

From: Ricky-John
Sent: 24 September 2015 10:46
To: Minerals and Waste Plan Consultation - E&E
Subject: Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 1 Core strategy Proposal Document August 2015

Dear Sirs,

I feel that we have been ignored by OCC regarding this Proposal. It appears that none of our views have been taken into account. You appear to ride roughshod over the views of the vast majority of Cholsey/ Wallingford residents. This is not a case of nimbleism. The value of property in the village and surrounding areas will suffer as a consequence, not to mention the adverse effect on tourism, saying nothing of pollution, loss of habitat etc.

This is a blatant case the council steamroller in through a wildly diverse enough proposal. I have seen the Gardner Representation and I am furious that again the OCC has failed to consult Parish Councils and myself as a member of the public and a resident in Cholsey, that you have increased the Local Aggregate Assessment (number of tons of gravel required) , even though you found the resources (from my Council Tax Bill), and the time, to consult the mineral producers, but you deliberately failed to consult the public at large, you certainly have not informed me of any public meetings. In my opinion you have let down all who voted for you.

When you were happy with the lower LAA this time last year, I would like to know what has changed to enable a nearly 50% higher figure at the turn of this year.

You have also used my taxes to hire yet another set of consultants who will increase the LAA and comply with your plans. I find this most suspicious.

Your Plan is contrary to government policy and therefore not based in law . There is a circular argument in your OCC Plan which makes it non - compliant with Government Guidelines (the NPPF), the OCC argument is that you can leave site allocations until a later stage while at the same time indicate, without any formal supporting evidence, that the preferred area for allocations will be South Oxfordshire.

In fact, I believe, you are obliged to set out formal evidence as to why each site has been chosen, so may I ask why a site in Cholsey, which contains a listed barn and a large house right at the centre of the site, has been suggested as a potential site for mineral extraction.

I know that Campaign Groups have provided OCC with much input and advice, including from experts, which should have informed the Council enough to get this right. So it is peculiar, and to me, suspicious, that OCC keep returning with flawed arguments and figures which would make the County a huge net exporter of gravel. I assume this is the intention?

This has already amounted to an enormous waste of my tax money and to try again suggests that OCC does not have a grip on appropriate budgeting and the use of Public funds.

Government Guidelines (NPPF) advise using an historical 10 year average of minerals sales when calculating the LAA. The original LAA, proposed by the Hives Report was accepted by OCC in summer 2014, which would have meant no need for new gravel extraction sites in the County for many years to come. I object to OCC abandoning the 10 year average

methodology by hiring a new set of consultants in order to produce a higher LAA .

I believe that the UK Government should step in here, and bring some sanity back to the Council and I hope that by copying Mr Vaisey, that he will have the time to pass this on to the appropriate Minister, as I know he was following this situation last year, with interest.

I would appreciate a response to each of my points as I would regard that as part of your consultation process.

I am appalled by this misappropriation of my Council Tax and I only wish I could insist on a refund.

Yours Faithfully
Rick Holt

Sent from my iPad