was your decision to site pitches in a particularly difficult location in which to monitor and enforce terms and conditions. In effect to create isolated communities. Abercrombie's design ideas for Bath were also deeply flawed and driven by a cold focus and narrowness of view. They were eventually halted but we still pay the price today for the social and heritage damage inflicted. When an idea is driven by calculated logic towards a narrow purpose rather than with head and heart, sensitivity and understanding, we all suffer. Please do not let history repeat itself. Let us learn from the past and be wise. This proposal to start a traveller

site in this location will create both short and long term collateral damage. It serves us not if we pursue a numerical directive and block ourselves from fulfilling other aims like rural employment, village community cohesion, localism and global responsibilities.

19. How Do You Control Site Growth ?

I understand the seductive appeal of a single large site that would meet:-

- 1) the numerical needs of BaNES project but sadly it does.
- 2) Not meet the social needs of traveller families
- 3) Not meet the environmental needs of the local community so it would leave purposes unfulfilled and these are the most important parties to be considering. It could only accommodate those people wanting to live outside the city's opportunities and services. Policy C states that when assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi rural setting, local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community. We are an familiar with regular houses that get extended to within centimetres of their boundary. You estimated the number of pitches within a site 'to allow for household growth' ! How much growth will you allow before you step in with an enforcement notice given that this will be time consuming, costly, miserable for all concerned and no-one will want to do it? But it will cost1 because you will face litigation from the injured parties, those suffering emotionally and environmentally from the uncontrolled growth that you have allowed. How can limits be enforced? It would be irresponsible to allow a foothold onto this open site. There is no alternative to create smaller portion of site and less pitches. Harm to green belt arising would Not decrease and the site would grow in an uncontrolled way into the space available.

20 pitches to 1 hectare - to allow for household growth!

20 pitches means:- 40 trailers and 40 vehicles

plus 20 buildings housing a kitchen and bathroom

and 20 sheds and 20 gardens and 20 play spaces.

That is huge - could we all be afforded so generous an amount of space!

If the capacity is 50 pitches and 20 is recommended,it will obviously grow to 50 ! or become a derelict dumping ground if no one wants to-continue living there ... Presumably over the full 10 hectares as you wouldn't be able to stop it.

Development of this site would not directly assist the aim of social integration. Even having the site's location remote from the main settlement would not limit the impact on neighbouring residents unless the travellers intend to live as recluses and never venture across the border into the 'settlement'. It would facilitate an isolated, self serving form of gypsy life by providing a site capable of accommodating many families and future household growth, giving a ghetto style of residential. Is this not undesirable; locally, nationally and also sadly damaging to the traveller children in their capacity for educational and social mobility. A pitch for a couple of caravans/mobile homes is a facility. 100's of people residing in tens of mobile homes with accompanying outbuildings, vehicles and commercial activities is a township.

20. Can any of the Current Sites. used by Travellers become Legal Sites ?

It is possible that some of the tolerated locations currently used by travellers are suitable for legal development. It may be that although there is a negative effect to their siting, it is less damaging environmentally than any of the proposed new sites.

21 . What is the Current Need ?

Where is the proof in order to determine a planning application without recent evidence of continuing need? Are there any more recent verifiable figures for households than the 2007 West of England GTAA of .'

1-2 Irish Travellers

1 Romany

2 of Travelling Show-people

14-17 households new travellers.

How can the planning committee determine a planning application without recent evidence of continuing need?

22. How is the Site List kept up to date and the matrix kept relevant ?

When are updates made to help with accurate decision making, as there is no mention of planning permission given for pre-school at Keynsham or loss of the Doctors surgery closest to the Stanton Wick site? Is there a consideration for the capacity of local services not just are there any? On the Stanton Wick site, existing buildings are minimal compared to what is necessary' for the development of a traveller site. The site assessments give no idea of scale, for instance not just is there a local school (a small local junior school) but what is the capacity. Not just there is a road (a narrow lane) but how many miles it is to a main road. There seems few specifics as to size, capacity; actual budgeted costs. How can you judge these sites without these real numbers? The existence of a local school does not mean you can check that box on the matrix without knowing the current and expected capacity of that school. It may be that only two more pupils could be taken on without harming the education of all or it may mean that next years intake of local children cannot be accommodated. How much resentment do you think that would generate?

23. Doesn't this site fail to fulfil Traveller Needs According to the GTTS Assessment?

What will it really be like for the new residents probably none of whom have grown up locally? How can this site serve the gypsies and travellers? Why uproot travellers from existing sites they may not want to move yet? Just because you can accommodate a large number of people on one site does not make it ethically acceptable to do so. It cannot reduce overall level of need, as not many of the travellers may find themselves suited to living remote from the city and will not want to move there or will move back to the town. To provide education and commercial use of this site, which has not been offered to local people, acknowledges that these services do not exist and to allow these services only with the installation of traveller pitches is a gross prejudice in favour of the new community you intend to install into a settled one. Where is the 'Equality impact assessment' appraising the effects of plans strategies and policies on different groups? Has this been completed for all the considered sites? Have we identified discriminatory and negative consequences of pursuing the current project. How will this eat into the 'affordable homes program' (is it £60 million) and where will the families live who cannot now find a home due to the priority given to travellers? How will this damage the creation of more jobs in rural areas? What are BaNES plans to sustain this area once it's primary asset of area of natural rural beauty has been removed by imposing a caravan site in the field? Is the council prepared for the litigation that will ensue if the proposed site has a negative impact on existing businesses and the work, home and health of existing residents?

28. Does BaNES have sufficient Resources/Funds for Continued Support to Sites?

If you invest in attractive, inviting permanent pitches for travellers and gypsies for their caravans and commercial activities word will get around. Travellers travel don't they. The Bath area will be known as an inviting and accommodating place for them and sites will all be fully utilised. Then Illegal sites will still be used. They are convenient and there is no other space. So, you had better have ready six more, equally handsome sites waiting in the wings. Does BaNES have the funding to keep supplying this want. How much is currently spent on managing illegal sites? What about the ongoing cost to all rate payers and council tax payers? BaNES will not be able to recover much council tax from a community that organises itself in a traveller way. When things go wrong as they inevitably do when things are in the wrong place there may be no central government funding to bail out the problem. How much has BaNES already spent pursuing unsuitable sites? The council has a great deal of tax and rent revenue rolling in because it's a good place to live and work but if they remove existing amenities from established communities they will have less revenue income. The sites on the list will require substantial, expensive ongoing management. Social discord produces it's own costs, more diverse and less easy to calculate. This project like a Kraken and you have to keep feeding a Kraken once you have awoken him.

29. What is the Criteria for the Success of the Project ?

If none of the sites currently being proposed is acceptable or suitable this exercise will be a great waste of public money/ just to prove that we tried to find sites but it is not possible without an unacceptable level of collateral damage. Is there a Plan B?

30. What Are the Risks and How Will They Be Mitigated ?

There are consequences to this action. What risk assessments have been taken? How are sites revoked if they prove problematic for their host community? Where is the exit strategy defined?

31. Why is this a Priority Housing issue when there are other more Urgent needs?

Why are gypsy caravans and commerce given such a high priority, when given the great range and diversity of needs for residents of Bath and NE Somerset? By creating an oversupply, new traveller pitches will be taken up, BaNES will create a demand by providing spare capacity and the traveller lifestyle will become appealing to more people as a way of finding a home, a lifestyle which is perhaps not in the best long term interests of their families. With an extensive housing waiting list and homeless people on the streets, why is BaNES so keen to prove they are prepared to move a minority up the housing list? The space required for a pitch is huge Any money spent on this process is not spent on the affordable homes program or renovating existing property, drawing them back into housing stock. If BaNES is prepared to upset so many people and dispel of planning policy, and government guidelines to see this project through, it has set a dangerous precedent. By acting unreasonable it has shown it does not need reason to act. It will be pressured to accommodate any minority interest. He who pays the ransom invites more kidnapping.

32. Is the Cabinet to retract it's proposals in the light of overwhelming evidence or is 'Consultation' just for show ?

At the cabinet meeting, the councillor instructed that we shouldn't be against the traveller people, which none of us were. We are not denying them a home by defending ours. Apparently 'consultation is not statutory'1 i.e. we don't have to be fair. It is heartening to know that BaNES is unafraid of scrutiny and will not railroad their ambitions through if there is opposition? There must not be efforts by some councillors to force us to accept the unacceptable/ or resent our steely assurance that we will defend our right to stay living in a peaceful and harmonious way, in a traditional rural village. Everybody defending a stable community life and the protection of 'open spaces and green belt'1 without exception, expressed their concerns eloquently and rationally and without prejudice, demonstrating such character and intellect as would make anybody proud of their citizenship. The reasons why these proposals should not go ahead were indisputable. In the light of all the presentations, BaNES will have to shelve it's proposals to despoil amenity land, unless it intends to prove that it's implementation of democracy and consultation is a sham and it has a despotic attitude and lamentable lack of good character in local council such as gives government de-centralisation a bad name.

33 . Who is Responsible for Driving through this Project?

I can only understand a councillor pushing forward this if they have a problem with traveller sites within their own ward. Who are these councillors? Cannot they be helped to solve any problems where they exist, rather than just temporarily displacing people elsewhere at great cost in time, resources, distress to all concerned, loss of amenity land and landscape? How does this serve the common good? How does this even serve the needs of the traveller communities? Is this quota, for traveller site pitches, a real 'directive' or just a useful tool by which to displace people? Haven't top down targets for the number of traveller pitches been removed? What was said to the gypsies when they were taken on a site visit? What are their real feelings on being removed to a remote site? An obsession with forcing these proposals through, could lead to overriding the government guidelines on protecting the green belt and causing worry and disruption to the wards beyond their own. If council members decide to press ahead with this proposal, despite rational argument can they be made individually liable for the physical distress and material costs incurred by the citizens in defending their quiet way of life. Can individual councillors who decide to direct public funds in this way, without regard to wider priorities and higher purposes be held personally liable? After all, the council members will then be operating contrary to government guidelines I and unrepresentative of the electorate.

15. Why is this proposal being Pursued Despite it's deep unpopularity?

Abercrombie and Buchanan and Beeching are seen as ridiculous figures now. When their plans came to light there was much said against their ideas but they barged on anyway. Just because this project is unpopular doesn't mean it is right and even they were eventually stopped before they could fulfil all the bizarre proposals. At the end of the day history may judge you to be as destructive to social and environment as your predecessors.

35. To What Extent Are we Blinkered by a Belief that this is Bound to be unpopular?

There are some real concerns and red flags raised about these development site proposals but they are easily and wrongly

dismissed if we adopt the mind set that such developments are bound to be difficult.

This is a deeply unpopular proposal to put a traveller on Stanton Wick green belt, but for very real reasons. It has to have so many fixes to make it work: remedial work; screening; road safety changes; new school; planning rule changes; new areas found for recreation for existing community; green belt loss; public transport provision; healthcare provision; elderly care; and the cost of these as well as ongoing costs; business rate and council tax loss; compensation; legal fees; management; monitoring; enforcement action ... to name but a few, isn't it time to say it's wise to press pause on the project now that we have found the flaws, so we can put them right and move forward with more sensitivity, accuracy and confidence. To continue, would be considered by many, simply tunnel vision. 'Better to doubt methodically than think capriciously'. Perhaps it is easy to be blinded by your singularity of purpose. Your position is not to push through unpopular ideas but to bring together a spirit of co-operation and involvement in the communities. We have suspicion about your motives. How will you politically survive this? Insecurity means less confidence less goodwill and effort. •It is said that 'Rome fell because there were not enough Romans left to do the job of Rome.' Why are you trying to upset those who most contribute to the work of the county? You hold your office by being given the goodwill and trust of the people how can people trust an authority that seems prejudiced against them? This will never be over. How will history judge you - should we not be looking long term? It will be an ongoing part of BaNES responsibility, to carry on finding new sites and monitoring and mending the effects.

36. Can Consultation Be Improved?

There was to my knowledge no public consultation with local people before this site was shortlisted. It was noted that there was limited response to the three public drop in events, a low turnout and only 41 responses received. Does this not imply that the you may not be using the right communication methods? Are people really really aware of the huge impact of your proposals on land user on the planning system, on the social and financial short term and long term effects for the county?

37. Where is the Capacity for Future Needs ?

When one looks at the beautiful unique locations that BaNES proposes to destroy for their current plan to work, one's heart sinks. How can you be so destructive, for just some current arbitrary directive? You will be scorned as Dr. Beeching is scorned. He was mis-informed and mis-guided and short-sighted, unable to see the enormous benefits that sparing his axe would have had on the transport system of the future. Is not BaNES guilty of such short-sightedness, because it is not immediately obvious of the benefits of keeping this reserve of natural land.

38. What Future are you Creating ?

If you destroy the open rural character of our green belt, no one will be able to view it without pain. BaNES does not have a good track record¹ we have little faith in it's placations. Bath bus station is a failure of the council to listen to the people, it's impractical, dangerous and painful ugliness erupted despite huge support to keep the historic and beautiful Churchill House. However, unlike the design of Dorchester Street which we learn to side step, or failings in the management of the Bath Spa Project which is behind us, the costs incurred by the creation of so many caravan sites will be ever ongoing and these will simmer constantly and periodically erupt volcanically, eroding funds for all new projects, as they create outflow of expense, misery and heat. What makes the council so sure it won't mess up spectacularly this time? Abercrombie and Beeching caused destruction and despair more through ignorance than malice. Their sad legacy is still viewed with anger but also pity at their soul-less focus.

39. What is the Most Rational choice for Reasonable People ?

Do you choose to destroy the homeliness, environment, leisure and work environment for 1000's or do you resolve to find a more creative way to give 18 or 22 families a caravan pitch?

40. What is the perceived Effect on the Attitude of ordinary Citizens towards BaNES?

1250 signed the first petition against this proposal - and this is just the start.

If you decide to prioritise the lifestyle wants of one group of people and allow them to override accepted planning policy, government policy and the needs of other citizens, you are creating an unfair system. It is often an absolute tinder box to high emotion when there is perceivable unfairness in a community or in a country. What happens when someone is injured on the rural roads as a direct consequence to the unsuitable siting of residential caravans? There may be civil unrest to face on both sides of the fence. You, as the councillors responsible, may find yourselves embarrassingly notorious for being the administration that, far from solving a 17 year issue, made a dormant problem so much worse. Like the sorcerer's apprentice, BaNES may be unable to control what it has started. Please reassure me.

I always had such great faith in what I believed to be a fair and democratic system; the stabilising effect of planning regulations; that any people whatever their denomination or lifestyle had to comply as individuals with the laws of the land and go through due process for building any style of habitat for residential or commercial use; the long proven benefit of having green spaces within and green borders around our cities and villages; and respect for the peoples that love and protect them.

Respondent: 3665 / 2 Name: J Vickery Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The site is not available as it in green belt I affects the function of the green belt. The green belt cannot be used as the need is unproven.

The site is unsuitable as it is in an area of land too big to manage. It would grow in an uncontrolled way. Enforcement action would be difficult and expensive. All services will have to be self contained and installed leading to ghettoisation.

The site is not achievable as remediation works for this land would be costly to the BaNES GTTS SA beyond all benefit as traveller pitches. Road access is via a narrow winding lane, with sharp bends. Road use and the number of vehicles using this lane is currently a minimum, more would make it a highly dangerous route.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. This site should not be taken forward. It has no potential for pitch provision of the required size for a traveller site as set out by the GTTS SA specifications.

To develop a large site will overwhelm the existing settlement and a small site will be costly to service. There are no suitable facilities at this location. There is a very real danger that crime will increase, not from the gypsies, but from other persistent perpetrators of low level crime certain that the presence of travellers would be blamed with the trouble.

In the past, planning permission for more than one dwelling was turned down and permission for commercial development was turned down. If experienced and qualified planners and other people deemed it unsuitable at that time, it is even more unsuited to the proposed purpose now.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3666 / 1 Name: Mrs Kathleen Burbridge Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Normal prudence and practical considerations are being overridden by the political need to provide sites for travellers, in

particular with regard to the multipitch Stanton Wick site. It is apparent that the cabinet is determined, regardless, to ignore the assessment criteria in continuing with this site.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I do not agree. How can the council consider this site when it is already considered 'inappropriate development' as it is on Greenbelt site - never mind the health and safety issues. The site is dangerous and it is on top of old mine shafts and the ground is contaminated.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No - there are MANY reasons why I do not agree, the above being only a few. Also, there cannot be access to local amenities as there is no safe walking route and the Doctors Surgery is 5 miles away. When you did your own assessment YOU found the site unsuitable.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Should the site go ahead, what employment could the travellers get? There is very limited employment in this area and who will pay for the site to be cleared???

Respondent: 3667 / 1 Name: Mr Tom Holmes Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes I think they should use old MoD sites outside of the Greenbelt areas.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

A large development such as the proposed Old Colliery development would overwhelm the existing community (up to a factor of 3:1)

Respondent: 3668 / 1 Name: Ms Elaine Holmes Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Ex MOD Sites
Outside the Green Belt

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Wick Lane, Stanton wick lane and the junctions cannot support any real increase in traffic volume without substantial road widening and junction alteration: BANES have cited traffic volume in previous refusals.

Respondent: 3669 / 1 Name: Gaynor Evans Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am deeply concerned that a decision is being made without due consideration to the enormous impact this will have on the local community, the environment, or the residents of the proposed site, both in terms of providing for their needs or their safety. I appreciate and respect that you have made a commitment to provide for a disadvantaged group of people, but this should not mean that your desire to provide for them, blinkers you to the potential risks, or unsuitability of a site.

LOCAL COMMUNITY

It is clear that ANY development of this size would be **DETRIMENTAL** in that it would **OVERWHELM** a hamlet of 50 people with limited services, which is why after repeated application **BANES** have previously approved planning for only **ONE HOUSE**. 1. I would like to know why it is it now being considered suitable for a much larger development. 2. I would also like to know how you intend to ensure social cohesion, which is of utmost importance if two very different communities are to live side by side harmoniously.

AMENITIES/TRAVELLERS NEEDS

This site would not provide easy access to ANY vital services, namely a Doctor's surgery, Shop, Schools or Leisure facilities apart from the local Pub, residents would have to get in a car for **EVERYTHING** they would need to do. Apart from **NOT MEETING THE NEEDS OF THE TRAVELLERS**, it would have a **DEVESTATING** impact on the roads the local environment, and the service providers. 3. Could you explain to me why a site that has nothing in common with the preference of travellers is to be in close proximity to amenities is being considered, and why you feel that this site **DOES** meet the criteria.

SAFETY /ROADS

Which raises the question of just how **SAFE** this site would be. The roads could not cope with the potential **SIZE** of vehicles or the **VOLUME** of traffic (up to 100 more cars) which would put other users at risk too. The potential for accidents is very real and presumably the cost of widening the roads to cater for the vehicles would be huge. There is no public transport and so the only alternative would be to walk on country lanes with **NO PAVEMENTS** or **LIGHTING**. I certainly would not want my children/teenagers to be put at such a risk. 4. I would like to know what your proposals are for improvements to roads/lighting and who will bear the cost. 5. I would like to know if the Highways Dept has assessed these roads.

CONTAMINATION

I am deeply concerned that you would consider a site that could potentially risk the well-being of the very people you wish to help. This site was originally a mine and is **HIGHLY CONTAMINATED**. A detailed survey has not been completed to establish old mine shafts that would be a very real **DANGER**. Surely the safeguard of their children should be of utmost importance. This is a **DANERGOUS SITE**. 5. I would like to know if a thorough examination of the site will be carried out, in terms of dangers/ health risks, the results, the cost involved to make the site safe, and who will pay for this.

COST

Bearing in mind the **UNSUITABILITY** of this site, a vast amount will have to be invested in order to make both the **ROADS** suitable, and the **SITE HABITABLE**. This surely would make the viability to any business considering building a site unattractive and prohibitive. 6. I would like to know what costs eg Water, Sewerage, Electricity etc, will be passed on to Rate Payers, and how much it will be.

GREENBELT

My understanding is that the government, for very good reason supports the protection of its Greenbelt. Building on land has to be 'appropriate', and The National guidelines state that 'Traveller sites in green belt are an **INAPPROPRIATE** development'. 7. I would like you to explain to me what special circumstances you feel you have, that allows you to ignore our **GOVERNMENTS**

COMMITMENT to protect the **NATIONS Green Belt**.

Finally, It appears that your intent to meet a criteria, ie cater for a disadvantaged group of people, who I believe SHOULD be catered for, has blinkered the process. It appears to have resulted in a lack of due care and consideration for ALL parties, SUITABILITY OR SUSTANABILITY. A desire to 'get a result' has resulted in some serious errors of judgement in terms of ASSESSING the suitability of a potential site.

Respondent: 3672 / 1 Name: Ms Harriet Richardson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I believe the site to be unachievable because it would breach a number of planning requirements, esp: The site is within the Green Belt. Government Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012, Paragraph 14 states "Travellers sites in Green Belt are inappropriate development." and "Inappropriate development is harmful to Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances." BaNES have not provided any reasoning to they might consider there to be very special circumstances. Also Paragraph 23 of Policy H states, "Local Planning Authorities should strictly limit new travellers site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the Development Plan.", this site is in the open countryside remote to the a major village.

I believe the site is unsuitable for a number of reasons, including:

Government policy also states the "When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, the Local Planning Authority should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community." Stanton Wick is the nearest settled community, a very small Hamlet of just over 20 houses, it would be unacceptably dominated by the site. BaNES emerging CP11 includes criteria against which G and T proposals are to be assessed, one of the criteria states "Use of this site must have no harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers", there are two adjacent residential occupiers (The Winding House and The Bath House, 2 families totalling 10 occupants) whose amenity would undoubtedly be compromised by the proposed scale of development.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The Council's assessment matrix is flawed, in that it has incorrect weightings/scores for proximity, nature conservation, contamination, highways accessibility, safety, noise, and Green Belt. If the evaluation matrix was properly scored, the Old Colliery Buildings Stanton Wick would not have been designated as a preferred site.

With a corrected matrix this site would have come lower than 17 out of 23. However even with the flawed scoring it seems incredible that a site ranking only 17th was carried through to a preferred options stage. Even more astounding is the admission by officers that the matrix did not give the desired results so the list was modified ("screened!!").

BaNES Issues and Options Report refers to: "The need for smaller sites in Bath & North East Somerset district is supported by the West of England GTAA which found that most surveyed respondents expressed a preference to live in smaller family-sized sites of no more than five pitches." Both local councillors and planning officers have on numerous occasions stated that in their opinion the major appeal of the Stanton Wick site is its "large size", they are clearly at odds with their own documentation!

Finally, the most recent Government policy guidance for gypsy and travellers sites gives a range of policy criteria, the site at Stanton Wick would fail to comply with most of these so it would appear that BaNES have blatantly chosen to ignore recent Government policy.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

This site would neither satisfy the requirements of the Gypsy and Traveller community based on the West of England GTAA nor would it satisfy the requirements for integration into local community and as such it OUGHT NOT TO BE TAKEN FORWARD

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The needs assessment on which this DPD is based is rather old.

Since the Gypsy and Traveller community that passes through BaNES tends to be predominantly 'New Age' travellers who do not generally wish to have fixed pitches, it would appear that the council ought to revisit their needs assessment to ensure it is updated and fully caters for the needs of Gypsy and Travellers that come to BaNES.

Respondent: 3673 / 1 Name: Ms Elizabeth Richardson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site is unachievable as it would not comply with several planning requirements, primarily: The site is within the Green Belt. Government Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, March 2012, Paragraph 14 states "Travellers sites in Green Belt are inappropriate development." and "Inappropriate development is harmful to Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances." BaNES have not provided any reasoning to they might consider there to be very special circumstances.

I believe the site is unsuitable for a number of reasons, including:

Government policy also states the "When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, the Local Planning Authority should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community." Stanton Wick is the nearest settled community, a very small Hamlet of just over 20 houses, it would be unacceptably dominated by the site. NPPF seeks sustainable development, Stanton Wick colliery is not sustainably located in that it is in a remote location away from all services (including schools, shops, doctors and public transport) and the roads from the site to the nearest villages (Stanton Drew and Pensford) are primarily single track lanes that cannot viably be upgraded. BaNES emerging CP11 includes criteria against which G and T proposals are to be assessed, one of the criteria states "Use of this site must have no harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers", there are two adjacent residential occupiers (The Winding House and The Bath House, 2 families totalling 10 occupants whose amenity would undoubtedly be compromised by the proposed scale of the development.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site. I believe that the assessment matrix is flawed, in that it has incorrect weightings/scores for proximity, nature conservation, contamination, highways accessibility, safety, noise, and Green Belt. If the evaluation matrix was properly scored, the Old Colliery Buildings Stanton Wick would not have been designated as a preferred site. There is a discrepancy between BaNES estimated number of vans per pitch (1 . 7) and the government's estimates (3.2). BaNES Issues and Options Report refers to: "The need for smaller sites in Bath & North East Somerset district is supported by the West of England GTAA which found that most surveyed respondents expressed a preference to live in smaller family-sized sites of no more than five pitches." Both local councillors and planning officers have on numerous occasions stated that in their opinion the major benefit for the Stanton Wick site is its "large size", they are clearly at odds with their own documentation! The Preferred Options Stage: Detailed Site Assessment Report states that "All known constraints were identified to draw out site delivery costs such as infrastructure and remediation works." This is untrue, there has been no attempt to quantify the infrastructure costs, these include highways infrastructure, drainage and remediation works. Without this information the site ought not to have been included as a preferred site. Also, the most recent Government policy guidance for designating gypsy and travellers sites gives a range of plan-making and decision-taking policy criteria. Since the site at Stanton Wick would fail to comply with most of these policies it would appear that BaNES have blatantly chosen to ignore recent Government policy.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No! Since the site is so obviously not achievable and fails to comply with many National and Local Government planning guidelines it is inconceivable that it could continue as a preferred site designation as the DPD progresses.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

It is of great concern that the local community were not approached by the Council between November 2011 and April 2012 (when the Preferred Options Report was produced) as one would expect if the council truly had a proactive approach to local involvement.

It would seem that the consultation is being blindly driven by the Liberal Democrat cabinet with a pre-determined result in

mind regardless of planning policy.

During the councils public exhibitions particularly Stanton Drew and Pensford officers appeared either to be illinformed or were unable or unwilling to provide open constructive answers to questions which were acknowledged to be of merit and relevance. The general answer was that either "information was in a report on the BaNES website" or that the point was "yet to be looked into".

Respondent: 3680 / 1 Name: Ms Suzanne Winter Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

My concerns are using/developing The Old Colliery Site in Stanton Wick, is having walked the public footpath and lane past this site to Stanton Wick from Pensford and there is no safe walking route to either Pensford School or Stanton Drew School. The lane is one carriageway wide so will easily become congested if this proposed site goes ahead. This will also seriously impinge on the enjoyment of this area which is

- 1) In the green belt area
- 2) Is a site of Nature Conservation Interest which provides habitat for many important species

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I do not

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

While I support the need for permanent pitches to be available for Gypsy and Travellers alike, in order to support the integration of this community group, I feel the site would also need to be smaller with fewer pitches. This proposed development would overwhelm the existing settled Community and especially the residence adjacent to the site and opposite. Another concern is the cost to the council to remedy this site for safe usage when already there is a need for more housing for growing local families.

Respondent: 3681 / 1 Name: MW Morris Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Having lived for over 70 years in and around Pensford I feel qualified to comment on these points:

For reasons stated overleaf I believe this particular site (Stanton Wick) to be wholly unsuitable and unachievable for a gypsy and traveller settlement.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

- 1) Site is situated within the green belt
- 2) Large development such as this is wholly disproportionate to the local surroundings
- 3) Previous history of planning refusals / inappropriate development within the green belt cited
- 4) Roadways unable to support the huge increase in traffic
- 5) No safe walking route to local schools
- 6) Site will overlook one residence and very close to another

Respondent: 3682 / 1 Name: Mr R.W Churchill Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No. Not suitable

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Should have not been considered under any circumstances. Not suitable.

Respondent: 3686 / 1 Name: Mr GE Baber Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No but certainly not at Stanton Wick

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO I do not agree on this (green belt land)

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO This site is not suitable for many reasons. Access schools, shops, doctors etc & many more reasons

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3687 / 1 Name: Mrs J Baber Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No - I do not agree. This is Green Belt Land and should remain as such.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No - I do not agree. There are endless reasons why this site is unsuitable - the access i.e. far from suitable and walking routes to Pensford and Stanton Drew (especially for schools) is dangerous to say the least.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3689 / 1 Name: Mrs R Ferris Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick totally unsuitable

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No!

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Definitely Not

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Small secure sites where they cannot congregate in large numbers, or if a large site is preferred, one that does not interfere with local businesses and residents.

See attached: (Copy of map attached) Have you considered other sites? A location I think is very suitable is the redundant M.O.D. Depot near Burnett (location map attached) it can cause no offence as it is not overlooked by any properties and is secluded. Access is ideal from the B3116 at Burnett Point.

Respondent: 3689 / 1 Name: Mrs R Ferris Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Opportunities NO! Constraints YES!

Total lack of facilities, water, sewerage, road access, proving the stability of the coal tip site. These can only be provided at an unnecessarily high cost with so many local services underfunded (local road maintenance an example)

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. Far too many to impose on the small local almost non-existent services

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Has the now defunct MOD depot at Burnett been considered. There is still a lot of land (with services) not used at this location. Road access is ideal, no property nearby to be offended.

Respondent: 3690 / 1 Name: BG Curtis Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

- The Stanton Wick Site is in the Green Belt and the proposed site would constitute "inappropriate development in the

Green Belt".

- A large development such the proposed Old Colliery development would overwhelm the existing settled community (up to a factor of 3 to 1)
- The overall Old Colliery site is much larger than the area earmarked as a G& T site. Can BaNES reassure residents that uncontrolled expansion will not take place?
- There is a long history of planning application refusals, both at the Old Colliery and the adjacent site (Filer's Coaches): the only permission that has been granted in recent years is for a single dwelling. Inappropriate development in the Green Belt has been cited as reason for refusal.
- Wick Lane, Stanton Wick Lane and the junctions, cannot support any real increase in traffic volume without substantial road widening and junction alteration: BaNES have cited traffic volume in previous refusals.
- There is no safe walking route along the roads either to Pensford or Stanton Drew schools. The public footpath from the side of the Winding House to the A37 is not safe, even in summer.
- There is no public transport within safe walking distance.
- The only local shop in Pensford is very small, does not stock sufficient for a food shopping requirement and there is no safe walking route.
- The nearest Doctor's surgery is around 5 miles away and there is no public transport.
- The water supply to Stanton Wick is notoriously unreliable and is at capacity for the infrastructure. There is no mains sewerage in Stanton Wick and a development of the proposed size cannot be supported by septic tanks.
- The land at the Old Colliery Site is contaminated and remediation would uneconomic without a significant contribution from the Council and would involve an intolerable number of heavy vehicle movements along Wick Lane.
- The site is dangerous, has several old mineshafts within it, and these could be liable to subsidence at any time.
- There is limited employment in the area.
- The Old Colliery is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and provides a habitat for many important species.
- The site is very close to the Pensford Conservation Area.
- The site has historic significance
- The site is immediately adjacent to, and overlooked by, one residence and is very close to another

Respondent: 3692 / 1 Name: Mr Andrew Vickery Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site is not available as it in green belt I affects the function of the green belt.
 The green belt cannot be used as the need is unproven. The site is unsuitable as it is in an area of land too big to manage. It would grow in an uncontrolled way. Enforcement action would be difficult and expensive.
 All services will have to be self contained and installed leading to ghettoization. The site is not achievable as remediation works for this land would be costly to the BaNES GTTS SA beyond all benefit as traveller pitches. Road access is via a narrow winding lane, with sharp bends. Road use and the number of vehicles using this lane is current! a minimum, more would make it a highly dangerous route

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

There are no affordable opportunities to successfully develop this site. It is not safe or sustainable.
 Buildings on the site were for working mines, only allowed due to their very specific purpose, this is not industrial land. It is green belt.

There is nothing to recommend this site for the purpose proposed. Planting schemes are not practicable and cannot be guaranteed to remain in place to soften the visual impact of development on this site.

The constraints are that :-

Education, medical care, transport, retail and jobs would have to be installed, none of which are available at this site. Please note that there is no longer a Doctor's Surgery even at Chew Magna which will need to be updated on the constraints list.

Along with all the visual screening and highway changes, these represent such extensive areas of development, upon this remote rural site all of which will have to come together absolutely perfectly in order for it to function at all.

The cost of providing all the necessary infrastructure would clearly be vast Such work would be prohibitively risky and damaging.

There is nothing to recommend this site as a suitable base for Travellers. The site is too large to fulfill the GTTS SA DPD criteria.

It has been refused planning permission many times. It has hazardous road access. There is no easy access to schools. No public transport. No shops. No doctor's surgery (the nearest one has now closed). Insufficient water and electricity supply.

It is not safe due to previous use. It is not sustainable. It would be harmful to the Green Belt. It is close to Pensford Conservation Area

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. this site should not be taken forward.

It has no potential for pitch provision of the required size for a traveller site as stipulated by the GTIS SA requirements.

To develop a large site will overwhelm the existing settlement and a small site will be costly to service.

There are no suitable facilities at this location.

There is a very real danger that crime will increase, not from the gypsies, but from other persistent perpetrators of low level crime certain that the presence of travellers would be blamed with the trouble.

In the past, planning permission for more than one dwelling was turned down and permission for commercial development was turned down.

If experienced and qualified planners and other people deemed it unsuitable at that time, it is even more unsuited to the proposed purpose now.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

All the comments above apply also to planning issues, national and local policies. Green Belt is preserved by planners for everybody's benefit. Attitude towards gypsies, travellers will be severely damaged if they were used as leverage to use green belt for residential use.

It doesn't serve the governments aim of a Big Society and community cohesion. Government policy is for equality of opportunity. Condemning that policy would be the only way this site can be develop for residential use.

You cannot, in all conscience, be prejudice and reserve this site orily for gypsies, it would be open to all to have opportunity to live there.

The aims of the GTTS site allocations DPD are not met in the following ways :It is a remote site having no supermarket , shops or services so it does Not improve access to community facilities and local services.

There js no school accessibility or available space, so it would be necessary to have (ACTES) traveller education service giving already isolated children, a further discriminatory effect, and bad social cohesion.

Sparse services for Health and Well-Being would be further stretched, worse for travellers and settled alike.

Does not produce cohesive communities by installing traveller families in an isolated encampment, overwhelming in relative size to an existing working community.

The transient nature of a traveller life would mean less commitment to the long term best interests of the current stability and sustainability of this rural environment and so would be at odds with the aim of the settled community.

There is minimal opportunity for employment and business as most people have to travel to work given little locally.

It would be a divisive discriminatory action against local people if planning controls were set aside and commercial activity granted to travellers.

Indeed by using this site for residential occupancy you reduce options for local business and employment.

Where is the sustainable transport as cycling I walking I public transport are not an option for getting to work I getting supplies I supplying services.

It will adversely affect the protection and enhancement of the district's distinct historic environmental and cultural assets - which would be most costly to protect in this beautiful remote location and its unique heritage value, under such development, would be destroyed.

It will endanger not encourage and protect habitats I bio diversity nature conservation interests would be lost.

It will increase traffic movements and carbon footprint adding to, not reducing, land, water, air, light and noise pollution.

Even in the initial installation and remediation work, caravan and working vehicle movements would damage environment and habitats.

It seems strange that any council not bent on its own demise would pursue such a policy, and I truly hope they won't.

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

- No - there are no opportunities
- Road inadequate
- Wildlife disruption
- Schools, shops, doctors cannot cope
- Site is contaminated
- Site would dwarf the hamlet of Stanton Wick

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No - by your own guidelines it should not continue
 Why set guidelines and then ignore them?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The council have had the guidelines for suitable sites via the matrix and then gone on to totally ignore them. I understand this site was one from bottom in the scoring and yet you are still at the stage of considering it. Surely this makes a mockery of the whole process.

Respondent: 3696 / 1 Name: Ms Sally Whitemore Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

If the council had carried out proper assessment of this site it would be glaringly obvious that it is not suitable to house this size or type of settlement. Access is down a narrow lane, prone to flooding. The drainage system is barely able to cope with existing development never mind any extras.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I do not - for the reasons given above, and because the local 'facilities' are/would not be able to cope with this influx of people. The transport issue is probably the most obvious barrier, but also the fact that it is an area of outstanding natural beauty and should not be developed.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Surely the gypsies/travellers would be better off in an area that can cope with their needs, ie good transport routes, local facilities

Respondent: 3697 / 1 Name: Barpoara Bowes Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

In principle

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Referring to Government guide and best practice for G&T sites this site seems to fail on most counts. Access is very poor affecting access to Health & Education. A site of this size will have a huge impact on the local community e.g. schools. This is a valuable wildlife site and it appears likely that the ground is contaminated.

Respondent: 3700 / 1 Name: Ms Deborah Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I believe the Stanton Wick site is very unsuitable for a Gypsy and Traveller Site for the following reasons:-
 - the roads are very narrow and could not support an increase in traffic; no public transport
 - local facilities are extremely limited
 - opportunities for employment are very limited
 - the site is dangerous and contaminated
 - Stanton Wick is a small community and would be overwhelmed by a large development
 - the site is in the Green Belt and the development of a Gypsy & Traveller site is wholly inappropriate

Respondent: 3701 / 1 Name: Mr Geoffrey Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

NO

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Stanton Wick site is in the Green Belt and the proposed development is inappropriate. The development would be too big and would overwhelm the existing community. Previous planning applications have been rejected by BANES as inappropriate and they were much smaller than the proposed development. There are no adequate road or infrastructure facilities. The site is a site of Nature Conservation providing a habitat for many important species. The site is far too close to existing residential dwellings.

Respondent: 3702 / 1 Name: Mrs SP Curtis Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick

- * The Stanton Wick site is in the Green Belt and the proposed site would constitute "Inappropriate development in the Green Belt".
- * A large development such the proposed Old Colliery development would overwhelm the existing settled community (up to a factor of 3 to 1)
- * The overall Old Colliery site is much larger than the area earmarked as a G&T site. Can BaNES reassure residents that uncontrolled expansion will not take place?
- * There is a long history of planning application refusals, both at the Old Colliery and the adjacent site (Filer's Coaches): the only permission that has been granted in recent years is for a single dwelling. Inappropriate development in the Green Belt has been cited as reason for refusal.
- * Wick Lane, Stanton Wick Lane and the junctions, cannot support any real increase in traffic volume without substantial road widening and junction alteration: BaNES have cited traffic volume in previous refusals.
- * There is no safe walking route along the roads either to Pensford or Stanton Drew schools. The public footpath from the side of the Winding House to the A37 is not safe, even in summer
- * There is no public transport within safe walking distance
- * The only local shop in Pensford is very small, does not stock sufficient for a food shopping requirement and there is no safe walking route
- * The nearest Doctor's surgery is around 5 miles away and there is no public transport
- * The water supply to Stanton Wick is notoriously unreliable and is at capacity for the infrastructure. There is no mains sewerage in Stanton Wick and a development of the proposed size cannot be supported by septic tanks
- * The land at the Old Colliery Site is contaminated and remediation would uneconomic without a significant contribution from the Council and would involve an intolerable number of heavy vehicle movements along Wick Lane
- * The site is dangerous, has several old mineshafts within it, and these could be liable to subsidence at any time
- * There is limited employment in the area
- * The Old Colliery is a Site of Nature Conservation interest and provides a habitat for many important species
- * The site is very close to the Pensford Conservation Area
- * The site has historic significance
- * The site is immediately adjacent to, and overlooked by, one residence and is very close to another

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3704 / 1 Name: Mrs E Woodford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Much too near existing housing. Wick Lane is unsuitable for increase of traffic. Water supply would be stretched to an impossible limit of requirement.

Respondent: 3705 / 1 Name: Mrs Tracey Watling Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

As per the matrix used by BANES it appears none of the sites were suitable for various obvious reasons. Stanton Wick "Old Colliery" was 17th out of the 23 sites listed but it has been put forward as one of the favourable sites.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

The site does not fit with the requirements that have been set out by the government. It is very limited access, amenities, water supplies, schooling etc.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Absolutely not! This would be detrimental to the environment and existing residents. The access is restricted, there are no local amenities, doctors, school. The water supply is already at capacity for existing residents, plus the site is contaminated and dangerous from mineshafts within. And has previously had planning permission refused on all of these facts.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The proposals for the preferred sites have been fast tracked by BANES with no real consideration for existing residents. We appear to have been given limited information in the hope this would hinder any actions residents may have wanted to put in place, and to prolong the "consultation period" and lose any momentum or interest from existing residents. As "tax payers" we should be given more of a voice and our opinions respected and taken seriously.

Respondent: 3706 / 1 Name: Mr+ R Chandrasakera Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

We wish to raise our objections to the proposal that The Old Colliery site is developed to provide a permanent traveller site. We would like to state that it appears that the proposed development would; overwhelm the existing community, be within the green belt, no safe walking route to the very limited local amenities. You are aware of the many, other arguments that appear to contravene BANES's own planning regulations but in addition we feel that the decision to place this site as one of the top six to be considered, is fundamentally flawed when it was placed 17th out of 23 according to the matrix scoring system employed by BANES to shortlist sites. What is the point of using a system that is clearly ignored when important decisions are to be made?

We feel that the inclusion of this site has been made on political reasons that have nothing to do with common sense and reasoning. We urge you to remove the Old Colliery site from the shortlist, and that you take into consideration and act

upon the views of your local constituents who you are supposed to represent and who have put forward rational and logical objections to this proposed development.

Respondent: 3706 / 1 Name: Mr+ R Chandrasakera Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site at Old Colliery, Stanton Wick appears not to conform to some of BANE'S own criteria for inclusion as a preferred site.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree with the assessment of opportunities & appears BANES has not fully appreciated the constraints or else would've taken off list.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Please consider the local (& others) constituents views that the planning issues are not supportive of a site as proposed to be developed.

Respondent: 3707 / 1 Name: AD Wright Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Site is in green belt with very poor road access or by foot. Drainage is poor and occupation suggested would swamp locals. Public utility services (water, electricity, school, medical etc) are either non existent or negligible) It is totally unsuitable for proposed site.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3708 / 1 Name: Ms Susan Tufton Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

I am concerned about lack of infrastructure for a community as described, ie access to the site, extra traffic in the lanes around the villages and hamlets and the ability for local primary schools to cope with this proposed extra community.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3709 / 1 Name: Mrs Doris Gillett Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Twerton - It is suitable for travellers with the relevant infrastructure in place and has sufficient capacity to accommodate the required number of sites. Clearly an area suitable for a traveller site would be Lansdown Bath. This has adequate land and could use the existing road structure and educational and medical facilities including the B.U.H. on the north side of Bath.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No - The site is contaminated and dangerous. Millions of pounds will be needed to make the access roads safe. There is insufficient provision for schooling and medical care and only limited shopping facilities within two miles of the site.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Green belt areas should not be used for development in line with central government policy. BANES have included this site as an area of architectural and historical interest and designated it as a conservation area in 1988. This status must not be changed.

Respondent: 3710 / 1 Name: Ms Joy Barnet Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Stanton Wick site is not suitable

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. The assessment of the council is incorrect

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, Stanton Wick should not be taken forward

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Stanton Wick site should not be taken forward because - it is not appropriate development to the green belt. It would overpower the existing settled community. Planning permission has already been refused for a smaller development. The land is contaminated.

Respondent: 3711 / 1 Name: Mrs J Howie Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This site is entirely unsuitable

Unsafe

Green Belt.

Too expensive

Respondent: 3711 / 1 Name: Mrs J Howie Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I would like to query the plan for authorised travellers sites within Bath & North East Somerset, including a potential site for 15 permanent Plus 5 transit pitches in Stanton Wick.

I understand the requirement, however would like to know:

-Has the above site's suitability been assessed accurately?

-Do the costs involved in the c.20 unofficial sites within B&NES over the past 10 years justify I outweigh the costs (initial and ongoing) of this particular proposed official site?

-Is the above site a cost-effective option?

-Are the benefits quoted below, quantifiable and justified?

Excerpt from

<http://www.Bathnes.Gov.uk/news/latestnews/2012/April2012/Pages/AuthorisedTravellerssitestobedebated.aspx>

Benefits of our approach

1. Once the Council has allocated land for pitches and facilities are in place, we will have a firm basis upon which to take robust enforcement action on unauthorised sites.
2. Improved facilities on authorised sites will result in an improved local environment and more orderly surroundings compared with unauthorised sites. This will reduce the costs to the local taxpayer that are associated with some unauthorised occupations.
3. Unlike now, inhabitants on sites will be eligible to pay Council Tax and therefore will contribute to the costs of running Council services that currently are only picked up by existing residents. Our approach also offers the opportunity to access Central Government Grants, such as Traveller Pitch Funding, to provide the sites and minimise the expense of any development costs to the local taxpayer.
4. We are the only local authority out of Bristol, North Somerset, and South Gloucestershire Councils to have no authorised Gypsy and Traveller pitches. These authorities contain 179 pitches between them. They are able to better manage the impact of flows of Gypsies and Travellers in their area. For example, Bristol City Council's unauthorised site enforcement costs have dropped from around £200,000 per year to £5,000 since authorised pitches were established.

-What are the average costs involved to the local taxpayer when taking enforcement action on unauthorised sites?
 -What are the total costs to the local taxpayer that are associated with authorised occupations? How does this compare to unauthorised occupation costs?
 -How much did south Gloucestershire Council's authorised site enforcement costs drop by? And what other costs were increased as a result?
 In the current cost-cutting financial climate, can you truly justify the expense of such a development?
 In the scoring matrix for suitable sites, this potential site has been scored positively on the following areas ... Has it been scored accurately? :
 -Hazardous place- Are the mineshafts not considered hazardous?
 -Safe access to public highway- only via a steep, unlit muddy track- is that also considered safe? Would a sensible addition to the scoring matrix, be whether travellers have requested it I used the site before? Have any travellers been consulted?
 I'm concerned there could be substantial stress and inconvenience caused aswell as considerable time and money wasted, if the site were to remain unused if they also felt it was unsuitable/unsafe. I do not believe it has been considered/proven that the proposed authorised site of this size, in this location, meets the criteria for planning guidelines and most definitely could not be a cost effective proposition, for the following reasons:
 -Potentially two or three times the size (no. of people) of the nearest settlement
 -Additional (probably excessive) costs involved making the site safe (mineshafts I arsenic contamination)
 -Large No. of proposed pitches- making the site 'difficult to manage'.
 -Road safety- My daughter was recently been knocked down by a car in the village, my biggest concern (as we regularly walk past this site)- would be road safety. Highways have recommended refusal on recent planning applications relating to additional traffic on the same road - Has this potential development been referred to highways for their qualified opinion?
 -Land is within the Greenbelt

Is the above proposed site being considered under the affordable housing scheme 'umbrella'?
 Please can you explain what else contributed to the 'very special circumstances' that must be in place for this greenbelt development to be considered (other than the alleged absence of sufficient suitable sites outside the greenbelt). If this development were to be allowed, would that then open up the same 'very special circumstances' for other affordable housing projects within the area I county? I would appreciate your response to the above questions and would like your confirmation they have been and/or will be properly considered as part of the decision making process.

Respondent: 3712 / 1 Name: Mr R Oxley Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The site is in the Green Belt and should not be built on. There is no public transport in safe walking distance. The land is contaminated!!

Respondent: 3713 / 1 Name: Ms Mary Moore Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

There is no public transport within safe walking distance. The only local shop in Pensford is very small. It does not stock sufficient for a food shopping requirement and there is no safe walking route. The nearest doctors surgery is around 5 miles away and there is no public transport.

Respondent: 3715 / 1 Name: Ms Gwendolyn Price Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Stanton Wick

I was a 'lollipop lady' for the school for a number of years and used a moped for transport. At that time the traffic was no where near as heavy as it is now, but still I worried about the children. It will be even more dangerous now for them to get to school by walking down the lane or main road. If they have to be driven it will add to the traffic in the narrow lanes and parking in the village. You (they) will have to drive to the doctors and supermarkets.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The lanes are too narrow
The site is not safe
It is green belt

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No it is a small brownfield site in a green belt and will change the balance of the villages and the people living in them. The gypsies will be creating a separate village.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The lane is not safe for walking or driving large vehicles.
It is not a suitable place for families especially children.

Respondent: 3716 / 1 Name: Mr Colin Holloway Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, I do not agree.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I state that I do not agree with the proposal and I outline my reasoning below.

1. The site would in effect destroy the current local community. I understand the number of houses in Stanton Wick is approximately 30. A site of this size would overwhelm the residents. It is my belief that integration would not happen and the villagers would resent a large 'invasion' and that would create bitterness on both 'sides'. I stand behind the local people and I urge you to withdraw this site from your list.
2. Travellers prefer to live in areas where there are facilities. This is shown by the West of England Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. There are not enough schools or school places available to meet the likely increased demand. No shops, public transport or health facilities either. The closest village of Pensford does not offer real shopping either.
3. The roads here are far too narrow for the obvious increase in traffic. The lanes are twisty, hilly toward Pensford, muddy and unlit. People would not be safe walking around these lanes without pavements and the risk to human life would be substantial. BaNES have not explained what could or would be done to safeguard pedestrians. I understand they have not yet asked their Highway Department to look at this proposal. Cars and vans would be used and traffic pollution would increase as well as accident levels.
4. The site is in the greenbelt. Planning permission would not be available. We need to protect the greenbelt and the National Guidelines say gypsy and traveller sites in green belt 'are inappropriate'. This alone should stop this proposal in its tracks.
5. The proposal to have 20 pitches is far too large making the site difficult to manage and also expensive to manage too. It is larger than the government's stated maximum. The potential to expand and the likelihood of future expansion would make matters even worse. There is no explanation for dealing with unauthorised expansion. Some business activity is likely too and there is no mention of what would be allowed or not. Such activity increases commercial vehicle usage and pollution making life for the existing home owners and farmers worse.
6. The site is contaminated with dangerous chemicals. Much of the site has not been surveyed and it is known to have mineshafts. Safety issues need to be considered and actions addressed to deal with these serious dangers. BaNES do not explain what they intend to do about this.
7. BaNES have not explained just how this site will be financed or the necessary infrastructure delivered. The cost involved to make this a viable option will be substantial. The site will swallow a huge investment in roads, schools, water, electricity and dealing with sewage and waste. There will be further costs involved just at a time when this country is trying to manage the overspend. Seems to me to be more and more overspend would be on its way if this site proposal goes ahead.

I will conclude and reinforce my points why I strongly oppose Old Colliery at Stanton Wick to be used for a gypsy and traveller site.

Enormous costs would be involved, a local community changed and ruined forever, pollution, building allowed in the Green belt and on contaminated land, dangerous roads (currently mainly muddy lanes), no schools and I don't even think travellers would want to live there! They would much prefer to live closer to central Bath and shouldn't be 'forced' to live away from or closer to city centres and amenities.

I do hope you take my objections fully into consideration and I therefore look forward to an announcement that this proposal will not go ahead.

Respondent: 3716 / 1 Name: Mr Colin Holloway Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I do not agree.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I live in Norton Malreward Pensford and I oppose the proposal for a gypsy and travellers site at old Colliery Stanton Wick. I feel that the site is totally wrong for this type of development. It is in the green belt and no building is therefore allowed. The site is contaminated and dangerous.

The roads are little more than lanes and tracks and are dangerous. Being unlit and very muddy most of the year the danger of accidents to cars and walkers would be vastly greater with such a site.

There are no real amenities in this local and very rural area. No public transport, lack of schools for extra children, no shops, lacking in doctors and health services the list goes on.

The proposal for 20 pitches is far too large. Anyway, I don't think many people realise what a pitch actually is. I would expect more than 100 people are envisaged and this would overpower the local community. There would also be a risk of future expansion adding more and more to the misery of the rural inhabitants.

The costs necessary to bring this all about would be enormous and it isn't clear how the site would be financed. I don't believe many of the travelling community would actually want to live in such a rural and remote spot. There are no little doubt in my mind that most would prefer to live much closer to a city or town and so enjoy everything that is available much closer than ever possible in Stanton Wick. It would be dangerous if this development was allowed. Dangerous to the halt of the local people (pollution, stress, anxiety etc) and also to the gypsy and travellers themselves. The land is contaminated and contains mine shafts. More cars and vans on these roads means road accidents would increase and a site here means peoples' lives would be changed forever.

The council does not explain how the costs would be managed and it is likely that the expense of setting up this ill-thought facility would spiral as further infrastructure requirements would be identified. The council and the local Council tax payers cannot afford large funds for these major projects without the backing of the people involved. I do not believe the parish council wants this site allocated and developed either; listen to them or change at the ballot box can be expected.

I urge the council to drop this site from their options. People, including gypsies and travellers and not just the local people of Stanton Wick and surrounding villages deserve better than this.

Provide gypsy and traveller sites if that is decreed by the government but follow their guidelines properly and only develop with the co-operation and the support of local people; never contravene the greenbelt. Stanton Wick is totally and utterly unsuitable. I trust you will end this proposal at the earliest opportunity.

Respondent: 3717 / 1 Name: J Thompson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I would hate to see the character of the villages change it would mean widening roads and even more traffic.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The old pit has claimed many lives and will do again if you let children play there which they will do if they live there

Gypsy children can't be contained they are used to a free life and you cant keep them confined its not fair for any child.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No it is not a safe place

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Only what I have already said.

Respondent: 3718 / 1 Name: Mrs J Perrett Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Old Colliery site has lovely old buildings there are old mine shafts that have not been dealt with properly and so are dangerous. The approach to the site is not suitable for large caravans and how will they turn around or backup because they cant pass on the lanes.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I dont think that the village can cope with more people or that the services can we have difficulty getting anywhere because there are no buses - only from the village (Pensford) there is a coach from Filers for the doctors and now it stops in Chew Magna for shopping

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I don't think it should - what about all of the wildlife that is living there now and the dangerous mines for the children who will play out there

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I would think that there are more suitable places if they need shops and doctors

Respondent: 3719 / 1 Name: Mr R T Thorpe Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Only that this a lovely village to live in but we could do with more help with transport to shops and doctors. There is only the post office that sells a limited amount of groceries.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

There would not be integration socially
 It would spoil green belt and wildlife living there
 You would not be able to stop the site spreading
 They would have to use cars to get to the doctors, shop and schools.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I don't

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

It would cost too much to put the ground right and put in the services there would be a great increase in traffic. The roads couldn't cope

Respondent: 3720 / 1 Name: Ms Christine Godfrey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Green belt
 Old mine shafts

Nature conservation
 Pensford Schools to small
 Roads not safe to walk to school

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3721 / 1 Name: Mr+ M Loney Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Gov't states sites are inappropriate in Green Belt, sites should be near amenities e.g. MOD BATH
 The Old Colliery site is contaminated and so would need a great deal of local taxes to make it safe & habitable.
 Having had experience of the lack of co-operation from the Council with any problems in the village e.g. planning, I am sure the site will be 'sout of sight/out of mind' as to being regulated.
 How often will you check the limit stay of transit travellers?
 Who will check they are paying taxes?
 Who will check that no unauthorised businesses are being run from the site?
 Will the school be given extra help and finance to integrate the children?
 No safe way to walk to Pensford / Stanton Drew schools.
 No public transport within walking distances
 Limited employment in the area.
 Wick Lane is completely unsuitable to increased traffic
 The old colliery is a site of Nature Conservation Interest and close to Pensford Conservation Area.
 Water supply unreliable and at capacity.
 Several dangerous old mineshafts within it.
 No mains sewerage.
 At NO TIME should this site have been considered suitable for a Travellers site.

Respondent: 3723 / 1 Name: Ms Gillian Wookey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes. The Old Colliery Buildings at Stanton Wick are situated on green belt land and it is therefore inappropriate to develop them. The site has extremely limited vehicular access on narrow winding roads with no pavements making it also dangerous for pedestrians. A development of the site proposed will overwhelm the local community and inhibit any desire

to integrate with the resident population.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The objectives assessment completed by the council has awarded scores inappropriately e.g. the site is some way from the nearest public transport, limited local shop and primary school located in Pensford along a route that is unsafe to walk. It does not appear to have given sufficient consideration to the responsibility and practicality of utility provision and costs involved. The council is ignoring the fact that on previous occasions it has refused applications for minor developments in this area citing them as inappropriate for green belt and insufficient access.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

The Old Colliery Buildings should not be taken forward as a site allocation because in addition to my previous observations it is inappropriate to develop land for human occupation that is contaminated with the by products of mining. There are also old mineshafts located on the site that could subside at any time unless exhaustive removal work is executed. A site that is part of the historic somerset mineshafts will be lost and important wildlife species will be jeopardised if their habitat is destroyed.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I believe the National Guidelines for gypsy/traveller sites advise that sites are developed for small numbers of pitches eg up to 5 per site to prevent integration problems. I would be interested to know why the council wishes to ignore this and develop almost half of the needs identified in the Draft Core Strategy on one site which will quickly become uncontrollable. It is interesting that policies previously strictly adhered to when considering other development applications in this area eg. Green belt, insufficient road accessibility have suddenly become moveable goal posts. I think insufficient thought has been given to the local residents and the needs of the gypsy/travellers for a council who purports to listen to its residents. I have yet to see evidence of this.

Respondent: 3725 / 1 Name: Kelston Stark Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

1. Green Belt
2. Decrease housing prices
3. No public transport
4. No employment in the area
5. No local amenities

Respondent: 3726 / 1 Name: Mrs Anne Sessford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

This site is in the greenbelt, and adjoins Pensford's conservation area. The single track road to this site is a single track lane and passing can be difficult. The site was formally a coal mine and should be conserved for history and wildlife that live there. The land is contaminated with arsenic and not suitable for a gypsy and traveller site.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This site does not conform to any central government/local government guidelines. This is a total waste of council tax payers money and should not be take any further, By continuing this process the council is ignoring the feelings of the local communities, who want to protect the greenbelt and prevent any inappropriate developments such as this at Stanton Wick.

Respondent: 3731 / 1 Name: Ms Jaqueline Morris Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I fail to understand why the site at Stanton Wick has been considered a all. From the Gypsies and Travellers point of view, I cannot see that the site meets any of the legal requirements, being contaminated, dangerous and lacking any amenities necessary - poor roads, no pavements, no public transport, no local shops, no doctors surgery, no easy access to schools, limited employment, the list goes on!

From the residents point of view the site is unsuitable due to the fact that the proposed development would overwhelm the existing community, it has a very long history of planning application refusals for the very reasons that make the site unsuitable for a travellers site, The site is in the Greenbelt so has no infrastructure. How much would it cost to bring services to the site? The roads are already in poor condition, increased traffic would only exaggerate the situation.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

I strongly disagree with this site is being taken forward as a formal allocation. This would be a total waste of time and money which could be better spent on a more suitable site.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

As said previously, this site is most unsuitable and I wonder why it has been included in the preferred options. Surely the guidelines i.e. list of criteria necessary for the provision of sites seems to have been completely ignored.

Respondent: 3732 / 1 Name: Ms Lydia Batt Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I am sure there are more suitable sites nearer town's and city centre.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No, it is a larger development in a nature conservation area.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, there is no safe walking route along the roads for schools or shops.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3782 / 1 Name: Ms Christine Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

PENDFORD SITE UNSUITABLE

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

STRONGLY DISAGREE

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

FAILS TO MEET ALL RECOMMENDATIONS OF ANY GOVT. GUIDELINES 100%

Respondent: 3783 / 1 Name: Mrs Barbara Smith Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

NO. Suggest military sites being sold off - Gypsy site allocation could be provided which would provide amenities that are vital.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Totally unsuitable:-

- 1 - Greenbelt land.
- 2 - No easy access to schools, doctors, shops most of all NO public transport.
- 3 - Road single track not suitable large transport
- 4 - considerable cost needed for mains water supply, main sewage - possible mineshaft investigation & land contamination & work needed in building necessary pitches.
- 5 - the number of people will FAR out number the present population of Stanton Wick & change the character of this quiet & peaceful hamlet.

Respondent: 3784 / 1 Name: Mr Matthew Stenner Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

My mum told me that if the gypsies move here I can't go and play or make friends with them because where they live is very dangerous because there is poison in the ground and very large dangerous hills. I don't want to make friends with them because they might die.

Respondent: 3785 / 1 Name: Ms Amanda Stenner Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

CERTAINLY NOT

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I feel very let down that BANES who protect the greenbelt, one their first opportunity that suits them are proposing the use of the site. I feel you are letting me and the greenbelt down!! I myself was turned down for putting a sky light in my property, because of the greenbelt.

Respondent: 3786 / 1 Name: Mr Colin Stenner Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

ABSOLUTELY NOT

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I would like to know what happens if an enforcement officer is required to the proposed site at Stanton Wick? When there has been an officer needed for an old man [name identified] , but nothing was done because the officer felt threatened! By one man!! Plus failure to enforce his removal earlier has meant he has been able to set up home on what could have been a part cycle track on the old railway!!

Respondent: 3787 / 1 Name: Mr Michael Ryemill Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

As an ex water engineer, there could be problems in supplying an adequate supply to the Stanton Wick zone.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO

I do appreciate that you have a responsibility to provide for 'Travellers', but the site needs to be functional and 'suitable for purpose' STANTON WICK IS NOT!!

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, Absolutely No!

YOU BANES have previously rejected this site for minor additions and planning applications in the past for reasons YOU have stated, so how can you now just disregard them to suit YOUR TRAVELLER responsibilities at this site? When it suits you, why do you ignore common sense?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

- 1) This would become a 'community' bigger than the existing village of Stanton Wick, is that fair?
- 2) Inadequate infrastructure, roads, draings, swerage, water supply. Contaminated land is unsuitable.
- 3) GREEN BELT
- 4) Unsafe walking to nearest schools and roads Not suitable for 'big' truck transport.
- 5) No public transport
- 6) The site is dangerous to adventurous kids
- 7) This site CN NOT represent 'best practice for the travelling / long stay community.

Respondent: 3787 / 1 Name: Mr Michael Ryemill Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This site is entirely unsuitable
 It's not safe: mineshafts/contaminated soil
 Greenbelt.
 Too expensive

Respondent: 3788 / 1 Name: Ms Jane Thatcher Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No. The site at Stanton Wick is completely inappropriate as it will be so large that the immediate settlement will be swamped and the site is known to be contaminated with arsenic.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. The site is green belt and as such should be subject to the same planning constraints as any other development would and has been previously. There are no amenities close by - shops, Doctors etc.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. The site is very unstable, contaminated and is known to have a colony of bats. As the site is green belt it should not be

developed in this way. The local community will be swamped and large developments have previously been refused on various planning grounds.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Yes. As mentioned in my previous responses above the site is not suitable for this development, will swamp Stanton Wick, amenities are poor, road access is poor, the site is contaminated and is a nature site, the land is green belt etc. etc. It is not on any known traveller route and the Gypsy community has not chosen this site as their preferred site. Surely the sites should be closer to amenities.

Respondent: 3790 / 1 Name: Mr Mike Richardson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

In my view the Stanton Wick site is totally unsuitable for the proposed development. Stanton Wick is a small hamlet and would be overwhelmed by the development. The local schools would not be able to cope with the influx of children, the local shop is a small post office that would be overwhelmed. I notice that planning has consistently been refused on traffic volume.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree as the process is incorrect and inappropriate.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. - Stanton Wick

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

See front page: [In my view the Stanton Wick site is totally unsuitable for the proposed development. Stanton Wick is a small hamlet and would be overwhelmed by the development. The local schools would not be able to cope with the influx of children, the local shop is a small post office that would be overwhelmed. I notice that planning has consistently been refused on traffic volume.]

The public transport situation would create a huge problem, the water supply would not be sufficient plus there are no main sewerage available. The roads are totally unsuitable for any increase in traffic.

Respondent: 3791 / 1 Name: Ms Kathryn Richardson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes, in my view, the Stanton Wick site is totally unsuitable, surely there are other more suitable sites outside the greenbelt.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No, the process is flawed and biased.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No - the Stanton Wick site.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Stanton Wick site is unsuitable because -

1. in the greenbelt
2. it would overwhelm the existing settled community
3. previous planning for a smaller development has been refused
4. there are traffic issue.

5. there is no safe walking route to schools/shops.
 6. the land is contaminated.

Respondent: 3792 / 1 Name: Mr Dean Jones Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I feel that the travellers site would dominate Stanton Wicks; the road access is very poor, all amenities including water, electricity is at its limit already. The area does not meet with any of the criteria for travellers sites. I do not understand how this site ended up in the final stages. The land is contaminated.

Respondent: 3793 / 1 Name: Mrs Derrick Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

MoD site - Bath

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Dangerous site - old disused mieshafts
 Lane itself is not suitable for increase in volume of traffic - inappropriate to widen due to greenbelt land
 No safe walking route to nearest village (no lighting)
 No public transport within safe walking distance

Respondent: 3794 / 1 Name: Mr Derrick Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

MOD - Bath

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Dangerous site - old disused mineshafts

Lane itself is not suitable for increase in volume of traffic - inappropriate to widen due to greenbelt land

No safe walking route to nearest village (no lighting)

No public transport within safe walking distance

Respondent: 3795 / 1 Name: Mrs Mary Payne Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site is in the Green Belt and would constitute 'inappropriate development'.

There is inadequate road access. B&NES have cited traffic problems in previous planning refusals.

There is inadequate access to amenities. There are no shops in Stanton Wick nor Stanton Drew and only a very small post office in Pensford. The nearest Doctors' surgery is about 5 miles away and there is no public transport.

The site is contaminated and would require significant cost to make safe. The water supply at Stanton Wick is unreliable and is at capacity for the current infrastructure.

The site includes several old mineshafts and these could be liable to collapse at any time.

The site is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and provides habitat for some important species.

There is no safe walking to either Pensford or Stanton Drew Schools.

There is no public transport within safe walking distance, and what public transport there is, is very sparse.

The overall site is much larger than earmarked for current plans, and we have no assurances that expansion will not take place.

There is very limited employment in the area.

The large development as proposed would overwhelm the small settled community at Stanton Wick.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3796 / 1 Name: Ms Bernadette Heland Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes, totally inappropriate. How can you put people on contaminated land! It is also green belt land with endangered wildlife living within it. What would be left of our wonderful countryside if planning officers agree to build or allow

caravans etc. onto it? Once on this slippery slope, it's a downwards spiral for all green belt land.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The infrastructure of the two villages within this site (Stanton Wick and Pensford) would not be able to cope, a very small shop with no parking, which could create a major problem for the flow of traffic on the A37. Brownfield sites are much more appropriate as these in Bath i.e. the MOD sites. Please check out the sites in Cheshire where houses were built alongside Traveller sites. Conserve our COUNTRYSIDE and build on BROWN FIELD SITES, where amenities and infrastructure are much more appropriate and successful.

Respondent: 3797 / 1 Name: Mrs B Oxley Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Stanton Wick site is in the greenbelt and therefore this proposal should be turned down, especially as over the years various other proposals have been refused on the basis of the Greenbelt - why is there an exception being granted this time? The site is dangerous with old mineshafts and contaminated - who is going to pay for the clean up/safety work? Also with no mains sewerage in Stanton Wick this development would cause significant problems.

Respondent: 3798 / 1 Name: Mrs Catherine Swift Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The sites at Stanton Wick, Ellsbridge House, Keynsham, Radstock and Whitchurch are all unsuitable access wise. All have their own reasons for not to be on the preferred options document. I refer to Stanton Wick in particular.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO! How can anyone possibly consider this as an appropriate site? It is a contaminated and dangerous area. It is in greenbelt, with no amenities or public transport. The cost of putting mains services and converting this to a site for habitation would be phenomenal.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO! For the reasons given already, plus how can an area that has long been beset with planning refusals in the past seem to suddenly be deemed O.K to be converted into a large Gypsy/Travellers site that will completely swamp a tiny rural hamlet.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Surely the site currently occupied at Twerton where the inhabitants are happy would be far more appropriate, cost a lot less to update and solve this terrible animosity the council has created in our towns and villages, through the error of their ways.

Respondent: 3799 / 1 Name: Mrs M Southcott Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site is in the Green Bz%1t and would constitute ,'inappropriate development'.
 There is inadequate road access. B&NES have cited traffic problems in previous planning refusals.
 There is inadequate access to amenities. There are no shops in Stanton Wick nor Stanton Drew and only a very small post office in Pensford. The nearest Doctors' surgery is about 5 miles away and there is no public transport.
 The site is contaminated and would require significant cost to make safe.
 The water supply. at Stanton Wick is unreliable and is at capacity for the current infrastructure.
 The site includes several old mineshafts and these could be liable to collapse at, anytime.
 The site is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and provides habitat for some important species.
 There is no safe walking to either Pensford or Stanton Drew Schools ..
 There is no public transport within safe walking distance, and what public transport there is, is very sparse.
 The overall site is much larger than earmarked for current plans, and we have no assurances at expansion will not take place.
 There is very limited employment in the area.
 The development as proposed would overwhelm. the small settled community at Stanton Wick.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3800 / 1 Name: Mr Tony Southcott Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The site is in the Green Bz%1t and would constitute ,'inappropriate development'.
 There is inadequate road access. B&NES have cited traffic problems in previous planning refusals.
 There is inadequate access to amenities. There are no shops in Stanton Wick nor Stanton Drew and only a very small post office in Pensford. The nearest
 Doctors' surgery is about 5 miles away and there is no public transport.
 The site is contaminated and would require significant cost to make safe.
 The water supply. at Stanton Wick is unreliable and is at capacity for the current infrastructure.
 The site includes several old mineshafts and these could be liable to collapse at,
 anyme.
 The site is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and provides habitat for some important species.
 There is no safe walking to either Pensford or Stanton Drew Schools ..
 There is no public transport within safe walking distance, and what public transport there is, is very sparse.
 The overall site is much larger than earmarked for current plans, and we have no assurances at expansion will not take place.

There is very limited employment in the area.
 The development as proposed would overwhelm the small settled community at Stanton Wick.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Totally unsuitable. Beggars belief. What are you thinking B&NES?

Respondent: 3801 / 1 Name: Mr Michael Moore Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The council would have been aware that the MOD site where due for closure for several years. I do not understand why they have not been selected. The three MOD sites would give the council a frame opportunity to create development that would integrate a new community that included travellers.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Stanton Wick site is in the greenbelt and the proposed site would constitute inappropriate development in the greenbelt. The Old Colliery is a site of nature conservation interest and provides a habitat for many important species. The land at the site is contaminated and would involved an intolerable number of heavy vehicle movement for remediation.

Respondent: 3802 / 1 Name: Mr Matthew Smith Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes - while running in the winter I found the footpath very slippery, when wet the gradient and mud makes it very difficult to walk. I am also concered that the influx of gypsies and travellers would overwhelm local amenities, in particular the local schools and the surgery.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No - while there are 20 proposed pitches the full site has the capacity to contain far more than this, uncontrolled expansion would put further strain on local infrastructure. Furthermore the site is currently unsafe; potentially unstable ground, this would make any remediation work extensive and subsequently costly.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No - in my eyes the site seems wholly unsuitable, one reason for this is as the development would be within the green belt, this would go against the councils former wishes for 'no inappropriate development within the green belt'.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I understand that the council has a responsibility to provide gypsie and traveller sites. However as a result of its size and

location I feel that the Old Colliery is unsuitable for this purpose.

Respondent: 3803 / 1 Name: Mrs Jaqueline Smith Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes - the site is totally unsuitable for this proposed use. The planning history shows that the site is NOT suitable for multiple dwellings and that the highway & services infrastructure not of a capacity to cope with the huge increased usage that 20 pitches would bring.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No - there is only brief mention in your documentation that the site is in 'Green Belt' and so against government guidelines. The new policy states that Gypsies & Travellers are to have NO special priveledges to develop in greenbelt compared with the settled community. There were NO SPECIAL cirumstances when refusing planning for several residential units on the site the same applies to travellers.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No - the site is huge & liable to increased occupation either through illegal encroachment or by granting additional pitches further down the line. As it is the proposal is for an absolute maximum size under government guidelines & wholly unsuitable for a tiny small rural community such as Stanton Wick.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

There is a requirement to look for suitable sites & make plans to fulfil those requirement. It is best for integration & to secure social cohesion that the sites are of a small size (ie not like another Dale Farm) & if no or insufficient suitable sites are currently found in Banes provision should be made on proposed residential sites that ARE in existence within the BANES area. Stuffing the travellers out of the way because of the financial attractiveness of an inappropriate site is NOT the answer.

Respondent: 3804 / 1 Name: Mr Ben Smith Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes, the site is legally (multiple dwellings) and physically not suitable for a influx of large numbers of people. There is no nearby bus stops. The school is a perilous walk away and the local road network surrounding the old winding house is simply of not a high enough standard.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No - due to positive discrimination laws I feel it would be unlawful to allow the travellers access to the green belt.

There is no such 'constraint' on the physical size of the traveller community, thus this could lead to (if not properly managed) another Dale Farm.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No - the local area is surrounded by disused mineshafts of which if not very carefully sealed could provide an 'ideal' playground for large numbers of youths, and as there is no such 'play area' locally I see it as a real and potentially dangerous site for large numbers.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

In such a small rural village as Stanton Wick the potential for a backfire in social cohesion is much worse than in an area with local amenities and potential employment prospects. Thus allowing gradual integration into the community, benefitting both sides. Hence as the Stanton Wick offers none of these, it is entirely unsuitable for 20 pitches.

Respondent: 3805 / 1 Name: Mr Charles Wookey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

BaNES Council is to be congratulated for tackling the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocation obligation. Sadly, the proposed site at The Old Colliery Buildings at Stanton Wick is unsuitable. Use of this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This argument has been cited in the rejection of previous planning applications. Furthermore, I understand this site is contaminated and that the land over the old mineshafts could be liable to future subsidence. As the majority of the land is screened from the public highway, what controls would the Council's staff effect to ensure no future uncontrolled expansion?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The Council's use of the planning matrix shows quite clearly that this site fails on most of the criteria. In the Council's Development Plan Document Preferred Options Stage, it recognised significant constraints on development of sites stating examples - 'Green Belt, wildlife designation and contaminated land' yet this site was still moved forward. There are no very special circumstances to warrant siting this proposed development on this part of the Green Belt.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

I disagree most strongly with the Council's view that this site should be taken forward. It lacks a reliable mains water supply, access to mains sewerage, safe and appropriate vehicular access. Any development of the proposed size could not be supported by septic tanks without contamination of water courses. It does not have reasonable access to public transport, medical facilities or suitable food shops. I understand and support the intent to integrate the travelling community with the locals but with the number of proposed pitches, they would swamp the Stanton Wick populace.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The proposed development at Stanton Wick lacks merit. Without extensive sums of council tax payers' money, something the Council lacks, being spent to meet the adequate supply of services to this area, it defies sound logic that this site was transferred to the shortlist. If you were selecting an employee to fill a defined vacancy, this 'candidate' would not make the cut. It is high time that the Council cut their losses and stopped wasting valuable financial and staff resources on this deeply flawed proposal by removing the Stanton Wick site from their shortlist.

Respondent: 3806 / 1 Name: Mr Terry Marsh Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The site is not suitable for families due to old mineshafts, which could be liable to subsidence at any time, and it is also contaminated. There is no public transport within safe walking distance and the roads to the site cannot support any increase in traffic.

The occupation of the site would over take the population of the hamlet.

This is a green belt and it would totally destroy the picturesque of the surrounding countryside.

The water supply in Stanton Wick is only on a 3" main and is notoriously unreliable.

I strongly oppose to the planning of a Gypsy and traveller site at Stanton Wick.

Respondent: 3807 / 1 Name: Kay Stark Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Site in 'Green Belt'. No local facilities. No local transport. Access to site. No mains water / sewerage. Dangerous site.

Respondent: 3808 / 1 Name: Michelle Stark Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Green Belt. No public transport. No employment in area. No local amenities. Dangerous site.

Respondent: 3809 / 1 Name: Mr Alan Sparkes Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

MOD Bath.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

- 1) Inappropriate development within Green Belt.
- 2) No local services available.
- 3) Stanton Wick Lane would not withstand further traffic.
- 4) Insufficient water / sewage.

Respondent: 3873 / 1 Name: Mrs Sheila Taylor Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 3880 / 1 Name: Mr SE Perrett Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Old Colliery site has lovely old buildings there are old mine shafts that have not been dealt with properly and so are dangerous. The approach to the site is not suitable for large caravans and how will they turn around or backup because they cant pass on the lanes.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I dont think that the village can cope with more people or that the services can we have difficulty getting anywhere because there are no buses - only from the village (Pensford) there is a coach from Filers for the doctors and now it stops in Chew Magna for shopping

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No I don't think it should - what about all of the wildlife that is living there now and the dangerous mines for the children who will play out there

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I would think that there are more suitable places if they need shops and doctors

Respondent: 3919 / 1 Name: J Hewish Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No - A completely ill conceived plan

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

There is no way this should have gone this far, complete waste of tax payers money. Concentrate on sites that have a

chance of success. Not a political excuse to be able to say "we have tried".

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

What do you suddenly understand by the Green Belt? How come your planners can change their views/directives just because it suits political aspirations and tramples over previous rules?

Stanton Wick is too far from where the travellers have indicated they wish to be.

The schools are full therefore they will be taken to schools further afield, ostracising them instead of integrating.

How will the family get to services when the father is out working? There is nothing in a safe walking distance, and the road is narrow and dangerous!

You have not listened to any argument or advice to date so I guess this exercise is a waste of time just to prove due diligence.

Respondent: 4051 / 1 Name: Ms Abigail Horsey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The designated area, The Old Colliery, Stanton Wick is not suitable to obtain a large traveller site that Banes is proposing. This small hamlet would not be able to cope with the extreme increase in population and as a result the infrastructure would collapse. The size would not only overwhelm Stanton Wick, but Stanton Drew too as the villages are extremely close; it could potentially disrupt both areas.

The roads located in and around Stanton Wick are not easily accessible; the narrow lanes struggle to squeeze the current cars through. There have been many accidents already; I myself have experienced a car accident with a tractor. If the traveller's site advances then there will be a extreme increase in vehicles down these small roads, especially caravans and large cars, which could result in more accidents and traffic.

The site is situated above an old mine working. This is extremely dangerous for the gypsies as the land is contaminated. It would be very time consuming and costly to repair meaning The Old Colliery is highly impractical for a traveller's site.

Having considered why the site is unsuitable for Stanton Wick, I have also considered the Travellers safety and well being: the land is located above an old mine working which that itself is dangerous; basic supplies such as water, electricity and gas are limited; the local roads are not safe and there are no footpaths; Not only would the local schools be incapable of schooling this many children, other services such as hospitals, doctors and dentists are very limited and are nowhere near Stanton Wick; employment is very low in the area; the only local shop is located in Pensford and that itself does not stock sufficient for a food shopping requirement, plus there is no safe walking route; and there is no public transport in Stanton Wick therefore travellers will find it very difficult to travel around.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No – the site is clearly unsuitable as a development for gypsies and travellers as it is within the green belt area. If it does go ahead it will have a negative impact on the community of Stanton wick and the surrounding areas.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No under no circumstances should The Old Colliery site at Stanton Wick be taken forward as a formal allocation.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I agree that gypsies and travellers require safe accommodation but this should be in an area that complies with planning guidelines which I believe that the old colliery does not.

Respondent: 4052 / 1 Name: Ms Deborah Horsey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The proposed site at the old Colliery in Stanton Wick is not at all suitable as a gypsy and traveller development as it is situated in a green belt area and therefore an “inappropriate development”.
 A development such as this would overwhelm the existing settled community of Stanton wick and the proposed site is much larger than the area earmarked as a gypsy and traveller site.
 I do not believe that the hamlet of Stanton wick could support any more increase in traffic as the lanes are already full of pot holes and the main road junction would become even more dangerous than it already is. There are no safe walking routes along the roads either to Pensford or Stanton Drew schools or to other local amenities. The nearest doctors surgery is in Chew Stoke as is the secondary school and there is no public transport.
 The proposed site is dangerous in that it has several mineshafts within it and these could be liable to subsidence at any time. The site is contaminated and it would be a costly exercise to be put right by BANES and this would then mean heavy vehicle movements within the hamlet.
 Planning application for the old colliery and the adjacent site – filers coaches, has been refused many times on the grounds of inappropriate development in the green belt area and again increased traffic flow through the hamlet was cited as a major reason for refusal.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No i strongly disagree. First and foremost is the fact that the site is in a greenbelt area and BANES seem to have disregarded this. The impact on the area and local residents would be severe and seems to have been continually disregarded by BANES.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No under no circumstances should the old colliery site at Stanton wick be taken forward as a formal allocation.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I agree that gypsy and travellers require safe and healthy sites but in areas that comply within the stipulated planning regulations. I do not think that the old colliery site in Stanton wick falls within these planning guidelines and for this reason should not be pursued further.

Respondent: 4056 / 1 Name: Mr John Horsey Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The proposed site at the Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick, is totally unsuitable for use as a Gypsy and Traveller development as it is located within the Green Belt, making it wholly inappropriate. The site is situated above old mine workings and the land is contaminated – this would be dangerous to the potential inhabitants and extremely costly and time consuming to repair. The proposed development of 15 permanent sites and 5 transit sites would dwarf the local community of Stanton Wick. There are very limited essential supplies such as water, mains drainage, sewage, electricity and no gas. Access is poor and much of the road system to and from the site is single track, with no footpaths. Previous planning applications have been rejected due to inadequate access and increased traffic flow through the village. The junctions onto main roads in the area are dangerous and would become even more so with increased traffic flow. There are extremely limited local facilities such as doctors, dentists, schools and shops – all of which would have to be accessed by motor vehicle – again leading to increased traffic flow.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No – BANES Council have repeatedly ignored the fact that this proposed site is within the Green Belt and as such, is wholly inappropriate for such a development. At present, extant planning permission has been granted on the same site for the development of just one property – no more. It is therefore completely hypocritical to propose a development of such magnitude when private planning such be confined to just one family.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, under no circumstances should the Old Colliery Site at Stanton Wick be taken forward as a formal allocation.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I agree that Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople require safe and healthy sites, but these should be in areas that comply within the confines of stipulated planning regulations.

It is abundantly clear that the Old Colliery Site at Stanton Wick does not fall within these Planning Guidelines and as such, should not be pursued any further.

Respondent: 4159 / 1 Name: Ms Roseanne Arnold Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

I believe the site is unsuitable for a number of reasons.

We live in a semi rural setting. With this proposal we would be overrun with the lack of shops, schools, public transport, doctors, sewage, electric and water etc.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree with the council assessment of opportunities and constraints of this site. As it contradicts Government Policy of guidance on gypsies and traveller sites and is completely unsuitable with the size and amount of pitches that is being proposed.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO! NO! NO! The site is completed unworkable and will not comply with national and local government planning guidelines

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I feel that this is totally and completely unsuitable as a travellers site, the infrastructure e.g roads, school, shop, doctor, public transport, electric and sewage is unachievable in my opinion

Respondent: 4162 / 1 Name: Mr Tim Robinson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The location is wholly inappropriate for a number of reasons:-

-The site is within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for such use – this is evidenced by the refusal to allow expansion of the adjoining Filer's site on the grounds of Green Belt protection

-The site comprises old mine workings which would pose a major health and safety risk particularly to wandering children

-The site is contaminated – whilst the contamination could be removed (at considerable cost) there is no guarantee that no contamination remains – again placing residents at risk

-There is inadequate mains water and electricity supply and existing drainage systems barely cope with current requirements

-Highways access to the site is inappropriate for such an intensified use – access to Pensford down Wick Lane is little more than a single track road with sharp turns and restricted vision over a bridge, and no footpath. During winter this Lane is extremely dangerous and an intensification of use would mean that BaNES are knowingly placing users at risk.

-There is inadequate provision of facilities within the immediate area to support the anticipated additional numbers – there is no shop within safe walking distance, there is no Doctor within safe walking distance and there is inadequate

school capacity to cope with additional numbers

-The existing community of Stanton Wick would be dwarfed by gypsies and travellers threatening their existing way of life.

In addition to the above, I believe the proposed inclusion of this site is contrary to the Government's "Planning Policy for traveller's Sites 2012" in particular paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and Policy E.

In proposing this site for consideration I believe BaNES are at risk of serving no useful purpose to either the residents of Stanton Wick or the Gypsy and traveller community. Potentially they run the risk of destroying a vibrant and established local community whilst at the same time providing a site that is inappropriate for the needs of another community – indeed so inappropriate that it places the gypsy community at risk in terms of the overall health and safety of the site, inappropriate access, dangerous roads and so on.

In the circumstances we urge you to do all you can to ensure this site is withdrawn from any further consideration as a Gypsy and Traveller site.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No – this site is totally inappropriate

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The preferred Options Paper is a shallow document that clearly has little attention to reality and is written by someone who has little grasp of practicality, nor any grasp of the needs of the travelling community.

By excluding Bath itself from this process, on the grounds of its World Heritage status many eminently suitable sites are being missed. This is short-sighted and potentially costly – there are many existing sites within the Bath boundary that would be suitable for use and are clearly attractive to the travelling community – since the community is already in these sites

Respondent: 4163 / 1 Name: Ms Helen Robinson Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The location is wholly inappropriate for a number of reasons:-

- The site is within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for such use – this is evidenced by the refusal to allow expansion of the adjoining Filer's site on the grounds of Green Belt protection
- The site comprises old mine workings which would pose a major health and safety risk particularly to wandering children
- The site is contaminated – whilst the contamination could be removed (at considerable cost) there is no guarantee that no contamination remains – again placing residents at risk
- There is inadequate mains water and electricity supply and existing drainage systems barely cope with current requirements
- Highways access to the site is inappropriate for such an intensified use – access to Pensford down Wick Lane is little more than a single track road with sharp turns and restricted vision over a bridge, and no footpath. During winter this Lane is extremely dangerous and an intensification of use would mean that BaNES are knowingly placing users at risk.
- There is inadequate provision of facilities within the immediate area to support the anticipated additional numbers – there is no shop within safe walking distance, there is no Doctor within safe walking distance and there is inadequate school capacity to cope with additional numbers
- The existing community of Stanton Wick would be dwarfed by gypsies and travellers threatening their existing way of life.

In addition to the above, I believe the proposed inclusion of this site is contrary to the Government's "Planning Policy for traveller's Sites 2012" in particular paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and Policy E.

In proposing this site for consideration I believe BaNES are at risk of serving no useful purpose to either the residents of Stanton Wick or the Gypsy and traveller community. Potentially they run the risk of destroying a vibrant and established

local community whilst at the same time providing a site that is inappropriate for the needs of another community – indeed so inappropriate that it places the gypsy community at risk in terms of the overall health and safety of the site, inappropriate access, dangerous roads and so on.

In the circumstances we urge you to do all you can to ensure this site is withdrawn from any further consideration as a Gypsy and Traveller site.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No – this site is totally inappropriate

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The preferred Options Paper is a shallow document that clearly has little attention to reality and is written by someone who has little grasp of practicality, nor any grasp of the needs of the travelling community.

By excluding Bath itself from this process, on the grounds of its World Heritage status many eminently suitable sites are being missed. This is short-sighted and potentially costly – there are many existing sites within the Bath boundary that would be suitable for use and are clearly attractive to the travelling community – since the community is already in these sites

Respondent: 4164 / 1 Name: Mr Barry Vipond Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The proposed Gypsy and Travellers site at Stanton Wick is located close to the villages of Stanton Wick, Stanton Drew and Pensford. The site is within the Green Belt and would therefore represent an inappropriate development. The council asserts the Old Colliery site is Brown Field, but as the colliery was closed in 1955, and the site has reverted to a natural state it would now be regarded by most observers as Green Belt. In fact, a document available for download from the BANES council website (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/SiteCollectionDocuments/Environment%20and%20Planning/Pensford%20CA%20v3.pdf>), provides an assessment of Pensford and describes it as “being of special architectural and historical interest and was designated a Conservation area in May 1988”. It goes on to state that “Pensford’s inclusion within the Bristol-Bath Green Belt signifies the importance of the landscape setting and helps prevent development which would be harmful to the area”. The document also provides highlights of the special interest of Pensford which includes “Evidence of the former mining industry including miners’ cottages, the miners welfare and abandoned mineworks in the surrounding area”. These very features that define the character and history of the area are under threat from the proposed development such that they will be irrevocably damaged.

The short listing of the Stanton Wick site remains an unfathomable sequence of events. The site was low scoring in the initial assessment matrix and should in fairness have been removed from the sites undergoing further consideration as it was clearly inadequate. However, it was subsequently shortlisted by a more detailed assessment of sites in a flawed process that can at best be described as subjective opinion rather than an unbiased objective approach of the initial scoring matrix. The assessment report of the individual sites is also contradictory such that the rationale for inclusion (or rejection) from the shortlist are controversial. Local residents affected by the subsequent shortlisting process will rightly feel suspicious that the process has been unfair in its assessments and that these “opinions” have overridden the weightings and priorities identified in the initial scoring assessment. It defies logic that an abandoned colliery site with significant health and safety issues (contaminated land and proximity to disused mineshafts and potential for subsidence to name but a few) can be considered an appropriate location that there has been a scant regard for the wellbeing of Gypsy and Travellers in the selection process. The fact that this site has poor access, is located in the Green Belt, is remote from essential services etc etc only add to the evidence that the site should have been ruled out of the process. In continuing with this process the council has ridden rough-shod over its own planning policies such that sites are no longer evaluated on a fair and equal basis but by what appears a whimsy.

If the unsuitability of the site were not enough, the scale of the proposed development with 15 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches is significant cause for concern. Such a development would dwarf the local community and consequently is unreasonable. The development would encourage an increase in traffic on the narrow roads - options for walking to and from the site are lacking and unsafe and access to public transport is inadequate. Amenities in Pensford and Stanton Wick

are insufficient to support the proposed development. The nearest Doctors surgery is 5 miles away with no public transport options (despite a statement to the contrary in the detailed assessment). The opportunities for employment locally are limited and would consequently lead to increased commuter traffic in the area .

Ultimately, the council assessment relies on the clause of “very special circumstances” to ignore guidelines and justify the use of the Stanton Wick site which lies within the Green Belt. However, in the detailed assessment the council have used its own arbitrary set of “special circumstances” to exclude some sites that would otherwise have proven more suitable. It is not at all clear how the Stanton Wick site has been projected into the shortlist when it is clearly wrong in so many ways not only for the local community, but also for the Gypsies and Travellers themselves.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 4165 / 1 Name: Mr Simon Jerome Organisation: The Governors of The Federation of Bishop Sutton and Stanton Drew Primary Schools

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes, as a Governing body we have concerns that there is insufficient hard social area available to safely accommodate any significant increase in pupils at our Stanton Drew School based on the following formula:

What the recommended area should be according to ‘Building Bulletin 99 – Briefing Framework for Primary School Projects’. Published by Dept. for Education and Skills.

400 m2 + (1.5 x pupil numbers)

400 m2 + (1.5 x 46)

400 m2 + 69 = 469m2

The current area of the playground is 464m2

If Stanton Drew numbers rose to 70 (its stated capacity) the recommended playground space would need to be 505m2

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No, see other boxes.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, B&NES have been unable to give us guidelines on how many children would need to be accommodated in local primary schools for the number of proposed pitches.

We feel this would need to be established before the pitch numbers could be agreed to make sure there were sufficient pupil places available in the local community.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

a)We also have concerns over the soil contamination on the proposed site (GT2). The risk this could have to not only the

traveller children but also those existing pupils at the school.

We would seek reassurance that traveller children living on the site would be risk free health issues relating to the site's contamination.

b)The impact on local schools needs to be considered in particular areas like:

Future OFSTED reports (attendance etc)

Perception of the schools effectiveness by existing parents

Migrating numbers to other schools as a result of traveller children attending the schools.

The school is already short of 5m2 with no opportunity to expend the school's buildings/play area.

To compromise these guidelines would put at risk the safety and development of pupils within the school.

We are aware that the proposed site (GT2) is on contaminated land and we would have concerns that children who attend our school

Respondent: 4172 / 1 Name: Mr Robert Worrall Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

The Stanton Wick Site is totally inappropriate for this type of development for the following reasons:
 The development would totally overwhelm the existing settled community.

The old mineshafts on the site are very dangerous and it is also seriously contaminated thereby needing a great deal of (council tax) expenditure, not to mention an intolerable number of heavy vehicle movements on very narrow country lanes.

The site is of Nature Conservation interest providing habitat for many important species, and adjacent to the Pensford Conservation area.

The water supply in the area is at capacity and there is no mains sewerage in the area and such a large development cannot be supported by septic tanks.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No!

The site is totally unsuitable and does not in any way comply with Government Guidelines for such Development and therefor the Coouncil's assessment of opportunities and constraints for the site is irrelevant.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No!

The suggested allocation of 15 permanent pitches plus 5 temporary pitches means in reality a total 50 caravans on site each containing sizable families – thus dwarfing the existing local community and putting a strain on local schools, doctors etc.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

As previously indicated, such a development would fly in the face of the Local & National Policy and Government Guidelines:

It is in a green belt area and would constitute "inappropriate development in the Green Belt" and this has been the reason cited for refusing previous planning applications for this site and an adjacent one.

The access roads(lanes) cannot support any real increase in traffic without msubstantial widening etc. and this has also been cited in previous planning refusals.

There is no safe walking route to either Pensford or StantonWick schools , nor any public transport within safe walking distance. The Doctor’s surgery is 5 miles away and there is no public transport.

Respondent: 4175 / 1 Name: Ms Patricia Ann Shah Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

1. Greenbelt

The proposed site Stanton Wick (SW) is in greenbelt. National guidelines clearly specify that gypsy and traveler sites in green belt “are inappropriate” development. No planning permission can be granted.

2. Inadequate road access

BaNES have already accepted that the road access is incapable of coping with the increase in traffic but claim that the increase will be modest. Approx 100 people will have to use the car in order to get anywhere producing a traffic increase of many times the current level.

All planning applications have been refused where there was likely to be an increase in traffic. The Highways Dept. should be asked to examine this proposal from the view point of safety and increase in accidents.

3. Access to amenities

The site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors etc only a steep, unlit and muddy track.

It is an issue that the schooling for increased number of children will be inadequate. This development is unsustainable as everyone will have to use cars to access the basics of life.

4. Size

The site is over half size of the whole of Victoria Park in Bath.

BaNES have not explained how many people they expect OR how they will deal with unauthorised expansion across the site, OR what business activities will be allowed and volume of lorries etc.

5. Overwhelming the nearest settlement

National guidelines state that the site should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement. Even at 20 pitches the travellers would outnumber Stanton Wick’s residents, possibly 2 or 3:1

It is unlikely that BaNES will be able to discharge their duty in relation to social cohesion will be ensuring integration.

6. Contamination and safety

In an expert report and survey the site was found to be contaminated with dangerous levels of arsenic that has not been removed. The majority of the site has not yet been surveyed. It has mineshafts and safety issues have not been considered.

7. Traveller preferences

The site has nothing in common with the type of site preferred by travelers as shown in the West of England Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Travellers prefer close proximity to amenities and small family sites of up to 5 pitches.

8. Cost to Tax Payers

BaNES have not explained who will be paying for any or all of work required to make the site habitable, bring in water, sewage and electricity. They have not explained what the cost is for any mine safety work or roadwork costs or the costs to enable children to be accommodated in the schools.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council’s assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 4177 / 1 Name: Mr Rodney Andrews Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Government policy is to protect the Green Belt. There is no justification or any very special circumstance which makes the inclusion of proposed sites within the Green Belt acceptable.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree that it is appropriate to include this site as potentially suitable for allocation. The Council has only identified two constraints - the Green Belt and unsuitable access. There are other constraints which have been ignored:- the site is contaminated and hazardous and is remote from public transport, local facilities and services.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

It is not appropriate for this site to be taken forward as a formal allocation.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Under National Policy Guidance, development in the Green Belt is inappropriate. I do not consider that there are any very special circumstances to justify this proposal.

Under National Policy for Travellers, sites must not dominate the nearest settlement. This proposal would definitely overwhelm Stanton Wick and many local services including schools.

The local infrastructure cannot accommodate this proposal.

Respondent: 4178 / 1 Name: Ms Susau Aiers Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. Certainly not.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No, I don't.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This site is in the greenbelt, why, when planning applications in the past have been refused is it suddenly alright to allow such a large development? An equivalent number of park houses for the elderly etc. no doubt have been refused. The site is quite unsuitable in terms of amenities and safety. Furthermore there will be a huge increase in traffic up and down the lanes and congestion in Church Street, Pensford at the village shop and more parking difficulties this proposal is completely ill-thoughtout.

Respondent: 4181 / 1 Name: Mr Dan Boye Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

The site is - as already stated - within green belt land, and has severely limited access. The site also needs considerable development to make it fit for purpose.

The local area is already being threatened by other development (Stowey Quarry, etc) and related increased traffic. I do not believe it is necessary for BaNES to go forward with this specific allocation as there must be a number of sites in and around Bristol eminently more suitable; it is much more important to respect the green belt status of the area and the valley to protect it for the future.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

I do not accept that this is in any way a suitable site, and do not want it taken forward as a formal allocation.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 4182 / 1 Name: Mr Mark Finn Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No:

- The assessment process scored the site very low in it's site scoring matrix (10 points which includes 5 for (hazardous place) but then short-listed the site. This does not seem to make any sense.
- The site has mineshafts and the land is contaminated so is potentially unsafe, I'm surprised that an assessment of 5 points for this in the scoring and would like to see a published expert assessment of these issues.
- There doesn't seem to be any consideration for water, sewerage or drainage.
- There are also bats on the site, which I believe are protected. There is no mention of how their habitat is going to be safeguarded.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I don't agree that green belt land should be used in this way, government guidance says it is inappropriate.

I am concerned about any increase in traffic, as a family, (we have 3 young children and 2 dogs), we use the lane for walking to footpaths and for cycling on. I also use this lane for running. As there are no local amenities the site users would be forced to use cars. As there is no pavement and it is quite narrow in places any increase in traffic could easily lead to an accident.

The site, even at 20 pitches, would overwhelm the Stanton Wick community. This seems to be against National guidelines.

The actual site is large, there is no mention of how the site would be limited to 20 sites. It would be very easy for this to be contravened.

Respondent: 4183 / 1 Name: Ms Karen Brennand Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 4184 / 1 Name: Mrs Irene Brennand Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 4190 / 1 Name: Ms Angie Holden Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Yes, in part, particularly that the site is in the Green Belt, it will require remediation works and the access is single-track in several parts. What it does not mention is that 15 to 20 pitches with an average of 1.7 caravans (or similar) on them will add up to a large amount of new people and vehicles, totally disproportionate to the community around them. Even if the site itself is 'well screened' – assuming that there is an effort towards 'sensitive site design' – there will be a huge increase in traffic along the single track roads, which will affect the rural nature of the neighbourhood. Also the traveller population is likely to double the size of the current community, which does not promote social cohesion.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

The provision of 15 pitches and 5 transit pitches on Green Belt land is contrary to planning guidance. As there is planning permission for one residence, it would be acceptable to provide planning permission for one pitch. I do not agree that there are 'very special circumstances in this case.'

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The provision of 15 pitches and 5 transit pitches on Green Belt land is contrary to planning guidance. As there is planning permission for one residence, it would be acceptable to provide planning permission for one pitch. I do not agree that there are 'very special circumstances in this case.

Respondent: 4192 / 1 Name: Mr Con Bradley Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. It is a ludicrous site to select for Travellers for these reasons:

1. The site is not near any amenities such as schools, shops, doctor surgeries, public transport etc. and is totally isolated. Any residents would have to use private transport to reach the site.
2. The site is inherently dangerous for any residents given its previous use as a colliery. This would be especially true for children at the site. There is also the risk that the site is contaminated from its previous use.
3. Despite the suggestion that a few trees will screen the development, the site will dominate the tiny adjacent hamlet of Stanton Wick where there are no facilities.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 4199 / 1 Name: Mr Jonathan Harrison Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

In a word, no. The Stanton Wick site is a wholly inappropriate location for a Gypsies Traveller & Travelling Showpersons site, not least because the site is counted as greenbelt. Any such attempt to provide a site for what could be over 100 people there clearly constitutes inappropriate development of such an area; with such a reason given by the authorities on numerous occasions to private citizens. Moreover, the location of such a large development in what is in truth a thoroughly rural area would place unnecessary strain on the local infrastructure. For example, Wick Lane, the only route of access to the proposed site, cannot support the increase in traffic, which would include large vehicles, that would surely accompany the development. The potential increase in traffic volume has been cited by B&NES in previous refusals. Similarly, the local shop (Pensford), whilst able to provide for the needs of existing residents, would be unable to cope with extra demand, not to mention the lack of safe walking route to the shop. In fact, travel of any kind, automobiles aside, would prove to be an issue for any inhabitants of the proposed site. Public transport in the area is notoriously scarce, with bus stops few and far between. A lack of such amenities prevents easy access to the nearest doctor's surgery and other essential facilities.

This is not to mention the problems with the proposed site itself. The land of the Old Colliery consists of old shale and slag from historical mining operations. This constitutes contamination and could easily pose a health hazard to traveller children who might play in the area. Equally the nature of the ground would make water supply to the site, as well as drainage and waste removal, hugely difficult, as mains sewerage is impractical and the ground could not hold septic tanks

to provide for the camp.

The individual nature of the site, and the fact it has been untouched for so long, makes it a site of nature conservation interest, and of course any decision to develop the land would harm wildlife there; a protestation that often seems to be favoured by local and national governments.

In summary, the proposed site is inadequate for such a development on the grounds of infrastructure, quality of life and countryside protection.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 4200 / 1 Name: Ms Katharine Finn Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I do not agree with the council's assessment and am very concerned about the decision to take forward the Old Colliery Buildings at Stanton Wick as a preferred site. I understand that on the evaluation matrix that the council used to assess the suitability of sites, that this site scored very low and I think that it was inappropriate for the site to be taken forward to this later stage of consultation.

I also believe that the council have been inconsistent with how they have viewed this site – I understand that they have previously turned down planning applications for housing redevelopment here and it is therefore illogical of them to now assess this site as being suitable for a large population.

I also understand that they have turned down planning applications to expand the adjacent transport business on the grounds that there is in appropriate road access for greater transport. It is therefore again illogical for the council to now feel that this is appropriate for being developed as a site for multiple families.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No – as noted above I do not think it should be taken forward. Irrespective of whether or not the correct process has been followed or whether or not the site is greenbelt or not, I do not think that this is a suitable environment to develop for a large number of families to live on. As you will know the local school in Stanton Drew is a very small school and the Pensford school is also small. I do not think that introducing a large number of people into that population is appropriate. I also believe that the a traveller site would be better located closer to a larger urban area than in the middle of a very sparsely populated area with few amenities available within a close distance of the site.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I believe that if the council wants to pursue some larger sites for traveller population, these should be in the larger urban areas of the county.

Respondent: 4204 / 1 Name: Ms Lucy Sutton-Fricker Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am against the Traveller site in Stanton Wick because the site is unsuitable because of the wildlife, there are many important species and the site would destroy their habitat, for example bats live on the proposed site and they are a protected species, and species I care a lot about.

Respondent: 4205 / 1 Name: Mr David Hall Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes. With reference to the Stanton Wick Colliery site:-

- 1) The access road is very narrow, being single track with passing places only, and a double bend over the railway bridge/tunnel entrance.
- 2) Pedestrian access is potentially dangerous as there is no footpath along the road, or grass verges as refuges for pedestrians.
- 3) The coal waste tip is a contaminated area, containing residues of heavy metals and mining waste, and with shafts below, subject to collapse.
- 4) The Salters Brook watercourse in the valley below feeds into the River Chew, which has high purity uncontaminated water, and a considerable reputation for the clean habitat for all sorts of river ecology. This would be compromised by disturbance of the site and subsequent contamination.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. The site is unsuitable on numerous practical counts, some listed above, as well as being in the Green Belt and the proposed size being out of proportion to the numbers of residents in the hamlet of Stanton Wick.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.
The transit sites provisions are not welcomed by potential resident site occupiers.

The numbers of sites initially proposed is inappropriately high, and the suggested maximum size totally out of proportion to the local need and desirability.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Planning permission has been refused for a local coach company to increase the number of vehicles it keeps on an adjacent site due to lack of capacity on the side road serving the site.

It is absurd to believe that the traffic generated by a substantial Gypsy and Travellers site would be acceptable in this narrow lane.

I understand there are nearby sites that have been suggested which would be more suitable, with far less expense, and serve the Gypsy/Traveller and local communities far better than a large development here on such an unsuitable site.

Respondent: 4208 / 1 Name: Mr Donald Weston Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Site is located in the Greenbelt

Does not meet the Council's own criteria as indicated by the low 'matrix' score

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

The Government's removal of the word 'normally' from PPG indicates clearly that planning permission should not be awarded to Travellers Sites in preference to local residents.

BathNES planning policy for many years has been one of refusal to allow any new development in small rural communities unless they were in areas designated for development. This policy has been applied in Stanton Wick and other nearby villages like Chelwood. If this site were accepted and planning permission granted then it would indicate a clear preference towards travellers and against local residents.

Also if planning permission for this site were granted then how could the Council oppose subsequent residential applications for this site or on adjoining greenbelt land?

A much less contentious proposal made by several people at a 'pre-consultation' meeting at Pensford that each new housing development should incorporate land for two travellers pitches, in much the same way as the requirement for social housing. A representative from BathNES dismissed this suggestion saying that "the land required for traveller pitch was over one and a half times the area needed for a house". This again implies that some form of preference is being traveller sites.

Respondent: 4209 / 1 Name: Mr George Sutton-Fricker Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am against the Traveller site in Stanton Wick as the site is a nature conservation interest and also provides the habitat for many species some which are very important, disturbing these habitats would either be fatal for them or force them to move somewhere else which could cause an unbalance in the area they move to.

There is also residences very near by to the site, i think it is unmoral for a site to be put that close to homes. These people have moved to a very quiet area for a reason that it is quiet and peaceful.

An increase in traffic is something that the junctions and roads in Stanton Wick cannot support, without substantial road widening and junction alteration. one junction in the area is extremely dangerous as it enters a national speed limit road, if anymore cars and vehicles is caused to use this junction, i am almost certain vehicles travelling at those speeds, there will be many accidents.

Respondent: 4210 / 1 Name: Ms Jennie Fegan Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Reasons why this site is not suitable for a permanent gypsy site:-

- 1/ The site is in the greenbelt.
- 2/ It would disturb a site of nature conservation.
- 3/ The site is potentially dangerous with redundant mine shafts and the possibility of subsidence.
- 4/ The site is probably contaminated.
- 5/ There is not adequate water supply and no means of drainage and too large for septic tanks.
- 6/ The access roads are not suitable for the increase in traffic.
- 7/ The site would be far larger than the local population of Stanton Wick.
- 8/ The site would put too much pressure on local schools and doctors surgeries.
- 9/ There is no public footpath or pavement suitable.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Reasons why this site is not suitable for a permanent gypsy site:-

- 1/ The site is in the greenbelt.
- 2/ It would disturb a site of nature conservation.
- 3/ The site is potentially dangerous with redundant mine shafts and the possibility of subsidence.
- 4/ The site is probably contaminated.
- 5/ There is not adequate water supply and no means of drainage and too large for septic tanks.
- 6/ The access roads are not suitable for the increase in traffic.
- 7/ The site would be far larger than the local population of Stanton Wick.
- 8/ The site would put too much pressure on local schools and doctors surgeries.
- 9/ There is no public footpath or pavement suitable.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I do not understand when the combined housing proposal for Ensleigh, Foxhill, Warminster Road totals 1190 houses with 35% being affordable housing why has the option of integrating the necessary traveller allocation into these sites not been looked at. Yet a site in the green belt has been shortlisted.

Respondent: 4213 / 1 Name: Ms Joyce Cox Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Greenbelt area – not suitable for proposal traveller site. Site far too large, no services or amenities.

Respondent: 4214 / 1 Name: Ms Alison Dymond Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Not suitable to be in a greenbelt area.

Respondent: 4215 / 1 Name: Mr James Cox Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No. Grennbelt area, should not be allowed.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 4216 / 1 Name: Mr Matthew Cox Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I don't. Area is greenbelt and should remain greenbelt.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 4217 / 1 Name: Ms Kim Cox Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I don't.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Greenbelt site and bad access to site.

Respondent: 4218 / 1 Name: Mr Ian Cox Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I don't.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Not appropriate site as greenbelt and access.

Respondent: 4219 / 1 Name: Ms Rebecca Cox Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 4220 / 1 Name: Mr Brian Cox Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I don't greenbelt area, lanes not built for traffic.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Respondent: 4221 / 1 Name: Mr Adrian Cox Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

No

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I believe this site is totally inappropriate for the greenbelt area.

Respondent: 4223 / 1 Name: Mr Nick Moon Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

My first observation is that this site has been the subject of many planning applications and each one has been refused citing inappropriate use of Green belt land and I can see no reason why this proposal would be in anyway more appropriate as use of Green Belt land.

If this were just a simple case of bringing in a few caravans, and that was it, then it might have some possibility but the work that would be needed to clean the site up of the contamination that the old colliery working have left, making all the old mine shafts in the area totally safe and bringing to the site all the services that would required to support 'these few caravans' would be an enormous undertaking and no little cost to the tax payer.

If then this is overlooked then once the site is established the movement of vehicles and people would be another significant issue as I am sure that the proposed residents of the site would want to travel to areas such as Bristol and the route from the site to Bristol would sensibly be seen to be via the roundabout at Chelwood bridge but the most direct route would be down the hill, over the old railway bridge and down into the heart of the Pensford conservation area. The feeling I have is that the proposed residents would prefer such as more direct route and as their way of life is seen to use vehicles such as lorries or vans then this route would become a danger to them and to the current people who use the road and live at the bottom of the very steep hill. If any of the residents of this route require to walk, cycle or use their horses to the potential increase in vehicles using this route could be a major Health and Safety issue.

The area is a site of Nature Conservation and it is my belief that it be maintained as such. The area was countryside before the colliery was built and should be returned to nature. I gather that there are several species of plant and animal life that are doing well there and any such development would be a threat to them.

My last observation is based on experience I have had when living near a site that has been occupied by travellers for some years now and that is if permission is given for two or three caravans to be placed at a site then over time there is a general expansion in those numbers and many more occupants attempt to take up residence at such a site. The site proposed is supposedly quite small but there is potential for BANES to 'allow' a natural expansion in residents population without any control. If this should happen then all objections thus cited will be increased many fold and the local infrastructure will be overwhelmed and bring many problems to the local area with many Health And Safety issues not only for the proposed residents but also of the local population.

I do feel that it would be a better proposal to place the site for such travellers near large centres of population where they can obtain all the amenities they require such as employment, education, utilities and food supply far more easily rather than placing them in the Green Belt which has been designated as such to keep it Green, not to be destroyed to make the necessary changes needed to allow the proposal to be completed.

Respondent: 4225 / 1 Name: Mr Steven Haines Organisation:
Anthony

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

since the matrix was completed further errors by the Council have become apparent making the final score for this location even lower on the Councils OWN matrix

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

The Council has a duty to its electorate to ensure the site complies with its OWN matrix findings and based upon this flawed evaluation requires complete re-evaluation and as such cannot be taken forward as a formal allocation

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I consider the site is unsuitable as it is green belt and cannot be used - using this site would send the wrong message and would further erode our countryside

I consider the site is unsuitable because of the high level of contamination and removal of such will incur severe costs in neutralising which we the rate payers will have to bear - there has to be a more suitable site at less cost available

I consider the site is unsuitable as the hamlet of Stanton Wick will be swamped with additional families putting additional burden on the very limited facilities

I consider the site is unsuitable due the narrow road with no pavement serving the site

I consider the site is unsuitable as the nearest school at Pensford is already full

I consider the site is unsuitable as there is no safe pathway to the nearest school or village shop at Pensford

I consider the site is unsuitable as there is no infrastructure in place i.e. sewers, drainage etc.

I consider the site is unsuitable as there is endangered species living on the site and no regard has been taken over these habitats

Respondent: 4226 / 1 Name: Mr Julie Haines Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I do not agree as the Council has not done its job properly. It has assessed the site to find it is not 17 in its preferred list and without explaining its reasons moved it to the top 6 which surely is NOT doing its job properly. Also, since this list was put together it has been proven that the Council did not find out all the facts before it published.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No. How can it be put forward when the Council has not done things correctly as the list put together by the Council is proven wrong and needs to start again. The council has wasted a large amount of rate-payers money on this and should have thought it through properly before starting

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I do not think this development is good idea for the following reasons: -

The site is green belt

This site is contaminated and will cost a lot to put right - there must be somewhere it will not cost us rate-payers a lot to put right first

The people of Stanton Wick will over-run by new-comers which is not fair

The road has no pavement and is not really good enough for a lot more cars and lorries using it - you wouldn't let the coach people have more coaches because it is so small

Our School at Pensford is full

There is no safe pathway to the school or shop in Pensford

There is no amenities at the site

The wild-life will be disturbed or destroyed

Respondent: 4228 / 1 Name: Ms Kathryn Joy Croker Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No I do not agree with the councils assessment as it is faulty and does NOT comply with its own findings in that this site is 17th in the original matrix and has been elevated to the top 6 with no rational and justifiable argument It has been demonstrated that the Council has NOT followed set guidelines, has not carried out a full assessment i.e. failed to contact highways on potential traffic load and failed in its duty to the people who they claim to serve

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Based on the fact that this site is no.17 on the suitable sites list this site CANNOT be taken forward as a formal allocation

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I object to this development for the following reasons: -

The site is green belt and cannot be used

This site is contaminated and will cost a lot of OUR money to rectify - there has to be a cheaper alternative

Stanton Wick's small community is in danger of being over-run by new-comers, something of which the rules do not allow

The narrow road with no pavement serving the site is not designed for additional traffic the proposed site will bring

The nearest school at Pensford is already full

There is no safe pathway to the nearest school or shop at Pensford

New sewers and water etc. will have to be installed and will cost a lot

The wild-life and habitats have not been considered

Respondent: 4229 / 1 Name: Mr JH Coles Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Please see next section.

Site commenting on:

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

I believe insufficient consideration has been given to the hazards on this site. There are disused mine workings on or near the site that could be susceptible to subsidence but this appears to have been completely disregarded by the Council since the site has been given a rating of 5 in the scoring matrix. Is the Council willing to gamble with the lives of the occupiers of the site, including children.

In addition a site investigation report by Sanctus has determined that there are levels of arsenic contamination on the site that indicate a potentially significant risk to human health and recommend remedial work. Has this work been costed and will BANES and its taxpayers have to pay for it.

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

I do not agree that the pitch provision of 15 permanent and 5 transit pitches should be taken forward since such a large influx of new residents into such a small hamlet would completely overwhelm the existing community. It should be remembered that the hamlet of Stanton Wick consists of only 26 dwellings, housing 60 people. Such a large increase in population would put a tremendous strain on the existing infrastructure. This goes against policy C of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Although the recommendation for this site is for a total of 20 pitches, the assessment tables mention a possible holding

capacity of 50 pitches. Does this mean that if planning permission is granted and a precedent is set, we can expect further applications in the future to increase the number of pitches in order to satisfy the Council's legal obligation to supply them, should the need arise.

Respondent: 4232 / 1 Name: Mrs Sarah Perry Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Yes – in respect of the old Colliery buildings at Stanton Wick – I believe this is unsuitable for the following reasons:

- 1) Site is in the green belt.
- 2) Insufficient road access.
- 3) No Public transport access.
- 4) Insufficient school capacity.
- 5) Insufficient walking access.
- 6) Contaminated site.
- 7) The proposed site would overwhelm the nearest settlement.
- 8) This site is also covered by a protection order for bats.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No – in my view the constraints outweigh the opportunities by a huge margin

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Absolutely not

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

This issue should be decided purely on planning grounds and for the reasons given on the front page is therefore wholly unsustainable.

Respondent: 4243 / 1 Name: Mrs Carolyn Walford Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

NO! When this site was first proposed and placed on the list of the top 7 sites, BANES had not actually been out to the site to carry out a site inspection!

Local residents were not consulted during 2010 and 2011 and only found out about the plans for the site a few weeks before the cabinet meeting on 9th May 2012!

This site has had planning permission refused on a number of previous occasions, "Inappropriate development in Green Belt" cited as the reason, so how can this Gypsy/Travellers site hope to get through the planning stages?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

NO!
This site is totally unsuitable to be taken forward due to the following reasons:

- The size of the proposed site would dwarf the local community and the village school could not cope.
- The Lane is far too narrow and unsafe as there are no pavements, lighting or public transport.

- There is only one tiny shop in Pensford and the nearest Doctors surgery is at least 5 miles away with no public transport.
- The land is contaminated and therefore poses a health and safety risk.
- There are no mains services to the site and it would end up costing BANES tax payers a fortune to make this site fit for habitation.
- The site is a conservation area for protected wildlife.

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

From the meetings I have attended and the information gained, it seems to me, that the only reason this site has been placed on the list at all, is the fact that it was offered to BANES by the land owner (an ex BANES employee!) whom I believe has also had previous planning applications refused!

Please see sense and remove this site from your list and try to find one which is much more suitable for the Gypsy/Travellers themselves who i am sure would prefer to be closer to amenities, health care and job opportunities!

This site seems to be preferred by yourselves as it is tucked away in a small rural location away from the majority of your voters and basically away from the historic city of Bath!!

Respondent: 4244 / 1 Name: Mr Paul Sutton-Fricker Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

I am against the Traveller site in Stanton Wick because the lane is too narrow to take all the traffic.
There is also no mains sewage

Respondent: 4245 / 1 Name: Ms Jean Phippen Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No
This is contravenes the aims of Green Belt legislation
Local roads will not be able to cope with the extra traffic
Local services are not available in sufficient size and volume in the close proximity and those available are not suitable for the extra numbers of residents
Local employment for the numbers envisaged is not available – local unemployment facilities are not available
Road access into the site is dangerous and the site has issues concerning safety
A site of this size will overwhelm local communities such as local schools and completely destroy the balance of views / influence in the local community
The cost of providing utilities to the green field site will far out strip any benefit

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?

Although appreciating the need to provide facilities for travellers and their families this proposal smacks of desperation in that it is a site with no redeeming features except it is remote and potentially available. The proposal whilst laudable in principle does not take into account the physical and safety problems of the site, the views of the local population and the basic principles of planning law.

Respondent: 4246 / 1 Name: Mr PM McIlwraith Organisation:

Do you have any evidence or information about any of the sites set out in the Preferred Options document which will help Bath and North East Somerset Council to determine whether they are available, suitable and achievable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision?

- Greenbelt Stanton Wick Colliery-contrary to national guidelines to use greenbelt.
- Inadequate road access-Highways department not consulted on safety issues.
- Access to amenities-difficult, dangerous.
- Size-20 pitches is larger than government stated maximum.
- Overwhelming the nearest settlement-contravening national guidelines stating that site should not overwhelm nearest settlement.
- Contamination and safety-expert report states site is contaminated with dangerous levels of arsenic. The majority of the site has not yet been surveyed. It has mineshafts and the potential for subsidence has not been addressed.
- Travellers preferences – not met as travellers prefer close proximity to amenities and small family sites of up to 5 pitches.
- The lack of due diligence by BANES is inappropriate as the project would expose the taxpayer to inordinate expense.

Site commenting on: GT.2 Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of opportunities and constraints on this site?

No

Do you agree that the potential pitch provision be taken forward as a formal allocation?

No

Do you have any other general comments on the Preferred Options paper?