



## Suffolk EfW Community Liaison Group Minutes

Great Blakenham Village Hall  
 Tuesday 22 February 2011  
 6.30pm-8.30pm

### Attendance:

Cllr John Field, (JF) - Chair  
 Mrs Pearson, resident  
 Sophie Meudec, resident  
 Mr Derek Lockwood, resident (DL)  
 Desma Girling

### Observers:

Cllr Lisa Chambers (LC), Suffolk County Council  
 Manda Henry (MH), Suffolk County Council  
 Cliff Matthews (CM), SITA UK  
 Emma Smyth, (ES), SITA UK  
 Rebecca Eatwell (RE), PPS Group (minutes)

### Presenters:

David Palk (DP), Development Control, Suffolk County Council (SCC)  
 Graham Gunby (GG), Development Control, Suffolk County Council  
 Peter Black (PB), Highways, Suffolk County Council

### Apologies:

Cllr Michael Blakenham (MB), Mid-Suffolk District Council  
 Cllr Roy Barker (RB), Mid Suffolk District Council  
 Cllr Sandy Martin, Suffolk County Council  
 Cllr Shirley Fairburn, (SF) Gt Blakenham Parish Council

Discussion	Actions
1. Welcome & introductions  JF announced himself as the new chair of the CLG.	
2. Minutes and actions from the last meeting  The minutes were accepted.  Actions: Page numbers have been included.  Wattisham – no further conversations between Dan Smyth from RPS and RAF Wattisham regarding the lighting required for the stack. The lights will be fixed (not flashing) and medium intensity, half way up the stack and on the top of the stack. JF asked what medium intensity means. ES to check.  AQ presentation was circulated to the group.	ES to find out strength of light



<p>New CLG member – the CV of a potential new member of the CLG was circulated to the group. JF noted that he doesn't live locally but that as this is a Suffolk wide proposal it is still relevant for him to be a member. The group agreed he should be invited to the next meeting.</p> <p>As there remains another space on the CLG, JF suggested also trying local parish councils to see who else might be interested in attending. The group agreed.</p> <p>Timescales for parish councils commenting on applications – DP explained that if Parish Councils are likely to miss the deadlines for responding that they should keep Development Control (DC) informed. It was explained that whilst a deadline is set (to enable SCC to have time to respond to any issues raised) that SCC want to help ensure the Parishes can submit their responses so would be flexible. DP noted that determination of the application isn't planned until July.</p> <p>Photos of HGVs queuing – GG stated that SCC are aware of the issue of HGVs queuing.</p>	<p>PPS to contact new CLG member</p> <p>JF to contact Parish Councils.</p> <p>PP to feedback to Parish Council</p>
<p>3. Project Update</p> <p>Planning application - ES explained that the application was in the hands of the planning process now.</p> <p>Permit application - CM stated that the Environment Agency (EA) have all the information they require, following a request for further info. Determination on the permit is expected by the end of June when the EA will issue a draft permit. DP asked for clarification as to whether the information requested by the EA was just in relation to permit. CM confirmed this was the case.</p>	
<p>4. Planning Process (SCC)</p> <p>DP explained that SCC have received application and going through the process.</p> <p>GG is case officer. Two parallel processes – Permit (pollution control) and Planning applications. SCC are a consultee on the permit, AQ manager is employing a consultant to look at the permit in detail to ensure an informed and detailed response.</p> <p>GG handed out a schedule for the planning application</p>	



programme. Validated 10 January 2011, public consultation started on 26 January. Hard copies delivered to parish councils, who were first to receive the application,

Public consultation ends on 9<sup>th</sup> March. Parishes can have a little more time but asap.

GG provided address for representations – these are public documents, published on the website.

Consulted long list of various bodies e.g. MOD, HA, and starting to get responses in. Dev Control are starting to look through documents – very comprehensive application.

Can also see the application on the SCC website. MS oblique 210 oblique 11, or search SITA or EfW.

Consultation responses from public, parish councils and statutory consultees. Also take county councillors to see an EfW to enable an informed decision – similar to proposed here, state of the art. Potentially also take parish councillors. SM – which facilities? GG – still trying to work out which one is the best option, geographically and in terms of matching what is proposed for Suffolk. Proposed for 3<sup>rd</sup> June.

There are objections to the application so it will have to go to committee.

Site visit for county councillors on 15<sup>th</sup> July – anyone who's made representations will be invited along, will also invite parish councils (but anyone is welcome). 14 councillors on DCC.

PP noted that SITA did kindly take the CLG round the site earlier in the consultation process.

Development Control Committee (DCC) 21<sup>st</sup> July

JF – can give an outline of DCC?

DP - 14 CC's. Membership is proportionate to the political make-up of the council (10 Conservative, 2 Liberal Democrat and Independent, 1 Labour, 1 Green and Independent). All members are trained by DC or legal team, lots have experience of sitting on Mid-Suffolk DC. None are members of the Cabinet. They have full powers to make a decision. Chairman is a Mid-Suffolk CC.



Papers are made public 7 days before the meeting. People can make representations at the committee. DP – usually 3 mins pro, 3 mins against, but likely to change this as a significant application (chairman’s discretion).

SM – Will the meeting be open to the public? DP – yes and members of the public are entitled to speak. Tend to ask groups to nominate a spokesperson to avoid duplication.

Report will summarise what’s being proposed, supporting docs, policy context, representations, consultee responses (e.g. EA) – with a recommendation for approval (with draft conditions) or refusal.

DP - Dates are provisional – if something crops up and need to go back to SITA this may delay things,

JF – how is decision taken, structured method? DP - case officer will give a presentation, then public speaking, then individual DCC members can question case officer and make comments. One will then move a recommendation, then a vote. Not a formal scoring process, but up to Cllrs to come to their own view

If refused, SITA have right of appeal. If approved no right of appeal but can be judicially approved.

PP – final decision? DP – at the committee, decision notice prepared then with reasons for refusal

6 month period for applicants to appeal. Or Secretary of State could call-in the application – usually only in very exceptional circumstances. Would lead to public inquiry and Inspector’s decision. e.g. national significance.

DL – it should be determined through public inquiry and not a group of councillors

JF – do members have to consider finance? DP – no, have to consider it again waste development plan and land-use (ES topics).

SM – unanimous vote or majority? Done in public? DP – majority and show of hands. Sometimes the votes are recorded for the minutes (likely to be the case for this application).



<p>SM – it's getting close and not all issues have been dealt with, e.g. traffic. The meeting is also in school holidays. DP - can't avoid this</p>	
<p><b>5. Traffic</b></p> <p>PB highways are a consultee on the application. Existing site is old highways depot – was a very busy depot. This traffic level is the baseline for the Traffic Assessment (TA). Traffic counts undertaken in June.</p> <p>SITA have produced a TA which covers this.</p> <p>Highways ask for junctions to be scoped in, and committed developments (Snoasis and housing development). All requirements identified by the Highways department were incorporated into the Traffic Assessment.</p> <p>Computer modelling scoped to 2020 with an agreed growth factor on the network. If any junctions are going to be overcapacity we ask the developer for mitigation measures to overcome the problems.</p> <p>Highways are currently going through documents, initial assessment is that traffic is a lot less than highways depot and no mitigation measures required.</p> <p>Understand that there are concerns about vehicles parking on Lodge Lane – not aware of any issues with traffic backing up onto Bramford Rd. Mitigation measures are proposed for Snoasis, reduce 60 mph down to 40mph – going through the process now.</p> <p>DL questioned vehicle assessments undertaken by SCC – traffic flows are different types of vehicles which find it harder to enter traffic flows. Close to junction so get a build up of lorries needing to cross the flow of traffic. How many vehicles expected from housing estate? Taking into consideration application for Lyme Barn?</p> <p>JF - Needham market has a HGV ban so they come through Great Blakenham.</p> <p>PB – aware of Lion Barn but this is only pre-application (?)</p> <p>DL – traffic is worse now than before the A14 was built, hard to get out into flow of traffic now at any time of day.</p>	



PB – look at time of when vehicles arrive as well as traffic numbers, less during rush hour. Bottom line is that EfW shows a decrease in traffic flows, if EfW doesn't go there than another development will, which could increase traffic flows.

JF – artificial as changing emphasis from cars to HGVs – which is leading to concerns. Also issue of traffic from Needham Market. Measured traffic from depot but also need to take into account traffic from businesses opposite. Vehicles have been parking on the B1113. Are all these things really being evaluated

PB – parking is an enforcement issue. Traffic counts were done all around the network, not just depot and takes into account committed development and standard growth factor.

GG – TA showing no significant impact on network but do take on board the concerns. RPS are looking at some of these issues and will potentially provide SCC with more information to ensure everything has been looked at. SITA have looked at every worst case scenario and it still seems to satisfy highways criteria. However Peter will review this and take a view.

PB - Snoasis measures will help traffic issues – speed reduction, new traffic lights on Hackney Corner

DL – solution is to provide a link road but recognises cost of this. PB – SCC doesn't have the money to do this as it crosses the river and the railway.

PB – can only ask SITA to mitigate against the issues that the EfW site will cause.

JF – already a problem, so this will make it worse. DP – at lodge lane or at the junction? JF – vehicles backing up from lodge lane onto the B113, right turning manoeuvre. Other sites down Lodge Lane generate lots of traffic and no limits on what they do – and increasing – can't be stopped as applications were granted years ago.



<p>DL – haulage depot now doing MOTs. PB this site does have permission for this. DL –a vehicle will be going in every 20 mins. PB – this is a current use and can't do anything about it. PB – have to consider the traffic that's not there since depot closed.</p> <p>JF – depot is already closed and there are already problems. Need to consider this use against what's actually happening now.</p> <p>CM – vehicles going into EfW will only be allowed to turn left – '3 strikes and you're out' policy used on other sites. Need to agree this with the districts sending HGVs to the site. Some will have to go into GB as local vehicles. Part of the traffic plan, and condition of the application.</p> <p>JF – take away the fact that other sites have grown since depot disappeared and traffic levels have increased since the depot closed. Also landfill site will still be used.</p> <p>PP – traffic is always an issue when driving along the B1113.</p> <p>SM – was traffic an issue at Kirklees. GG – didn't appear to be.</p> <p>JF – what is the capacity on the site for vehicles queuing? There were vehicles queuing at Kirklees. CM – visited Kirklees at peak time, post-Christmas backlog and bad weather which had disrupted waste collections. Unusual to find vehicles queuing at Kirklees and not seen this at Tees Valley or Isle of Mann.</p> <p>PP – traffic is the main issue for all the surrounding villages, vehicles already taking shortcuts through villages.</p>	<p>PB to ensure this is considered and check if background traffic has increased</p> <p>CM to provide no. of vehicle queuing space</p>
<p>6. Any other business</p> <p>Circulated handout from last month's presentation – visual impact and landscaping.</p> <p>JF – is there a standard for photographs for visual impacts? DP – yes there are, RPS confirmed that this had been done but will check and feedback to the group.</p> <p>ES – SITA still looking at Isle of Man visit and getting dates.</p>	<p>DP to confirm</p> <p>PPS to confirm</p>



<p>7. Next meeting</p> <p>Date of next meeting was agreed as Tuesday 22 March 2011</p> <p>Topics for future meetings: Deal with questions raised by JF at last meeting - concerns about the cooling equipment, size of bunker and speed of tipping.</p> <p>Topic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- review of how plant works, cover off how issues such as odour, noise etc are dealt with.</li> <li>- Answer questions raised during</li> </ul> <p>JF – can PPS do ring round early to encourage people to attend</p>	<p>PPS to follow up with formal invitations.</p> <p>CM to provide answers for next meeting</p> <p>PPS</p> <p>PPS</p>
--	--