

**Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council**

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held on  
26 November 2002 at 7.30 p.m. at Sherbourne Village Hall**

**Present:** Cllr J V Murphy (Chairman)  
Cllrs M P Byerley, Mrs A Gordon, G P Grimma, R G Mulgrue,  
A Roberts (*vice* Clay) and J T Wright.

**In attendance:** representatives of T J Composting Services Ltd,  
Mr R Braithwaite (Zero Environment Ltd, acting as adviser to the  
Committee) and Cllr R G Butler (WDC).

**1. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs R Clay (represented by Cllr Roberts), D H Hunt and W Worrall.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared.

**3. Planning Application**

The following planning application was considered:

W1031/02CM029 – composting of organic horticultural and landscaping materials on land at Longbridge Farm, Sherbourne.

At the invitation of the Committee the developers described the proposed development, the nature and scale of the operations, the environmental impact and the licensing régime.

Several members of the public were present and at the invitation of the Chairman questioned the developer's representatives and commented upon the application.

Members of the Committee and Mr Braithwaite on their behalf also questioned the developers on aspects of the proposal. Amongst the points raised were the following:

- (i) conformity with policies in the District Local Plan, in particular policies towards greenfield sites near motorway junctions, developments in special landscape areas and developments near ancient monuments;
- (ii) the location of the site in relation to dwellings and workplaces;
- (iii) traffic movements;
- (iv) environmental concerns, particularly noise and odour;
- (v) health concerns arising from airborne micro-organisms, particularly since the site was close to places of work, a number of residential properties and a footpath and cycleway frequently used by schoolchildren;
- (vi) concerns over unsuitable material arriving at the site for processing;
- (vii) possible problems from rodents;
- (viii) the capacity of the nearby farmland to utilise the material processed on the site;

- (ix) concern over possible conflicts of interest in the County Council, in that it was to decide on the application yet it appeared to derive a trading benefit from the operation of the site and it was the Waste Disposal Authority with pressures to meet re-cycling targets.

The developers responded emphasising the control measures which would be in place, the safe operation of their existing sites without complaints from residents, the very limited extent of noise and odour from the site, the screening process for unacceptable materials, the minimal problems with rodents and the Environment Agency's licensing and control procedures if expansion of the site from its initial capacity to that shown in the application were implemented.

Mr Braithwaite drew attention to inconsistencies between the applicant's responses to questions and the written application and to points made by the applicant that could be challenged. He considered that the control measures could not completely negate the effects of the operation of the site and that, therefore, the site was poorly located in view of its proximity to existing dwellings and workplaces.

The Committee unanimously *resolved*:

that Warwickshire County Council be recommended to refuse the application for the development on the following grounds:

- (a) it is contrary to the District Council's Local Plan on three counts (policies ENV4, ENV21 and C8);
- (b) detrimental environmental effects (e.g. odour, noise, dust and visual intrusion) and health effects which the Committee believes could not be controlled satisfactorily by the Environment Agency under its licensing regime;
- (c) the effects of processing operations on the site are unacceptable in close proximity to dwellings and workplaces in Sherbourne, Longbridge and Barford and to a footpath and cycleway used by schoolchildren;
- (d) concern that there appeared to be no control over spreading operations on nearby farmland and throughout the estate, nor over the quality of material arriving on the site;
- (e) concern, based on evidence given to the Committee by the applicant which appears to be at variance with the written application, over the potential number of traffic movements.

The Committee also expressed its concern that the application was to be determined by the County Council despite appearing to have a conflict of interest since it would derive a trading benefit in disposing of the waste.