

MINUTES

Meeting: TIDWORTH AREA BOARD
Place: Ludgershall Memorial Hall, Andover Road, Ludgershall,
Hants SP11 9LZ
Date: 6 June 2011
Start Time: 7.10pm
Finish Time: 9.15pm

Please direct any enquiries on these minutes to:

Lisa Moore (Democratic Services Officer), Tel: 01722 434560

or (e-mail) lisa.moore@wiltshire.gov.uk

Papers available on the Council's website at www.wiltshire.gov.uk

In Attendance:

Wiltshire Councillors

Cllr Christopher Williams (Chairman), Cllr Mark Connolly (Vice Chairman),
Cllr Charles Howard

Cllr Toby Sturgis, Cabinet Member for Waste, Property and Development Control
Services

Wiltshire Council Officers

Lisa Moore, Democratic Services Officer
Mary Cullen, Community Area Manager (CAM)
Alistair Cunningham, Service Director for Economy and Enterprise
Andy Conn, Head of Waste Management

Town and Parish Councillors

Tidworth Town Council
Ludgershall Town Council
Chute Parish Council
Chute Forest Parish Council
Collingbourne Ducis Parish Council
Everleigh Parish Council

Partners

Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service – M Bagnall

Garrison – Colonel Paddy Tabor

Community Area Partnership – T Pickernell

Total in attendance: 250

<u>Agenda Item No.</u>	<u>Summary of Issues Discussed and Decision</u>
1.	<p><u>Welcome and Introductions</u></p> <p>The Chairman, Councillor Chris Williams welcomed everyone to the extraordinary meeting of the Tidworth Area Board. He introduced the top table, including Councillor Toby Sturgis, Cabinet Member for Waste, Property and Development Control Services, and Alistair Cunningham, Service Director for Economy and Enterprise.</p>
2.	<p><u>Apologies for Absence</u></p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Burke – Netheravon Parish Council
3.	<p><u>Declarations of Interest</u></p> <p>There were none, however Councillor Mark Connolly noted that he was a governor at Wellington Academy.</p>
4.	<p><u>Opening Remarks</u></p> <p>Councillor Toby Sturgis, Cabinet Member for Waste, Property and Development Control Services</p> <p>He gave an overview of his role as a Cabinet representative attending an Area Board meeting and explained that it was important for any messages arising from the meeting to be taken back and fed into Cabinet.</p> <p>He went on to explain that the Development Planning Document which had evolved since 2005, had originally contained 100 possible sites for development, but that figure had now been reduced to 43, for the final consultation.</p> <p>The consultation would start on 13th June 2011 and would run for 8 weeks, with a report returning to Cabinet in October 2011. The report would go on to Full Council in November 2011, then onto the Secretary of State who would appoint an inspector to make sure the document was fit for purpose.</p> <p>The consultation was an opportunity to gather all of the responses from those who take part. An earlier consultation on the harmonisation of Wiltshire's Waste Services received over 10,000 responses of which 72% of those who responded to that consultation agreed with a harmonisation of services.</p>

	<p>Alistair Cunningham, Service Director for Economy and Enterprise</p> <p>Alistair explained that the Council would be coming out during the consultation period, towards the end of June and the beginning of July, to a venue within the Ludgershall and Tidworth community areas, to hold a consultation event. This would take place from 2pm to 8pm. Officers would be on hand to help people to respond to the consultation, not only on the Development Planning Document, but on the Core Strategy also.</p> <p>The document produced and provided to the Inspector, would need to show evidence of how the consultation process was addressed.</p> <p>Councillor Mark Connolly added that the consultation that starts on 13th June included three sites within the Tidworth Community Area, these were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Castledown Business Park • Pickpit Hill • Everleigh
5.	<p><u>Changes to Wiltshire Council's Waste Contract</u></p> <p>Andy Conn, Head of Waste Management – Wiltshire Council (WC), and Andrea Pellegram, Hills Waste Solutions, delivered information on the planning proposals arising from the changes to Wiltshire’s Waste Contract as follows:</p> <p>Andy Conn</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the sites included within the consultation document is the Castledown Business Park. • Hills had proposed to develop a Waste Transfer site at Castledown Business Park. • Following the formation of a unitary council, Wiltshire’s waste would soon be harmonising the collection of all of the waste across the county. This waste would then need to be managed. • Hills were one of the two main contractors used by WC. • Services carried out by Hills for Wiltshire included kerbside collection of recyclates, operation of household recycling centres, collection from local recycling sites, delivery of recycled materials, delivery of waste to energy plant and landfill. • The duties of WC are to collect and deliver waste safely, avoiding contamination of the environment and ensuring the health and safety of the public and workforce. • The strategy of WC is to reduce the amount of waste that ends up at landfill sites. Thus reducing the negative affect it had on the local environment as well as the global concerns, and making better use of

resources.

- Landfill tax is currently £56/ton this will rise to £80/ton in just a few years. If WC continued to send the amount of waste to landfill that it did a few years ago, the landfill tax bill would be £16 million per year by 2013.
- WC currently diverted non recycled waste to Slough to be processed.
- Ten years ago WC was sending 80% of its waste to landfill, last year this had been brought down to 37%.
- WC had to provide sites to enable the work to be carried out in a safe location.
- The proposed site at Castledown would enable the work to be carried whilst meeting the three key needs, which are safe management of waste, reduction of landfill and efficient bulking and delivery of recyclables and non-recycled waste.
- The sites at Thorny Down and Everleigh would need to be replaced as they did not meet current standards and were not expected to be in use after 2016.

Andrea Pellegram

- Changes in the WC waste collection service would see all households moving to a fortnightly plastic bottle and cardboard collection in addition to the current collection of paper, cans, glass, foil, clothes and shoes. A new county-wide green waste collection service will be available, more waste will be recycled and less landfilled and the waste-related carbon footprint will be reduced.
- In addition to the service changes, there is an identified shortfall in the handling capacity for industrial and commercial waste in the county.
- Hills Waste Solutions' response to the service changes is to increase the capacity for recycling all types of waste to reduce the amount landfilled to reduce the number of lorries used to transport waste between the point where it is collected and finally managed and to make sure there is sufficient capacity to handle all the waste types when the new collections are started by the council.
- Hills Waste Solutions had considered a number of alternative sites before choosing the Castledown Business Park site.
- Solstice Park was Hills first choice and they were negotiating with the landowner when they decided to sell the land to another company and it was no longer available.

The proposal:

- Incoming refuse collection vehicles and kerbsiders run by Wiltshire Council (recyclate and residual waste)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very small number of incoming commercial vehicles from a local area • Sorting materials in bays inside the building • Loading onto larger trucks for onward shipment to other management facilities • 28,000 square feet (approximately) • 1.9 acres (approximately) • 30 jobs (approximately) most transferring in • The whole building would be contained. The waste would be stored in bays, which when full would be taken by a lorry to various locations. • The planned development would take up a small proportion on the site and is some distance from the Wellington Academy. • Hills had hired an architect to produce the best design possible which would include doors to prevent odour. • Consultants had also been hired to look at any concerns which may arise during the pre application consultation stage, with the aim of addressing those concerns prior to submitting the planning application. • It was currently expected that the operational hours would be from 7.00am to 6.00pm, Monday to Friday and from 7.00am to 12.30pm on Saturdays. Peak hours would be between 1.30pm to 3.00pm.
6.	<p><u>Questions from the Floor</u></p> <p>The Chairman invited questions and comments from the floor, some of these were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why has the site at Castledown Business Park been chosen when it is so close to the school. <u>Answer:</u> Castledown Business Park site already had an outline planning permission for B1 (business) B2 (general industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution) uses with associated access, landscaping, parking and servicing, which would allow for businesses other than waste to move in without being required to apply for planning permission, but could still use the same sized lorries. • The timings of the vehicle routes used from the Thorny Down site would need to be increased by 40 minutes each way, as it would take the vehicles coming from Salisbury that additional time to reach Ludgershall. • The presentation had shown that the object would be to reduce the carbon footprint of the waste service, but where was the evidence to

show that this could be achieved by using this site. Answer: Part of the planning application would require Hills to carry out an assessment of the amount of movements to and from the site. By bulking up from smaller to larger vehicles, there would be a need for less vehicle movements.

- What considerations had been given to pest control. Answer: Hills would be required to meet certain standards and requirements to obtain a permit from the Environment Agency. The proposal on display is of a closed building with a roof, which helps to control animal and vermin problems.
- Looking at the figures of the number of vehicles going in and out of the proposed site, it appears that there would be a vehicle either arriving or leaving the site every 2 minutes. These vehicles would need to pass over a weigh bridge which could lead to lines of queuing lorries along the road.
- What would be done to ensure major aquifer protection, to avoid pollution of drinking water, and to prevent surface water flooding. Answer: Hills would have very detailed studies carried out on the drainage for the site, to ensure there would be no chance of flooding. This would also be a requirement of the Environment Agency.
- The Wellington Academy Parent Governors felt that they did not want the Academy to be associated with the proposed waste transfer site.
- The tenants of Castledown Business Park who were all owners of small and expanding businesses and local employers felt that if the waste site was to go ahead as planned on the site, they would all take their businesses elsewhere, resulting in more local jobs being lost than would be gained by having the waste site at the park.
- Why would the current sites at Thorny Down and Everleigh not be able to be used after 2016. Answer: The planning permission for both of the sites would expire in 2016. If new planning permission was sought after that, new buildings would be required to meet current standards and secure the necessary permit from the Environment Agency. The type of buildings would be similar to what had been proposed for the Castledown Business Park site. In the case of the Thorny Down site, where there was a weigh bridge and cabin in place, a new licence would be required from the Environment Agency. The type of building which would be required to meet standards would require more space than was available, as steep chalk slopes and landfill surrounded it. Even if it was possible to construct the required building, the site would need to shut for works to be carried out, which would result in the need for an alternative site to process the waste whilst Thorny Down was out of action. In the case of the Everleigh site, this was currently an open tip with bays. The Environment Agency would require this to be enclosed and the chances of getting a building there were minimal, due to planning restrictions on the development of large buildings in the open countryside.
- The dustcarts coming into the proposed site would come from across the

old Salisbury District area. Currently 23 vehicles a day operated from the Churchfields site in Salisbury, 8 of those were currently able to carry out two routes in one day, as they could unload at Thorny Down in-between routes, before going back to Churchfields to return the dustcart. If all of the lorries were to unload their daily collection in Ludgershall, approximately 19 miles away from Salisbury this would incur an additional £76,000 per annum not counting additional costs for wear and tear, road maintenance, labour costs, mileage and an increase to traffic during school run times. Over a ten year period, there would be an estimated £1 million cost to Wiltshire Council for moving the site to Ludgershall.

- Has anyone approached the MOD to ask to purchase an additional 2 acres of land at the existing Thorny Down so that the appropriate building could be constructed. Answer: The MOD had not been approached with regards to purchasing some land as the surrounding land was landfill or a steep slope.
- With the new military and civilian integration, it would be worth going to the MOD to ask for support. Answer: Wiltshire Council was prepared to have that conversation with the MOD, and would look into it.
- Was it true that Wiltshire Council (WC) would be taking over the Ludgershall Business Park in the near future. Answer: An opportunity for WC to take over the site at Ludgershall under a development agreement arose 6 to 8 months ago. The discussion about the suitability of the site for waste transfer had commenced prior to this.
- When the Academy received £30 million from investors and £2 million from sponsors to build the school, it never crossed the governors' minds that only months of opening, they would be discussing the proposal for a waste disposal site next door. The school is in use for many more hours than just the core school opening times.
- The Zog Group was proposing to build 550 new homes on a development near to the proposed waste transfer site. What position would that put those new houses in when they were ready for sale.
- The Casteldown Business Park was supposed to be a business estate, not an industrial estate.
- The toxins and stench in the air would be carried by the easterly wind and could cause a health risk to adults and children living close by who have asthma. Answer: The Environment Agency would make a distinction between toxins and odour and in both cases, they would need to be satisfied with the safety of the site before they would issue a permit for the site.
- A local Football Association worker explained that it was her role to engage young people in the area to encourage them to play football outside in the fresh air, not where they would be able to smell only waste.

- One person felt that surely it would be better to have the waste site in an area away from towns and villages where a limited number of people would be affected by the repercussions.
- It was felt that Ludgershall was a beautiful place to live, with its woods and livestock, putting a dump in the middle would not improve it for the residents.
- It was felt that following an unsuccessful attempt to have the speed limit outside the school reduced from 40mph to 30mph, the village could not sustain any increased movements.
- The proposal from Hills was for a strategic site and not a local site. Strategic sites should be 16 kilometres from a major city, Salisbury was further away than this from the proposed site.
- Creating more mileage for the dustcarts does not seem to support the green issue. Answer: WC has a development document which lists the 43 proposed sites (reduced from an original 100 sites) that are considered suitable to be used for waste sites. The document also says that there has to be evidence that supports the planning application for the development of a site, and identifies any issues connected to a site. Any issues that have been noted at the meeting and any that come in from the consultation process will need to be addressed within the planning application, should one be submitted.
- Have Hills carried out any air quality tests at the existing sites. Answer: Some studies had been carried out at composting sites.
- In the summer months when the temperature gets very hot, it is likely that the waste site would open its doors on a more regular basis.
- An increase in vermin at the site would result in a loss to the local wildlife and birds.
- Who put the site forward for consideration in 2006. Answer: Cllr Connolly informed the Board that in 2006 he objected to the site being used for a waste transfer station as did Ludgershall and Tidworth Town Councils, further objections were raised from him and Ludgershall Town Council earlier this year. He had never received a reply on why the site is still being considered.
- With the added traffic brought about during the construction of the Drummond Park housing site and after completion by new residents, how is the village expected to cope with the added traffic from the waste trucks. The roads are not suitable for large vehicles, especially around areas like the war memorial. Answer: In terms of development coming forward in Ludgershall and Tidworth, the transport development team would look at issues like that to establish any issues.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the proposed development have masts that spray out chemicals. <u>Answer:</u> If required by the Environment Agency, then yes. • Are the transport figures provided based on the facility working on a 100% capacity. <u>Answer:</u> The figures are based on the current usage of the existing facilities. If people create more waste then the figures would go up. • The Chamber of Commerce had been working for the past ten years to produce a Business Park, not an Industrial Estate. Waste smells after one week of sitting in a bin, imagine what it will smell like when we go over to fortnightly collections. • Is there a guarantee that this site would not be expanded in the future. <u>Answer:</u> There were no current plans to expand this site at present. • The original site at Solstice Park was a strategic plot, this is being classed as a local site. Whether strategic or local, this application should not be considered at all. • The Planning Committee should be asked to reschedule a part of Solstice Park, so the development can go there instead of here. • A petition had been prepared and brought to the meeting for people to sign if they were against the development of a waste transfer site at Castledown Business Park. <u>Answer:</u> The Chairman of the Board agreed to accept the petition when completed, for processing. • How would the consultation be publicised and made available to people. <u>Answer:</u> The consultation would be available on the councils web site at: http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal , by calling 01225 713223 or emailing mineralsandwastepolicy@wiltshire.gov.uk to obtain a hard copy. It would be publicised on the internet, in libraries, in the press and through the Area Board. • A letter from Claire Perry, Local MP who was not in favour of the Waste Transfer site proposed development, was read to the Board. <u>Answer:</u> The Chairman urged anyone else who wished to write to their local MP about the matter to do so. <p>The Chairman asked for a show of hands from all of those in favour of the proposed development at Castledown Business Park, no hands were raised. Then followed a show of hands from those against the proposals, the vote was unanimous throughout the room.</p>
7.	<p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>Councillor Toby Sturgis would take the comments of the people who had attended the Extraordinary Board meeting back to Cabinet. In addition, people were urged to take part in the consultation process which would open on the 13th</p>

	<p>June 2011 to register their comments. All comments would be collated and entered into a report for Cabinet in October 2011.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><u>Next Steps</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation on the proposed development of a Waste Transfer site at Castledown Business Park, starts on Monday 13th June 2011. To view the consultation on line please follow the link below: • Consultation will run for 8 weeks. • Comments will be collated and issues arising from the consultation will be addressed by Hills within an application, should they wish to proceed. • Planning applications can be submitted for consideration. <p>Councillor Sturgis also urged people to respond to the Planning stage of the development, as this was a separate thing which he was not involved in.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p><u>Closing Remarks</u></p> <p>The Chairman made a proposal that a statement was submitted on behalf of the Tidworth Area Board.</p> <p><u>Submission</u></p> <p>The Tidworth Area Board notes that the residents who attended the extraordinary meeting 6 June 2011 are unanimously opposed to the proposed Waste Transfer Facility and asks that the Director for Economy and Enterprise and the Cabinet Member responsible support the residents of Ludgershall and Tidworth by dissuading Hills from submitting an application on Castledown Business Park and help them find an alternative site somewhere else.</p> <p>The next meeting of the Tidworth Area Board will be held on Monday 18 July 2011, 7.00pm at Enford Village Hall.</p>