

FIGHT THE QUARRY!

NEW APPLICATION – MAJOR POINTS

The earliest the application can come before Suffolk County Council Development Committee is 23rd October 2008. Please copy your letters to your County Councillor, your District Councillors and to Tim Yeo MP (House of Commons, London S.W.1 or yeot@parliament.uk)

1. This site was added to the Suffolk Minerals Local Plan (SMLP) more than 10 years ago after a public inquiry. Investigations showed that there are 1 million tonnes less aggregate than first thought and the seams are less than the required 2 metres thick in places. This is therefore a sub – standard site and other activities have to be undertaken to make it profitable.
2. Brett Aggregate are proposing not only to extract sand and gravel but to operate a batching plant (to make and export wet concrete), a bagging plant (to bag up aggregate for resale, some of it especially imported to the site) and a waste recycling plant (to bring in builders demolition waste from the Ipswich area for sorting, crushing and re-export, mostly back to Ipswich). In addition the sand at Chilton is not of sufficiently good quality for concrete and additional sand of better quality will have to be imported from Layham quarry near Hadleigh. Only approximately a third of the lorry movements generated (according to Brett's own figures) have anything directly to do with the extraction of sand and gravel. All the rest, 67.27%, is to do with other industrial activity. In addition we believe that moving construction and demolition waste from Ipswich to Chilton for crushing and sorting and then returning it mostly to the Ipswich area is, in this day and age, completely unsustainable, especially when the same work can be carried out nearer Ipswich in the first place.
3. All of this will generate 20,228 vehicle movements a year, mostly 20 tonne lorries, some of them larger still. 65% of these movements will be backwards and forwards through the villages to Ipswich and Colchester. 35% will go westwards towards Melford and Sudbury, some going through Sudbury Town Centre and onward through Ballingdon to Halstead, Braintree and beyond.
4. The only feasible access and exit for this site is onto the A134 just before Wyevale Garden Centre. This stretch of road, which is very narrow and full of bends, has been described by the police as “approaching accident black spot status”. When accidents do occur along this stretch of road the A134 is closed for hours as it was two weeks ago when a three vehicle pile up occurred just 20 yards from the proposed quarry entrance.
5. Despite building a four metre bund (mound) around the plant, the site will be noisy (diggers, dumper trucks and crushing and processing machinery) and dust will be generated especially in dry weather. The aggregate at Chilton is mostly fairly large (40 mm) and will have to be crushed and this will be noisy. The prevailing wind to the site is from the south –west and therefore most noise and dust will be carried towards Chilton Corner, Great Waldingfield and further onto

- Acton. An east wind that usually blows for a week or so in winter will carry noise and dust westwards towards Chilton Industrial Estate and Sudbury. A north wind will carry noise and dust in the general direction of Little and Great Cornard.
6. To address safety concerns, Brett have now proposed to build a roundabout at the site entrance. This will make access for the lorries easier and slow traffic down to some extent. However, a roundabout in this location will generate queues of traffic as large, slow moving lorries navigate it, especially during peak periods. At peak periods the traffic flow at this point exceeds 1,000 vehicles an hour (SCC figures). A roundabout will also cause queuing traffic to block the entrances to other nearby minor roads and encourage traffic to use others (e.g. the road through Cornard Tye) as “rat runs” to avoid the roundabout altogether.
 7. Approaches to this proposed roundabout would be a blind brow of a hill coming from Sudbury and Cornard with vehicles breaching this as they accelerate away from the Shawlands roundabout and a blind corner coming from Newton Green. Collisions with queues of traffic waiting at the proposed roundabout would therefore be almost inevitable. In addition, unlike Layham (2.4 miles from the main road), the proposed Chilton quarry would be less than 100 yards from the A134. We believe that this will result in a layer of wet load run-off from the vehicles (almost impossible to control in wet weather) for about half a mile in either direction, further endangering other road users with a slippery surface.
 8. There is no guarantee that vehicle movements will not increase from 20,228 a year once planning permission is granted. Brett have also proposed that soil from the Chilton Woods housing development is used for infill once aggregate has been removed from the ground. There are no estimates of the extra lorry traffic that this will generate. Furthermore, experience elsewhere indicates once the ten year operation is complete, aggregate extraction companies very often apply for additional planning permission to further extend their operations on the sites they have occupied.
 9. All in all we do not believe that this is a viable stand alone site for aggregate extraction. (For ten years no aggregate extraction companies were interested in it at all). It can only be made viable by turning the site into an industrial processing one full of other activity. We do not believe that this justifies the disturbance and disruption to those living near the site, the loss of amenity to footpath users, the noise and dust that will be generated for at least ten years, probably longer, and the added danger to all road users on the A134 from Sudbury to Colchester and Ipswich and all the villages in between.
 10. In discussions with the Police they have indicated that they will continue to oppose this proposal for a quarry at this site on the grounds of the dangerous nature of this road, roundabout or no roundabout. The A134 together with the road through Hintlesham are two of their main target roads in Suffolk. Accidents especially between Sudbury and Newton cause them immense problems and not only block this main route for hours but simultaneously tie up valuable Police resources which are needed elsewhere.

These are the main arguments. Feel free to use any of them (or any others that you can think of) in your correspondence with local councils, councillors and your MP,

but especially Suffolk County Council who are the ultimate decision making authority on this issue. Wherever possible use your own words.

If you require any further information or help please email:

contact@stopthequarry.org.uk