

Welshampton and Lyneal Parish Council

Minutes of the Parish Meeting held on Thursday 27 November 2014, at Welshampton Parish Hall, starting at 7.30pm

Present: Chair: Welshampton and Lyneal Parish Council Chair, Chris Symes
Clerk: Carole Warner
In attendance: Shropshire Councillor Brian Williams and Stuart Lawrence,
Residents: approximately 40

PM 04/14

Introduction by the Chair

The Chair Chris Symes welcomed everyone and explained the 'rules' and objectives of the meeting. In particular, this was a consultation/information event and voting on the item on the agenda would not take place.

PM 05/14

Presentation of Planning Application:

**Extension to Wood Lane Quarry submitted by Tudor Griffiths Ltd Ref
14/04589/MAW**

by Stuart Lawrence, Group Estate Manager, Tudor Griffiths Ltd

The Chair invited Stuart Lawrence, to make his presentation. The following questions/comments were made:

1. Clarification was sought regarding any discussions with Wales and West Utilities Ltd in connection with the tunnel option to cross the Spunhill / Colemere lane and the basis of the decision to propose a road crossing.
Mr Lawrence explained the process in reaching the decision to install a road crossing. The key considerations were the unstable material in which the gas pipeline was laid and the requirement that any design of the tunnel would have to provide a 100% guarantee not to damage the pipeline. Mr Lawrence was to ascertain the size of the pipeline.
2. An explanation of how to make and deadlines for residents' responses to Shropshire Council was provided by the Parish Clerk. Viewing of the documents and maps are available on planning pages of Shropshire Council's website and in paper format on appointment at Shropshire Council's offices.
Mr Lawrence advised that the full paper copy of the planning application was available to view on appointment at the Wood Lane office.
3. Clarification was sought on the cost of the road crossing as opposed to a tunnel solution. Details of both solutions were requested so to compare costs against community intrusion.
Mr Lawrence explained that the engineering solution for the road crossing was still being progressed prior to submission to Shropshire Council for approval.
4. Clarification was sought as to whether Tudor Griffiths Ltd would be making a contribution to the community.
Mr Lawrence explained the levy paid to central government.

5. Clarification was sought on the safety measures to be deployed to ensure the gas pipeline.
Mr Lawrence stated that any recommendations by Wales and West Utilities Ltd would be included. Mr Lawrence was to ascertain where the valve shut off points along the pipeline were.
6. It was considered that the landscape, ecological and hydrological aspects of the application had not appreciated the setting in which the quarry was to be sited and that some aspects eg species report had not been included in impact assessments. It was noted that Natural England had submitted an objection response requiring more information from the applicant.
Mr Lawrence considered the assessments had been compiled appropriately and advised Natural England's comments had been referred back to the consultants responsible.
7. Clarification was sought on how the application would impact traffic movements on A528.
Mr Lawrence advised that quarrying in Zone 4 would start when Zone 3 was exhausted so no additional movements would be expected. Changes in traffic movements were due to the return to near pre-recession levels of business activity.
8. Clarification was sought on the depth of the proposed quarry.
Mr Lawrence advised the quarry would go down to 84 aod.
9. It was considered there were errors in the ecology and hydrology reports, in particular reference to the surface and spring water at Little Mill Pond. It was requested that a dye test be carried to clarify the water flows.
Mr Lawrence advised there was an error in the hydrology report and a correction was to be submitted to Shropshire Council. Mr Lawrence to follow up the request for a dye test outside the meeting.
10. It was considered that the noise impact to near properties would be horrendous and the local area would experience a substantial increase in noise pollution.
Mr Lawrence explained how the bunds were designed to mitigate noise. He acknowledged that when the bunds were being constructed there would be some increase in noise but this work would be conditioned by Shropshire Council. General discussion took place on the measures TGs are carrying out to reduce noise generated by plant machinery.
11. Clarification was sought on the disposal of silt and site lighting.
Mr Lawrence advised silt would go to the silt lagoon and no lighting would be placed in Zone 4.
12. Further comments were made about the noise levels, the efficiency or not of bunds and noise generated by pumps in Zone 3.
Mr Lawrence explained the dumper trucks would not generate noise over and above the excavating machinery and pumps had been required in Zone 3 due a period of a very wet summer and winter. He did not expect pumps to be used in Zone 4.
13. Comments were made about the visual impact from near properties.
Mr Lawrence advised visual impact assessments had been carried out although the initial stripping of soils would cause disturbance.

14. Clarification was sought regarding the volume of sand and gravel to be excavated from Stage 2 and Stage 3.
Mr Lawrence agreed to follow this up.
15. Concern was raised regarding the visual impact when trees near one property were felled as planned.
Mr Lawrence agreed to visit the resident/property in question.
16. Clarification was sought on any 'Plan B' if the application was refused.
Mr Lawrence advised the reasons for any refusal would be reviewed and an appeal would be made if appropriate.
17. Clarification was sought on the noise and visual impact on the canal.
Mr Lawrence advised that woods and bunds would mitigate the impact. Inland Waterways had also been consulted and no issues had been raised.
18. Clarification was sought on the independence of technical reports, in particular to noise assessments.
Mr Lawrence advised all consultants were independent, in that no instructions to the outcomes were given. The reports have to comply with standard industry and statutory requirements.
19. Clarification was sought on the size of the bunds.
Mr Lawrence advised details were included in the application documents.
20. Mr Lawrence was asked whether compensation would be given to those residents most affected by the quarry.
Mr Lawrence deferred to answer.

CLlr Chris Symes declared the meeting closed at 9.45pm.

Signed.....

Date.....