

Peter Clifford,
Chairman, Chilton Parish Council,
Grange Farm, Newton Road,
Chilton, Sudbury, Suffolk,
CO10 0PY

Tel/Fax: 01787 371798
Email: phoenixfound@btinternet.com

Mr. Terry Burns,
Scrutiny and Monitoring Development Section,
Suffolk County Council,
Endeavour House,
8 Russell Road,
Ipswich, Suffolk, IP1 2BX

13th September 2008

Dear Mr. Burns, **Ref: B/08/01182/CMA, Proposed Quarry, Chilton Estate.**

Further to Chilton Parish Council's previous objections to an application for a Quarry on the A134 by Brett Aggregates we would like to add the following comments on the revised application as above.

Traffic and Vehicle Movements:

1. It is clear that "desk top" assessments have been made about the nature of this stretch of the A134 and these do not take into account its inherent dangers and the extreme problems that local residents experience accessing the road at all. This also applies to everyone, including staff, visiting the nearby Wyevale Garden Centre.
2. Our own check of road traffic volume at the proposed site entrance is of over 1100 vehicles per hour in peak periods. Your own recorders (SCC) are recording over 1,000 vehicles per hour and it is not much less in non-peak periods during daylight hours. Whilst expected house building and industrial development in the Sudbury area is increasing all the time and we now expect in excess of 3,000 houses to be built in the area in the next ten years yet further increasing road traffic volume, it is inappropriate to service this from the intended site on such a poor quality stretch of road. The A134 is the main artery between Sudbury and Ipswich, Colchester and the East Coast and there is no other realistic route that residents in the immediate area can use.
3. All of Brett's traffic assessment figures are based on averages. We would suggest that with daily and seasonal peaks and lows, the actual impact on the local road infrastructure will be much bigger than Brett imply during peak periods.

4. Recent observations of Brett Aggregate's quarries locally now indicate that they are moving to use even larger vehicles with 12 wheels and weighing in excess of 30 tonnes when fully loaded. Vehicles of this size negotiating a roundabout will inevitably result in delays and tailbacks.
5. Brett have indicated that they will replace gravel and sand removed on the site with soil extracted from the Ashwell Development at Chilton Woods. The projected size of the Chilton Woods project is currently between 700- 900 new houses. There are no projections in Brett's vehicle movement assessments for this activity.
6. Observations at Brett's quarry at Layham indicate there is considerable vehicle activity from local builders and contractors coming and going in their own lorries to independently purchase loads of sand and gravel. Again there are no projections for vehicle movements by Brett to take into account this activity.
7. During wet weather in particular there will be a great deal of wet load run – off and for most vehicles this is uncontrollable. The Layham quarry is 2.4 miles from the Hadleigh by-pass and most of this loose material has been deposited on the side road before the lorries meet other traffic. At Chilton the proposed quarry will be just 100yards from the A134 resulting in road deposits for at least half a mile in both directions. Deposits on the road surface will inevitably result in further accidents.

Noise, Dust and Environmental Impact:

1. Most of the gravel in the site is believed to be of a substantial size, approximately 40mm, and therefore will have to be crushed to make it suitable for the making of concrete, its primary use. This will be an extremely noisy process and given a prevailing south west wind in the area the noise will carry to local residents, primarily those at Great Waldingfield and Acton and severely impact on those residents that live within 200 metres of the proposed site.
2. Nearby Sudbury sits in a deep valley and acts as a dust bowl and under certain wind conditions dust from the site will end up there. Asthma sufferers in the area and parents with children with this condition have expressed concern.
3. With regard to wildlife, recent surveys have shown that there are great crested newts, a protected species, at the pond P2 (and no fish as reported at 2.4.25 Brett's application document) and in the gardens of houses at Winthrop Close, all less than 250 metres from the proposed site. There are substantial colonies of great crested newts at Chilton Hall in several ponds, within 500 metres of the site, and these have not been recorded by Brett's environmental surveys.
4. There are also substantial colonies of birds feeding in the fields for the proposed site which have not been taken into account by the occasional visits of Brett's environmental observers.
5. Nearby Winthrop Hall has a team of dressage horses which are often in a field within 100 metres of the site. Such horses are temperamental at the best of times and will be significantly affected by loud noises from site processing equipment and traffic.
6. The Parish Council is also concerned about potential light pollution from this

site. There is already considerable light pollution in Chilton from Chilton Industrial Estate and from two sites on Chilton airfield. There is nothing in Brett's proposals to mitigate against this.

7. Apart from the clear industrialisation of this site, we believe that the importation of construction and demolition waste from the Ipswich area, more than 17 miles away, is, in this day and age, increasingly unsustainable, especially when the intention is to re-export it after crushing and grading back to the Ipswich and Colchester areas. The same work can be carried out at Brett sites nearer to Ipswich with much lower levels of pollution and road and environmental damage.
8. When assessing the environmental impact of traffic from this site, all the impact on villages between Sudbury and Ipswich and Colchester, Sudbury Town Centre (and in particular Ballingdon, which already has a monitored pollution and congestion problem) and villages to the west and south of Sudbury also needs to be taken into account. There is no clear indication that Brett have taken this into account in their assessments.

The Site:

1. It is clear from studying the reports and surveys that this site contains no more than one million tonnes of useable material, that the seams of sand and gravel are less on average than the specified 2 metres and that the sand in particular is of poor quality. So much so that Brett will have to import sand (again unsustainably) in order to make cement of the required standard. Brett's importation figures indicate that they will be importing 6,250 tonnes of sand and 6,000 tonnes of aggregate annually to a site where they are supposed to be producing it. This is not sustainable.
2. The Suffolk Minerals Local Plan ran out in 2006 and the latest proposed site specific document, which includes the Chilton site, is only in draft. We suggest that no weight should be given to the inclusion of this site in the previous plan as it may well not be included in the new one.
3. Preparations for the site will include substantial tree planting. If small whips are used, which is the norm, then these will take 5 to 6 years to mature and to be of any use in screening the site from the surroundings. No timing plans are given for this in Brett's assessments and we believe that this will be detrimental to the enjoyment of the environment by local residents if allowed to proceed in a strictly unregulated way.

Conclusion:

1. **We believe that this is a poor site for extraction of sand and gravel and (ignored by other extraction companies for ten years) can only be made commercially viable by importing construction and demolition waste for processing and carrying out a high proportion of other industrial activity. Brett's estimates indicate that less than one third (32.72%) of total vehicle movements are directly connected with the extraction of sand and gravel**

and that in total more than two thirds (67.27%) of the vehicle movements are specifically connected with other industrial activity. In our view this is an industrial site masquerading as a quarry.

2. Observation of the proposed site access will show that this proposed quarry is entirely in the wrong place on a narrow, busy and poor quality stretch of road. The Police have consistently opposed the siting of this quarry and continue to do so. From their point of view there is a high degree of accident risk and when accidents do occur the road is closed for several hours and valuable police resources are tied up accordingly. In their latest letter of objection the Police report that there have been 38 accidents on the A1071 from Ipswich in the last twelve months and a further 13 between Chilton and the A1071 junction. These figures include two fatalities. Just a few weeks ago there was a three vehicle pile up approximately 20 yards away from the proposed quarry entrance and this entire stretch of the A134 was closed for two and a half hours.

If allowed to proceed, this application will affect not only affect the Sudbury area but all the villages on the A134 between Sudbury and Bury St. Edmunds and Sudbury and Colchester and all the villages on the A1071 past Boxford and Hadleigh and through Hintlesham onto Ipswich. All the Councillors who use these roads regularly know that they are not designed for increasing numbers of HGV traffic. Just two weeks ago, Suffolk County Council put up a large "Accident Investigation Site" sign on the A134/A1071 junction. This is only done when accidents reach a certain level. Increased and unnecessary HGV traffic will not improve this situation.

3. The proposed roundabout would be approached by a blind hill and a blind bend coming from Sudbury and a blind bend coming from Newton Green. Whilst it would be easier and safer for lorries to enter the proposed quarry from a roundabout, the inevitable queues of traffic that would result would be a sitting target for fast moving traffic leaving Sudbury and Newton. Queues of traffic would also block the exits from the Winthrop Hall Road, Wyevale Garden Centre and Cornard Tye and possibly even Valley Road, increasing the risk of impatient drivers causing further accidents.
4. All the local Parish Councils, Babergh District Council and Suffolk County Council's own County Councillors, have unanimously rejected this application previously. We see nothing in the revised application to include a roundabout to make this proposal any safer for local road users or any more environmentally sustainable than the previous one (especially without any comments from the Highway Authority).

We therefore respectfully ask the Development Committee to once again reject this application on the grounds that 1. the proposal would be detrimental to the free flow and safety of traffic on the A134 and the A1071

and 2. the proposal would have an adverse environmental impact on the existing road network.

Yours sincerely,

PETER CLIFFORD

Peter Clifford
Chairman, on behalf of Chilton Parish Council