

ARPC Neighbourhood Plan First Consultation

I would comment in regard to the above. The NPSG is a sub - committee of the PC and therefore is governed by the same legal process's, this didn't happen. I warned and protested my concerns to the Chairman of the PC and NPSG, but they ignored me. I will now list the catalogue of illegalities and errors made.

1. Two years, 2016 and 2017, of agendas missing. You can't have a meeting without an agenda, so these meetings are null and void.
2. NPSG councillors not completing, DPI's, legal requirement to be done within 28 days, otherwise councillor cannot sit on committee. This was ignored until SODC, after my intervention, insisted from mid 2018.
3. I attach proof of minutes being approved before they were created, no explanation has been made for this illegality.
4. In regard to legal compliance the Chairman's answer has been that they were a group of 6 individuals who wanted to help the community and were ignorant of their compliance obligations. **IGNORANCE OF THE LAW IS NO EXCUSE.** In addition, as [REDACTED] (Chairman of the ARNP Steering Group) is a recently retired Town Planner and former member of the Royal Town Planning Institute (MRTPI), I am stunned that he would be ignorant of the compliance obligations.
5. As a subcommittee NPSG minutes must be ratified by full council, ARPC, this did not happen until I intervened and it started in mid 2019. Therefore none of the NPSG meetings happened until then.
6. Open BIAS by a certain member of NPSG displaying open objection to a possible site for housing, he should have been dismissed, but was not. He and three others did resign after SODC took legal advice, a blatant abuse of public position.
7. The democratic red site poll was never disclosed by NPSG until this consultation. The reason became obvious on its publication, the second top site was ignored by the NPSG for their own reasons, as they pushed forward the third site in the poll. They were told to publish by SODC but ignored. Blatant corruption and bias.
8. In the AECOM site appraisal, the preferred site by NPSG in Aston Rowant, which was the third preferred site in the poll, was described incorrectly by AECOM. They said it was a leisure site with no planning history. It is agricultural with a planning refusal. How did that happen?
9. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], NPSG councillors, both objected to the second most voted for site, while a PA was in place. How can they do this while sitting on the NPSG. The bias is blatant and illegal.
10. A site has now been proposed in Aston Rowant for housing that will provide a new Club House for ARCC, who are in desperate need to replace their present one. This site should be included in the Aston Rowant Neighbourhood Plan replacing the site which was third in the poll. It would be very easy to have a vote off done by the Parish Clerk by email, no one can vote twice and they must give their address. Aston Rowant Cricket Club is a vital part of our village and Parish rather than former and some present members of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) using the NP as a tool to protect their own self -interest, we should support this cricket club and enabling housing scheme proposal as it would bring with it large benefits to the community.
11. Having read the results of the Call for Sites process, only finally released by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group via an FOI request in December 2019 after the 1st draft of the ARNP was prepared and circulated, I note that the site at the corner of Aston Rowant Road and Chinnor Road (Site 4) was the preferred housing site in Aston Rowant and the 2nd most popular in the Parish losing the top spot by just 1 vote. I write to object to the proposed Green Space Designation LSO2 on this site which is clearly driven by bias for the reasons as set out above. In addition, I also object to the LS03 Designation for the cricket club pavilion and housing enabling paddock, as this such a designation would kill off this excellent and much needed village proposal. This would result in the pavilion being located in a far better location than the present approved building and with the delivery enabled by a housing scheme of 6 houses that would have no impact on any surrounding residents.

The NP should be rejected in its present form, but alas as it is so flawed the inspector will reject it anyway.