

From: Duncan Reed
Sent: 30 September 2015 11:41
To: Minerals and Waste Plan Consultation - E&E
Subject: Dr Duncan W Reed's response to the M+WP consultation

Dear OCC

This is my only communication regarding the current consultation which closes this afternoon. Please read it, record it and register it as valid comment. My full contact details are given at the foot of this email. I am a Chartered Member of the Institution of Water and Environmental Management.

I have looked at the Gardner report. The phrase "This is clearly representative of OCC's approach of expediency over community involvement" rang true to me.

The history of OCC's Mineral and Waste Planning is a troubled one, with several wrong turns concerning the demand for and location of gravel resources in Oxfordshire of suitable size, quality and accessibility. [That's size of the resource not of the gravel.] However, with regard to the earmarking of resources in Cholsey, the history of OCC's Mineral and Waste Planning is deeply scandalous. What may appear to be a reasonable course of action to others cannot be so viewed from Cholsey. OCC ought to have recognised this by promoting community involvement at this stage of planning.

Why is OCC pushing forward with a plan that identifies more gravel than is needed within the county? I can find no answer to this question in your documentation, so have had to come up with my own hypotheses. Perhaps one of them is correct.

Hypothesis 1

Vested interests would like to see Oxfordshire become a net exporter of gravel. The exploitation of natural resources is irresistibly attractive to those who see prosperity in terms of projected financial wealth, and neglect factors associated with community well-being and the health of the environment.

Hypothesis 2

Ultra-conservatism in West Oxfordshire is at its zenith in terms of raw political power. Whilst this position prevails, vested interests want to commit the County irrevocably to siting future gravel extraction in South Oxfordshire rather than in West Oxfordshire. Are communities in West Oxfordshire so underprivileged that they cannot tolerate this geographically reasonable imposition any longer?

Opposition

I oppose and reject the your Plan's conclusion that "any significant requirement for additional sites in this part of the county will need to be met by a new working area within the Thames and Lower Thame Valleys area from Kennington to Cholsey". The words "in this part of the county" appear to have been added to mislead. If it is too early to identify specific sites, it is too early to decide that these sites must not be in West Oxfordshire.

I believe the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be improperly formed.

Recycling in relation to the M+WP

The outline proposal to close the recently modernised and well-positioned Waste Recycling Site at Oakley Wood is preposterous. How can it be environmentally efficient to encourage much longer trips to dispose of waste and the inevitably increased incidence of fly-tipping and of failures to segregate household waste correctly? These sites were formerly designated Civic Amenity Waste sites. Perhaps we should have demanded a consultation when you renamed them!

This is not a spurious contribution in respect of the Mineral and Waste Plan consultation. The common thread is that OCC decisions which lead to minerals or waste material being transported over unnecessarily large distances – individually or in bulk – are environmentally irresponsible.

Thanks for reading this.

Kind regards

Duncan

Dr Duncan W Reed