

SPEAKER NUMBER ONE

CARE FOR THE COMMUNITY

We are very, very disappointed to be standing before you once again. Everyone in our community now knows, that you have totally disregarded the effects the dust from the proposed quarry at Site 4 will have on the young and elderly people living within the reach of its deadly cocktail of dust and diesel fumes.

A totally spurious argument is being used that the dust will be similar to that evident through the process of farming the land. There is absolutely no comparison to the long-term care and maintenance a local farmer takes in farming his land and the dust and dirt a quarry worker and lorry driver generate when extracting sand and gravel from a quarry with which they have no connection.

The main access to and from our village is via the A429. Therefore, the increased risk of accidents created by the volume and type of vehicles is significant: *"Is the increased risk of a fatal accident acceptable to you?"*

Many people have moved to Barford in recent times and have helped it become the vibrant community it is today, however they and us are now blighted by your proposals.

Let me remind you that the Children of our Community, many of whom attend Barford School, will have their health adversely effected by a quarry at Site 4.

And, we must not forget the Children attending the Round Oaks School for the Special Needs Children of South Warwickshire whose health will also be severely compromised. Or perhaps you can see a benefit that such children along with the elderly of Barford are killed off prematurely and will not then become a drain on Social Services?

These issues amongst many others will have a direct impact on our community, a community we care for passionately. We understand that our community does not mean as much to you as it does to us, but we urge you to rethink this plan and remove Site 4.

Thank you.

SPEAKER NUMBER THREE - CHRIS HARRIS

DESTROYING QUALITY FARMING LAND AND BLIGHTING OUR LANDSCAPE

Best and Most Versatile Farmland is protected for a reason. By definition this farmland is scarce. Approval of this plan is wilful and conscious destruction of some of the best farming land in Warwickshire.

The plan claims the majority of this land can be restored to its existing state. This is patently nonsense and insults the intelligence of the reader:

There is a lack of availability of inert land fill.

The mere process of extracting sand and gravel destroys the substructure that has created this high quality farmland. And

There is nowhere in this country where restoration to existing conditions has been achieved.

It appears to me that the words used in the plan are to appease the decision makers. They ignore the reality that this land will never – I repeat never be the same again.

Sadly, this wilful ignorance follows a pattern – the Minerals Planning Department have ignored the health risks to the adjacent community, have ignored inconvenient regulatory requirements and persist in suggesting that restoration to Best and Most Versatile Farmland is achievable. Such an assertion beggars belief.

We understand that yours is a difficult decision and we also realise Sand and Gravel is an important need in the UK. However, we believe your Planning Department have taken the easy route to address your needs despite clear and substantial evidence that Site 4 should not be included.

Barford has expanded significantly in recent years. Amenities, including the school have expanded to meet the challenge and maintain a vibrant community. It is our responsibility to protect that community and we have invested significantly in key surveys to prove this site is unworkable.

You, The Warwickshire Cabinet, have the responsibility and opportunity to ensure that The Minerals Extraction Plan meets all regulatory and community requirements.

We believe that we have presented substantial evidence as to why you should reject this plan and insist on the removal of Site 4. I urge you to grasp that opportunity.

Thank you

I'm Peter Phillips, District Councillor for Budbrooke Ward and resident of Wasperton commenting on the proposed Site 4.

Cabinet will be aware that the original site proposed in October 2015 extended right up to Barford. The new proposal has a 350-metre stand-off between Barford and the site.

Part of this "distancing" was to be achieved by the 2016 proposal by Gladman Development on behalf of St John's to build 135 houses in the north-west corner of the site instead of mineral extraction. The District Council's Planning Officers rejected the proposal outright, without even going to Planning Committee and Gladman's have not appealed. The Officers commented:

"The proposed development will have an adverse impact on the rural character of the area by introducing large-scale built development on a greenfield site."

While we aren't talking houses, we are talking large scale development on site 4. The Officers go on:-

"...it is important to note that the areas around Barford were all identified as being predominantly of high landscape sensitivity..."

Clearly Site 4 is "around Barford" and therefore should also be regarded as a landscape of high sensitivity.

Further the report concludes "Having considered the landscape impact together with the landscape assessments in the [approved] Local Plan, it is considered that the proposals would cause a significant level of landscape harm."

Like the District Council, you would reach the same conclusion that mineral extraction would also cause significant landscape harm.

The housing development also was objected to by Highways due to the extent of the potential additional traffic generated, a feature also common to Site 4. Referring to the stand-off, both the October 2015 and the current report refer to at least 100 metres stand-off from any house. As now proposed the outline boundary of the site is well under 100 metres from Holloway Farm, Wasperton Farm, and Glebe Farm, and is just 20 metres away from accommodation for 14 agricultural workers at Bradshaw Farm. Site 4 is also next to an area for cultivation of hydroponically grown crops approved by WDC Planners in June 2018.

Even if still included in the Plan, the site's boundaries will need looking at again.

Finally, I note that extraction would be limited to 70 Hectares. In October 2015 it was limited to 60 Hectares. The number of lorry movements has also dropped from 80 to 60 per day. Yet both are going to yield 1.8 million tonnes. There is an unfortunate degree of inconsistency here, which does suggest that the proposal is not soundly based.

Combine this with WDC Planner's view of landscape harm, and the boundaries being too close to housing, I would ask that you at least refer the site back to officers for further work, or more prudently exclude site 4 completely.