

ROXWELL PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk – Lorraine Green

23 Glebe View, West Mersea, Colchester, Essex, CO5 8GH.

Tel. No. 01206 384159

NOTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 14TH DECEMBER 2010 AT ROXWELL MEMORIAL HALL, THE STREET, ROXWELL AT 7.30PM.

Present: *Cllrs. Wallace, Page, Hatcher, and Chambers*
In The Chair: *Cllr. Pavitt*
Minute Secretary: *Lorraine Green*
Also Present: *Members of the Public*
Cllr. John Jowers - Cabinet Member for Planning and Localism
Cllr. John Aldridge - Broomfield, Writtle & Roxwell
Cllr. Gerard McKewan -Willingale, Ongar Rural
Lesley Stenhouse - Essex County Council -Mineral and Waste Planning Manager
Roy Leavitt - Head of Environmental Planning
Barbara Kendal - Essex County Council -Senior Planning Officer
Hamish Barrell- Essex County Council - Senior Planning Officer

		ACTION
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.</p> <p>Cllrs. Howlett, Brookes and Gilkes.</p>	
2.	<p>MINERALS SITE.</p> <p>The Planning Officers gave a presentation on the site and asked parishioners to return the leaflet handed out at the meeting giving their comments.</p> <p>42m tonne of sand and gravel has got to be found by 2028 and ECC have got to plan ahead for new sites.</p> <p>A parishioner reported that green recycling is ripping up some of the greenest fields in Essex and it is totally inadequate. Essex has the highest standard of green field sites. The parishioner enquired as to where the additional traffic would go – Chelmsford? There is no rail link whatsoever! Cllr. Jowers explained that ECC have to provide a plan and that they are legally obliged to have 7 years worth of minerals. Cllr. Jowers advised that the environment issue is a very strong one and has a strong view that only that which is required for the county should be extracted. He advised that you can restore and renovate land like has happened at Chafford and Fingringhoe. A parishioner stated that you cannot compare brown field sites at Thurrock with Roxwell village. Cllr. Jowers explained that ECC cannot turn down a site until the consultation has taken place. Cllr. Jowers discussed the weighting issue and advised that if the village could convince ECC that what is being proposed is unfair or wrong then the Planning Inspector will turn it down. Cllr. Jowers advised that there is going to be massive expansion on M11 corridor. It was felt that Chelmsford is already well supplied already.</p> <p>Cllr. Chambers advised that CBC are already submitting their objections and will be supplying more information as the weighting is fictitious. Several sites in Colchester are transported by rail from Marks Tey to Colchester and enquired whether ECC will be considering these sites as well as the one in the village. Cllr. Jowers confirmed that if a preferred site is indentified in Colchester it will be considered.</p> <p>A parishioner stated that a processing plant it to be on site and enquired whether other aggregate would be bought in from elsewhere. Cllr. Jowers confirmed that if it was adopted all material would stay on site to be processed on site.</p> <p>A parishioner felt that the dispersal strategy was fundamentally flawed and that the proposed site was in a beautiful area in Essex. The scoring is flawed as there is an equal factor on everything. Extra points have been put on to get sites on the list – why bother when ECC are going to put them on the list anyway? Cllr. Jowers stated that Fingringhoe is a beautiful spot but it has a quarry. He advised that Birch quarry is similar to Roxwell – we are driven by geology and that cannot be changed. Cllr. Jowers stated that the village needs</p>	

to decide whether the basic environmental issue is flawed. ECC need a geographic spread and they need to look strategically at what Essex needs. Cllr. Jowers explained that Cabinet Members with sites in their division are putting their case forward against sites. All stage 2 criteria is treated the same as others. ECC need some justification in case another weighting score is done.

A parishioner pointed out that the proposed site has 42 points and 6 points were western weighting. Had it not been for the weighting the site would not be on the preferred site list.

A parishioner enquired as to why the extraction area on site A140 had been reduced substantially and enquired whether the applicant can extend in the future. The parishioner did not think it was fair that the villagers had not been told about this change and the reasons why. There is a 15 year plan period and ECC believe the applicant wanted this change to happen. A parishioner enquired as to why the owner can keep the old boundary and enquired whether this was for future planning?

Cllr. Wallace said that he understood that opinions were very valued and asked whether opinions are worth anything or is the plan going to be forced through and Planning Inspector to make decision. 280 objections had been received at the last consultation. ECC advised that the key points and issues have been summarised in the document to ensure that comments have been taken on board. Residents need to let ECC know that the scoring is wrong. ECC are legally required to produce a plan.

Cllr. Gerard McKewan advised that it is not ECC proposing the sites. ECC asked operators to come forward proposing sites. He advised that ECC are not forcing sites onto the village. Equal weighting must be done and the scope put forward. ECC would welcome a suggestion of how the process can be done better. A parishioner stated that all sites should have weighting as to distance from M11 rather than add extra 6 points to all sites proposed. Cllr. McKewan advised that some sites will go up and some will go down after the consultation process.

A parishioner enquired as to what percentage of infill can be put in and if it is controlled by ECC. There were no details at the moment but ECC will have control how the site will be restored within the planning permission.

A parishioner, Hugh Dibbens, advised that weighting was the key factor but he felt that the actual level of concern locally was do people's views matter about how they feel about their village. Other areas may see employment and opportunities to bring regeneration to their area. Mr Dibbens said this proposal impacts on the people in the area and these factors should be used.

The most letters of objections had been received about the site at Danbury – 919 letters. 282 letters had been received about the site at Shellows Farm, 500 regarding the site at Admirals Farm, Great Bentley, 8 for Sible Hedingham and no letters for Armitages Farm.

ECC agreed that residents' views could be a significant factor. The number of properties within 250m of the extraction site had been looked at.

A parishioner enquired as to how many jobs would be available to local people if the site were used. Cllr. Jowers advised that a lot of stuff will transfer if other sites shut.

A parishioner advised that he suspects the overall requirement of 42m tonne which is imposed by Government is an old requirement. This may be an over estimate of what is required and it should be challenged. A parishioner felt that it was important to keep local materials being used locally. It was reported that none are going to Chelmsford but some will go to Harlow. The parishioner said that the sites near Harlow may be better. Essex has got the biggest extraction site in Europe. The North development will go ahead, the South is Green Belt so it would go towards the western side of the county. 14k – 16k houses in Harlow are to be built but transferring is the problem. If ECC do not get it right the operators can get lawyers involved.

A parishioner stated that she had lived on the A1060 since 1970 and this site was another accident waiting to happen as it was on a very dangerous bend. The parishioner was declined a personal access as Highways had objected due to safety issues. One access was 200m from the proposed site. Cllr. Aldridge said that he fully appreciated the parishioner's issue and stated that Highways would not allow any access. A bell mouth would have to be

created with islands etc.

A parishioner talked about the time lines and asked what would happen if aggregate was not required as the pit had a life time of 14 years. Would the pit be opened and not utilised? The parishioner enquired whether there would be constant extensions which go on and on and could take 30 years. Will the applicant apply to extend the site to other areas? The sites at Boyton Cross on the A1060 have had lots of extensions and this is has only just been finalised.

A parishioner advised that transparency would give people more confidence. He stated that people want to know what ECC thought of the comments made. An explanation should have been given as to why the 6 points had been added. He enquired whether the consultation exercise was a fait a comple as there would have been no alternative if ECC had stuck to the regular criteria.

There is a desire to have a geographic spread. The Planning Inspector will determine if it is right or not. Cllr. Jowers said come up with an argument that it is a flawed process and it will fail. There may be places in Herts but nobody has come forward.

The owner of Newland Hall advised that the site is a few yards from his paddocks and lakes and is going to be catastrophic to his thriving business where he holds weddings. The track goes across land that is not on the plans and goes through his paddocks. His listed house is 300m from the proposed processing plant. The owner had invested £1½m for accommodation and this will completely ruin his livelihood. He enquired as to why he had not been approached regarding the track.

The route from A40 site to Harlow M11 has been considered by Highways. A parishioner stated there are far better sites in central area alongside the A12 with better road links. This site will have lorries going through about 13 villages. This would not cause as much harm to the environment. All factors need to be considered.

The Highways Agency looks at major routes and have no problem. 90 lorries will be using the roads a day. The Highway Authority, CBC, Epping Town Council and various Parish Councils all objected to the proposal.

A parishioner, Glyn Eastman, advised that the A1060 does not go directly to Harlow you have to use B roads. The traffic was restricted to three lorry movements a day when the Writtle gravel extraction took place. How can things change to 90 lorries a day. In the Minerals Development document strategy report reports are based on aggregate industries to expand their businesses. Nothing is said in the documents where demands are or how much demand there is. ECC are being led by industry. It was reported that there is growth all across the county and it is county wide growth. The whole of the county is growing and 25% of the aggregate goes out of the county. Herts have also got to find tonnage.

Margaret Roding Parish Council had not seen any consultation document on transport alongside the A1060 in the August 2009 consultation. The Parish Council need to advise all villages that will be impacted.

A parishioner who lived on the A1060 discussed the access road and access to the site. They had never seen any major road schemes on A1060. The pot holes have still not been done there from 2 years ago. What is going to be done about infrastructure? 90 lorries a day is horrifying. The road should be a 'B' road not an 'A' road. It is a very attractive route into Harlow and people's feelings are not being thought about. There is a wish for the materials to build houses and infrastructure.

A parishioner enquired as to whether ECC challenged Government's Regional Spatial Strategy and asked what criteria they had put in. Cllr. Jowers advised that ECC had challenged it and had got the houses to be built down from 202,000 to 127,000. He stated that he did not want any site winning on planning appeal but ECC need to come up with the best sites that they can.

A parishioner demanded ECC not to ruin lives of people who live in the country and do not ruin the lives due to cost. Operators should travel a further 30 miles rather than this happen.

A question was raised of whether a restriction would be put on operators on dust and noise

	<p>and the answer was yes there will be a restriction.</p> <p>A parishioner asked how much data ECC had got from Herts. ECC know what is going on around their area.</p> <p>A parishioner stated that the weighting figure was incorrect and should not be there. Two thirds of the county do not think that CO2 is an issue. The distance and travel comes back to cost and commercial vehicles should bear the cost.</p> <p>A parishioner asked whether there would be a curfew on roads that the HGV's can use.</p> <p>A parishioner stated that if the traffic light system was used to rate sites then they could not understand why the site in Roxwell had received 6 points.</p> <p>Peter Aldridge of RRAGE advised that the group had the full support of the Parish Councils and they were raising funds to get professional advice. The website for RRAGE is www.rrage.co.uk . A fundraising event will be held in January.</p>	
--	---	--

The Chairman thanked everyone for coming; the meeting closed at 10.00pm.

Signed (CHAIRMAN).....DATE.....