From: John and Gill Bowler
Sent: 14 March 2017 15:40
To: Day, Peter - E&E

Subject: Minerals Consultation

Dear Peter,

I am attaching the views of AGGROW to the proposed Consultation. We strongly support the OCC view that it is impractical to include this area in those likely to be able to handle minerals extraction.

Regards,

John Bowler.
Dear Mr Day,

**Minerals and Waste Plan Consultation – Clanfield/Bampton area.**

AGGROW, speaking on behalf of its 11 constituent members supports most strongly the exclusion of this area from the final Plan, Policy M3.

Whilst we fully accept there are extensive deposits in the area of what we understand is Grade 2 gravel (that is for uses other than housing) it would be impractical to excavate it. The reasons are:

1. The road network is one of narrow ancient roads bordered closely by houses in the many villages that abound in this area. The roads would be unable to take heavy traffic and there are many weight limits.

2. Schools and churches are on the roadside and the many S bends are almost impassable for today’s agricultural machinery and impossible for large lorries.

3. There is no lorry route close to this area and all the bridges over the Thames are humpbacked and narrow.

4. To gain any reasonable access would call for a vast road and bridge building programme.

5. On the roads in this area there are more than 200 listed buildings in the Domesday villages. They could not withstand heavy lorry pounding.

6. This area is absorbing considerable expansion at the moment with housing growth in Carterton and Bampton as well as what appears to be continual expansion of RAF Brize Norton.

7. Any increase in waterways, as in the case of excavations, will increase the risk of bird strike at Brize Norton.

8. The gravel in this area is not deep. The Geographical Survey of Oxfordshire indicated that of the 59 locations surveyed the locations in the Clanfield/Bampton area came 9th, 20th, 56th and 59th for the number of tonnes per hectare. There are therefore many locations in the County with considerably deeper deposits.

9. The area is low lying and at risk from flooding. In 2007 more than 365 houses were flooded. WODC stated in their flood report ‘further gravel extraction or other major
developments beyond existing allocations should not be permitted without the fullest consideration of the potential of that development to worsen or ameliorate the flooding situation’.

10. The area is good agricultural land. Some of the parishes concerned are conservation areas. Areas of ancient habitation and historical importance abound.

11. The area is very flat and it would be impossible to hide a quarry.

12. This remains the only area in the Upper Thames Valley that has not been desecrated by quarries. It should be protected further. Many visitors find this area convenient for touring the Cotswolds and the thriving and growing tourist trade would be badly damaged by gravel extraction.

Yours sincerely, John Bowler (Chairman)