

(These minutes are published subject to approval by the parish council and to any amendments that will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which they are approved.)

Groby Parish Council

Minutes of the Meeting of Groby Parish Council held at 7.00pm on Monday 1st August at the Parish Council Chamber, Leicester Road, Groby.

Cou/121/05-06 Present.

The Chairman invited new Council Member, Mr. Martin Cartwright to take his seat in the chamber.

Members: Cllr Hagan (Chairman), Cllrs. Batty, Beck, Cartwright, Coates, Dickson, Hollick, Kennard, Marvin, Purves, Yarwood and York.

The Acting Clerk -Cllr Lock

Borough Councillor Collins, County Councillor Sprason (part), Temporary Minute Clerk Miss H Chamberlain, Members of the Public.

Cou/122/05-06 Apologies.

Cllrs: Emmerson, Jones and Hodges. PC Kelley.

Cou/123/05-06 Declarations of Interest.

Cllr Dickson – All items relating to Groby Parish Residents Group, all items relating to Field Head, Public Open Spaces, Fun Run and Parish Plan.

Cllr Yarwood – Lease of Car Park quarry playing field to Druck, Bluebell Drive amenity area and correspondence item no. 15.

Cllr Beck – Allotments, Druck.

Cllr Cartwright – All items relating to the Parish Plan, Neighbourhood watch.

Cllr Hollick – Allotments, Village Hall, Payment of accounts.

Cllr Purves – All items relating to the Landfill, Correspondence item no. 15.

Cllr Kennard – All items relating to the Parish Plan.

Cllr Coates – Correspondence item no. 14.

Cllr York – Correspondence items no. 6 and 16.

Cllr Batty - All items relating to Groby Parish Residents Group, Correspondence item no. 15.

Cou/124/05-06 Minutes of the Council Meeting Held on 11th July 2005.

Resolved that the Minutes of the Meeting held on 11th July 2005, copies of which had been previously circulated to members, be agreed as a true record subject to the following amendments:

Minute Cou/093/05-06 – Add “Cllr Coates and Yarwood”.

Minute Cou/097/05-06 – Change “Backass” to “Backus”. Change “we” to “The Council”.

Minute Cou/099/05-06 – Delete entire second paragraph.

Minute Cou/099/05-06 – Change “consultation” to “letter”.

Minute Cou/099/05-06 – Insert “when only one week between the two letters” after “one”.

Minute Cou/099/05-06 – Insert “for full explanation” after “asking”.

Minute Cou/103/05-06 – Add “until further notice.” in the resolution after “Council carries on with the Dog Warden Service”.

Minute Cou/109/05-06 – Cllr Batty questioned that the minute did not, in his opinion, fully cover the issue, as comments made by Cllr York were not fully minuted; the Chairman also reported that missing also was the cost to the parish and some member’s apparent lack of this knowledge that started the debate. Cllr York stated that she was in no way criticising the election process and only expressing concern about the cost that would be as being incurred; Cllr Batty stated that he was not trying to point score but pointed out that the comments were made in Council closed session and members of the public had a right to know the position of Councillors on such an important issue. Everyone acknowledged that this item was mistakenly discussed in closed session. He accepted Cllr York’s clarifications; The Minutes were then accepted.

Cou/125/05-06 Matters Arising.

Cou/052/05-06 – Proposed enhancements for Ratby Road Stone Wall etc.

Cllr Coates presented her proposal to the Council with regard to the proposed enhancements and bus shelter using FLAG grant money.

It was pointed out by Cllr Batty that FLAG would only grant money for such projects on production of deeds of ownership to the land, which the Council does not have because it does not own the land. Cllr Coates will reply to HBBC that the Council does not own the land in question.

Cou/038/05-06 – Renewal of Insurance.

Cllr Batty asked how we could conform to the audit requirements without doing an inventory; Acting Clerk Cllr Lock responded by saying that the statement was on the advice of the internal auditor and that the paperwork had been sent to Hacker Young, who no doubt will raise any concerns. Acting Clerk Cllr Lock also asked that as we had not addressed the issues that were raised in the inventory report by Cllr Purves, plus we needed to look at outstanding issues with our insurance that we fully discuss the issue at the next meeting. Council agreed to this action.

Cou/085/05-06 – Payment of Accounts.

Cllr Batty was happy that the outstanding invoice to Harvey Ingram's now be paid as the Council may need them to do some work in the near future. Acting Clerk Cllr Lock reported that after speaking to Cllr Batty the cheque had been sent with a letter attached requesting the written explanation that Cllr Batty had previously asked for.

Cou/099/05-06 – Acting Clerk Cllr Lock stated that he had not yet sent a letter, as he now understood from Cllr Batty that a visit to County Hall was the best course of action. Council agreed that Cllrs Batty, Purves and Lock would meet with the Highways Department to discuss this and all other A50 related issues.

Cou/100/05-06 – Field Head Service Roads.

The Acting Clerk Cllr Lock referred to a letter from County Councillor Sprason, which did not arrive until the 27th July, but he thought it to be relevant. He also referred to a letter from Cllr Batty regarding an accident had occurred at the very point on the A50 proposed for the pedestrian crossing and should be considered in the wider context as the letter from L.C.C. stated that no accidents had occurred at this location. Cllr Batty thanked Cllr Sprason for following up his concerns but did not think that they fully covered the legitimate concerns raised by residents; he wondered if the Officers would meet with the residents to listen to their side. The Acting Clerk Cllr Lock suggested deferring the letter to the working party that was set up at the last meeting. All agreed.

Cllr. Batty suggested that it would be helpful to invite Cllr. Sprason to participate, Cllr. Sprason agreed.

Cou/102/05-06 - Partnership Funding for Rural Bus Shelters 2005/2006 Programme.

The proposed shelters as part of the 27/28 Bus route improvements the sites outside Budgens and outside the Stamford Arms have been declined. The shelter outside Budgens was declined by the local Policing Unit due to a fear of unsociable behaviour, and the shelter outside a Public House (Stamford Arms) because the owner's have declined to release the land. Two alternative sites have been suggested instead but these will need looking into. When looking at Bus Shelters in the future Council needs to remember that the funding is for £3000 per shelter not per Council; therefore this needs to be added to our budget for 2006/7.

Cou/107/05-06 – Correspondence, Item No. 3.

Cllr Kennard wished to clear up a matter that had been brought up with regard to funding for notices for Groby Neighbourhood Watch. He stated that notices that had been placed in certain areas were to be used in other areas when required and the Council would not have to pay for new ones as somebody had suggested. Cllr Cartwright who is Chairman of the Neighbourhood Watch confirmed this.

Cou/090/05-06 – Speed limit on A50.

Letter from Mathew Redman about the 40 mph stating that the Police will not support any changes to this proposal. The proposal also meets the requirements for both pedestrian crossing locations. Cllrs Batty and Purves disagreed and were asked to provide the Acting Clerk Cllr Lock with a draft letter to used in the reply. Agreed that this subject we will be included when visiting County Hall before any correspondence is actually sent.

Cou/126/05-06 Public Participation.

This item to be deferred as members of the public had been informed that the discussion on the Bradgate landfill would not take place until 21.00, this item will be split into separate parts to allow the public to comment before each of these import issues are discussed by Council.

Cou/127/05-06 Grobby Juniors Football Club Fun Run.

The Grobby Parish Council Meeting held on the 27th June discussed a request from Grobby Juniors Football Club to use the perimeter of Marina/Castell Park to do "Fun Run" on Saturday 20th August 2005 and they were asked to complete an application form.

The Acting Clerk Cllr Lock looked for the policy and procedures, which were put in place by the Playing Fields Committee with regard to such events, but these could not be found.

Of one hundred and ten consultation letters which were hand delivered by the Council, only fifty three replies were received; some of these were collected by Cllr Batty due to the office being closed this had been agreed by Acting Clerk Cllr Lock prior to the distribution, the result of which was that forty four households were against the Fun Run and only nine were in favour.

The Acting Clerk Cllr Lock gave Mr Valance, of Grobby Juniors Football Club, a letter, which contained six items for them to fill in and return to the Council. None of these had been returned and there was no representative at tonight's meeting to ask why not, especially even though this item had been put on the agenda early for this organisation's benefit

The chairman expressed his disappointment that after all the efforts of the Council to accede to the request by completing their obligations that the football club had not given a reply or attended this evening given that the item has been fully published.

Resolved that the request from Grobby Juniors Football Club to hold a "fun run" on the perimeter of Marina/Castell Park could not be acceded to. The Acting Clerk Cllr Lock will go through the procedures for events such as this with Cllr Yarwood so that requests such as this can be dealt with promptly in future.

Cou/128/05-06 Police Report.

Due to recent terrorist attacks and the G8 summit, Police resources have been stretched and PC Kelley has been unable to attend the last two Parish Council Meetings for which he sends his apologies. Members fully appreciated this and that other duties must take precedence.

In his absence, the Acting Clerk Cllr Lock reported the information as follows:

<i>Crime</i>	<i>Number- Grobby</i>	<i>Number -Field Head</i>
Burglary – Dwelling	0	0
Burglary – Other	3	0
Robbery	0	0
Vehicle – Taking	3	1
Vehicle – Taking From	6	0
Vehicle – Damage	2	0
Non-Domestic Assaults	1	0
Other	0	0
Total Crimes	15	1

Cou/129/05-06 Borough Councillors Report.

Borough Councillor Collins began by thanking Groby Parish Council for them including him when sending their comments on planning applications; this makes the tasks a lot easier.

Matters covered: parking violations are being de-criminalized with the Police Service currently disbanding their traffic warden service. As a result, Councils will be responsible for the overseeing of parking violations and will be employing community wardens to take on this role and issue fixed penalty notices, where applicable. These wardens will be equipped with hand held computers that will be linked into the Police National Computer and Council Computers to make the job easier and more productive.

The planning department has had no further approaches from Bovis Homes as yet.

Borough Councillor Collins stated that Chatham House Rules can be observed in meetings that are minuted so that Members can be free to speak their minds but comments are not attributed to anybody.

Cou/130/05-06 County Councillors Report.

County Councillor Sprason was at the meeting to comment on Field Head issues.

With regard to the Crossing at Field Head, he said that he is waiting for the results of a topographical survey to come back which he was expecting mid to late September and the second plan will not be available until then.

County Councillor Sprason commented he was concerned about the proposed 40mph area and that if Groby Parish Council continued to object to it the whole project would keep being delayed. There had been two accidents at the roundabout in that area in the last five days because of people speeding around it. He suggested that some of the issues raised on the service roads the Council make recommendations under the Local Transport Plan, a draft copy of which he left for Members to look at. With regard to the Crash Barriers that have been requested by Groby Parish Council, Cllr Sprason said that more information was required as to why the Council felt they were necessary.

The Working Party for Field Head Service Roads is to liaise with Cllr Sprason and to report back to Council when they have resolutions for the known problems.

Cou/131/05-06 Payment of Accounts.

<i>Payee</i>	<i>Details</i>	<i>Amount £</i>	<i>Date Paid</i>	<i>Cheque No.</i>
Various	July salaries	3548.26	13.07.05 /25.07.05	105238/39/40/41
Post Office Ltd	Tax for truck	165.00	25.07.05	105242
APSE	Work Study	5,816.25		
HBBC	Office & Cemetery rates	229.00		
I E Fraser	Internal Audit 04/05	200.00		
Association of Burial Authorities	Annual Subscription	78.00		
British Telecommunications plc	Internet services	105.71		
Konica Minolta	Photocopies	21.10		
Granart	Kerb sets x 5 & Plaque	469.70		
Wildwood	Fuel filter	3.13		
SFB Tyres	Puncture Repair - John Deere	11.75		
Sturgess	Truck service	271.19		

Inland Revenue	Tax and N.I	1,443.55
P J Hagan	Chairman's Allowance 04/05	300.00
Parish Dog Warden Services	Dog Warden Services - July	141.67
M Cartwright	Loan (£1500) & remainder of budget	1,651.00
Total		£14,455.31

The Acting Clerk Cllr Lock wished to make the point that when Members needed to question a particular payment or group of payments that they do so carefully; some questions from Council Members with regard to payments for Petty Cash (£500 out of an expenditure of £156K 2004/5), maintenance of mowers, tyres and strimmers etc is sending out the wrong message to employees. It was discussed and thought that a cut-off date for payments should be put in place to give Members time to look over the accounts and question the Acting Clerk Acting Clerk Cllr Lock before a meeting. The cut-off date will be the same as that for correspondence, the Friday ten days before the next meeting.

The Acting Clerk Cllr Lock answered members' questions thereon.

Resolved the payment of the above accounts is approved.

Cou/132/05-06 Lease of Car Park Quarry Playing Field to Druck.

Council had made a resolution at a previous meeting that they were not willing to accept liability for contamination issues: It was also pointed in the District Valuer's report that the Parish Council should not accept any potential liability arising from contamination.

Since this there has been some correspondence with Druck, their reply was that they are currently in consultation with their legal department to restructure the lease agreement to remove the need for the insurance. Acting Clerk Cllr Lock had supplied a copy of the District Valuation report to Druck who were asked to bear in mind paragraph ten of it.

Waiting a reply from Druck.

Council thanked the Vice Chairman for all his efforts with this matter.

Resolved that the Druck lease item will be carried forward to the next meeting.

Advertising the Clerk's Vacancy.

During the debate Council spoke on this topic that was not on the agenda.

A question was also asked about the advert Acting Clerk Cllr Lock replied that Cllr Hollick had this covered.

Cou/133/05-06 Oakmeadow Way.

On the 30th March Council received correspondence concerning an incursion onto Parish Council Land by the owner of 30 Oakmeadow Way.

When these dwellings were built there was a plan for open space under a section 52 agreement. The builders had responsibility for submitting plans for transfer to H&BBC to then register the land with H.M. Land Registry. The land was subsequently transferred to the Parish Council by H&BBC and a title deed was issued. It would appear that H&BBC nor the Acting Clerk Cllr Lock and Chairman of the Council at the time had not checked that the Land registry entries matched the conveyance document and it transpires that the builder had improperly sold a small parcel of land that formed part of the Section 52 Agreement and registered in the title of one of the plots. This resulted in the Council maintaining the area of land in question for the last 16 years at considerable cost.

After some debate Council decided that they had these options:

1. As the Council has maintained the land for the last 16 years, it could be argued that the land belongs to the Council and Possessory Title could be applied for. This could cost the Council about £1500 in charges.

2. Charge the owner for the maintaining the land for the last 16 years at a cost of £2 per week, as our carrying out of this work has never been challenged by subsequent owners, this could amount to £1,500+
3. Ask HBBC to enforce the development's "open plan" requirements that was a conditions of the Planning Permission i.e. remove the fence that he has erected.
4. Seek compensation from the builders as they had transferred the piece of land to H&BBC as part of a Section 52 Agreement and had no legal right to sell it.
5. Do Nothing which was considered not acceptable

Chairman asked what level of value would the District Auditor put on this land Cllr Batty thought that it would be approx.£500

Resolved that Cllrs: Marvin, Hollick and Kennard visit the resident to explain our position and try to find a way of resolving the issue. In addition the Acting Clerk Cllr Lock will write to the resident and report back to Council as soon as possible.

Cou/134/05-06 Bluebell Drive Amenity Area.

A letter in reply to the Councils letter to David Wilson Homes requesting £10,000 for the work to be carried out had been received.

A meeting has been arranged for the 3rd August at 9am.

Resolved that Cllrs: Lock, Batty, Yarwood and Dickson meet with David Wilson Homes and come back with the result and any recommendations to the next meeting.

Cou/135/05-06 Bradgate Landfill Waste Site.

Members of the landfill liaison Committee raised their concerns with regard to the Landfill waste site, which have stemmed from the most recent Landfill Liaison Committee meeting.

Cllrs. Batty & Purves informed fellow Councillors that it had been confirmed by the Environment Agency that earlier allegations that hazardous chemical waste had been illegally disposed of at the landfill site were true and that in fact an average of 2 loads per week imported from outside of the County had been disposed of at the site from July 2004 to April 2005.

What concerned Cllrs. Batty and Purves even more was the revelation by the Environment Agency that prior to July 2004 when stringent new E.U. regulations were introduced by the Government, that the site had been licensed to accept both toxic and hazardous waste and "had done so as a matter of course!" This despite recent public assurances from a representative of Leicestershire County Council that no such waste had been disposed of at this site.

It was also reported that the "leachate" (a suspension of pollutants and contaminants collected) containment controlled by a hydraulic groundwater containment system reliant on a central groundwater tower was in danger of inward collapse and that no viable alternative had yet been identified.

Cllr Purves referred to the new Landfill planning application that did not appear to take into account the recent concerns relating to the leachate tower.

Meeting adjourned for public participation at 9pm.

Cou/125/05-06 Public Participation.

Borough Councillor Collins told the Council that methods are currently being looked at to solve the problems with the structures that are used to contain the waste at the landfill site. He also said that there are contractual problems with quotas for the amount of tipping at the site being fulfilled.

For the record this section of public participation was only talking about item 14.

A resident asked was it correct that the site height would be increased by ten metres and the site open until 31/12/2007, are the Council going to object to this planning request (the chair stated that they could not prejudge the matter).

Cllr Coates reminded Council that the site has to have a raised profile to avoid trapping water on top of it.

Meeting reconvened following Public Participation at 9.05pm.

Cou/135/05-06 Bradgate Landfill Waste Site (cont.)

Concerns from Newtown Linford Parish Council why has an alternative plan had put forward as the consultants appear to be driving the issues rather than the company responsible for the site.

The Chair asked members what action they wished to be taken and it was felt that this item should be linked in with the associated planning application.

Meeting adjourned for public participation at 9.10pm.

Cou/125/05-06 Public Participation (cont.)

The Council should object to the planning consent for the landfill as had been the case three years ago: to assist the City Council, the site was supposed to allow thirty vehicles on Sundays and Bank Holidays as a temporary measure. This is still going on but it is up to one hundred vehicles, not thirty, and it was felt and stated the fact are that the Council and Public have been lied to over the toxic waste issue. The Chair reminded all present that no one from Field Head had supported the Council's objections to the extension of the site three to five years ago. A situation that he felt most surprising and disappointing, at the time.

Have we any assurances that if the planning permission goes ahead that they will stick to it as we have had problems since the site opened with noise, smell, infestation of flies and undeclared toxic waste dumped.

Cllr Batty reported that new regulations had been implemented since last year and no further toxic waste will be added but we could still have a problem with the waste already there, Cllr Coates reported that the Environment Agency would enforce them if they are reported to them.

Chairman asked if there were any other questions on the waste site, as no more questions he reminded the public that we are now back to the original item 5, which is any questions on items on the agenda.

A resident questioned the Council on a letter that he had sent asking why they cannot vigorously pursue a compulsory purchase order for the Klondyke as other Councils in other areas had successfully done and why it appeared that the Borough Council had done nothing. In the mean time the Klondyke is having a detrimental effect on property prices in the area.

The Chair replied that he could not agree that the Borough Council had done nothing as they have been awaiting assessments from various agencies and it has been very difficult for these assessments to be carried out. The Council has to do things properly and follow procedures, which is what is being done.

The Acting Clerk Cllr Lock said that under enclosure C he had pointed out that he had indicated which items should be discussed under planning, the Chair ruled that they could be discussed during this item, the Acting Clerk Cllr Lock also agreed with the Chair that Cllr Collins had supplied regular updates to us the latest one 29th July.

Cllr Batty had discussed with Mr Cash what happens if the travellers appeal, Mr. Cash had confirmed that this would delay any enforcement action.

Cllr Collins has written to the Police authority to investigate if the cash transaction was legal to try every avenue to speed up their departure.

The Acting Clerk Cllr Lock pointed out that letters have been received from Borough Councillor Collins stating that these assessments have now been completed and enforcement notices will be going up this week.

Councillor Collins responded that he has tried every avenue he can to solve this problem and a compulsory purchase order has been suggested and has not been discounted.

Cllr Batty was concerned that as the travellers own the land it can be passed on to a number of owners and they could be here indefinitely so the compulsory purchase order should be seriously considered, he had two further points to raise.

Firstly, H&BBC have the powers under the Planning and Compulsory purchase act 2004 to purchase the land if it improves the Environment of the area and this should include the whole of the Klondyke to return the land to its' designated green wedge status and could then be used to provide amenities for the community. The site not having Planning Permission would be only at agricultural value, there could be two other ways of

funding the proposal; one the Parish could spend some of its' reserves and apply for Grants or it could approach Hanson who are concerned about the sterilisation of their planning consent for mineral extraction.

The Chair commented that this Council had not discounted getting involved in compulsory purchase and to this end we had advertised throughout the Parish to ask if anyone knew of the whereabouts of the original owners, our options are still open, if any Councillors wished it to added on the agenda.

Another resident wished to make a comment about the proposed 40mph speed limit at Field Head. He said that the speed limits are irrelevant if they are not enforced. The local Police have been asked to carry out surveys with Mobile Speed Camera units but many motorists see these and slow down so maybe static cameras would be more appropriate.

Cllr Batty asked if the Council could write to the local police unit if he supplies the details to the Acting Clerk Cllr Lock this was agreed.

Meeting reconvened following public participation at 9.30pm.

Cou/136/05-06 Planning Applications.

Acting Clerk Cllr Lock asked if there were any further questions on the Klondyke as he had referred correspondence items to be discussed on this issue. Cllr Collins only concern was that it was a contaminated area.

Chairman pointed out that the proper procedure must be followed or it could be detrimental to the outcome.

The Parish Council has considered the following applications and its comments are as set out below:

Cllr Purves proposed all the individual landfill items be addressed under one heading under one reference 97/0487/04

Settlement Gradient

In 2001 the County Council approved new settlement rates 20% at the edges and 17.5% within the central spine. The report supporting this submission states that within ref 3.22 that reliable methods of predicting long-term settlement from biological and chemical actions are not presently available and it is only thought that total settlements will be in the range 20% to 30%.

As there appears to be no reliable data available for landfill sites, just case studies, and as this data is still in the process of being gathered, what is available is purely guidance.

In view of this proposal, can this Council be assured that the illustrations of finished land contours can be anything more than a guess, illustrations that also do not appear to be consistent with the contour lines on the topographical study?

This Council therefore have grave concerns regarding the both the integrity and reliability of the information within the report supporting this application

Leachate

Proposals to increase Leachate re-circulation to accelerate the biodegrading of waste in order to speed up compaction rates and by doing so increase the generation of methane. This raises 3 significant issues:

i). Until the problems with the long-term viability of the hydraulic groundwater containment system have been properly addressed, how can this application even justify consideration?

ii). Whilst it may be commercially very attractive to increase the volume of methane produced, the question must be asked whether it is prudent, in view of the need having been identified to increase the gas monitoring/control facility, in respect the existing gas levels. The increase in volume and pressure of the increased levels of methane that would result from the proposals has not been identified in the report. Why not?

iii). Is the proposal to re-circulate the Leachate designed to speed up compaction intended to: (a) achieve the finished ground contour levels earlier, (b) increase the landfill capacity even further or (c) merely to improve the operator's revenue?

It is highly unlikely that the changed reaction processes triggered by increasing the Leachate re-circulation that can not be easily controlled, will have settled by the end of the 2 years extension applied for in this planning application and that no exact measurements can be determined.

One question that has not been answered is exactly how long after the end of tipping does the operator envisage the commercial harvesting of methane to continue? i.e. is the prime purpose of this proposal to increase the re-circulation of Leachate to maximise and prolong methane production and what are the risks

involved particularly bearing in mind, any potential inter-reaction of the (unidentified and undeclared) hazardous chemical and toxic waste that we now know to be in the landfill.

The landfill site is in close proximity to an area of Special Scientific Interest and considered beauty spot; it is questioned whether any new planning application should even be progressed until such time that the problems with the potential collapse of the existing hydraulic containment system have been fully resolved, and the long term viability/integrity of the system is assured.

Screening

Reference 3-45 indicates that as tipping progresses, screen mounds would be created to shield residents from mobile plant and machinery. The report goes on to state that this is good practise.

This is not what some residents are experiencing, they have highlighted the fact that this has not been the case to date as the mobile plant and machinery can be seen by residents who live in both Lena Drive and Forest Drive.

Drainage Restoration Proposals.

It is accepted that there is a need to ensure adequate drainage within the site. It is understood the proposals seek to remove surface water drainage ditch that crosses the site and install a series of open drains around the perimeter of the landfill site.

It goes on to state drawings RES 03 are included and they are not.

These plans not being included gives grave cause for concern as any drainage from this site, if it gets contaminated and leaks into a natural underground water course or these streams, it would detrimentally affect the local beauty spot of Groby Pool

It is also noted from the plans that there is already a lagoon outside the site under the management of the Landfill and clarification is sought on this point. This Lagoon is also adjacent to a stream, which flows through Lady Hay Wood and onto Groby Pool. Likewise there is a stream coming from Old Wood through the fields and onto Groby Pool

Residents in Elsalene Drive have also risen the fact they already have a drainage problem which they fervently believe stems from the landfill site.

Air Quality-Odour Impact

The report states that odour impact from ground level sources is likely to occur under stable conditions and low wind speeds and meteorological data from Watnall was used to identify wind direction.

The research findings in all cases risk of odour impact although low would exist only for the operational period.

Residents in Groby and Field Head are well aware that the weather conditions differ in these two areas which are on the north west to south west side of the landfill, so the overall statistics from Watnall regarding general wind direction may not accurately reflect the weather experienced in this area.

The area of Groby to the south west of the landfill has a microenvironment as it is in a hollow. Over the last few years there have been instances of odour both during the day and evenings, which has lasted more than a few hours.

If the site is to be elevated it is more than likely that the odour when the cap is removed will travel further a field, not only effecting local residents, but also other areas of the Parish.

Dust Impact

It is stated that this proposal differs from the original as it involves removal and storage of capping material and uncovering of an area of tipped waste. The report goes on to describe the dimensions of the dust and then states in 6-79 "The frequency of the dust generated (i.e. warm dry periods) is perceived to be small and no assessment required"

It is queried, as to who perceived that an assessment was not required and on what grounds?

No such sweeping statement can be made when there can be considerable variation in wind speed and wind direction that could greatly affect the disturbance and distribution of dust particles in dry weather; in relatively close proximity to residential properties. Furthermore, it is not believed that when existing capping are removed that material contaminated by previously land filled hazardous waste is not disturbed and that during dry weather there will be no possibility of airborne contaminated particles that may cause a health hazard to residents of nearby homes.

Local residents frequently have their cars covered in small particles of dust and one resident who suffers from asthma believes breathing difficulties are in part due to the dust. It is underscored as opposed to Sahara Desert sand.

Noise

The Report states that no survey was required.

This is disputed, as there is a constant and persistent drone from the site and reverse beeping of machinery during the week and at the weekends. The latter can be clearly heard by local residents from 7:30/8:00 am at weekends This it is believed will get progressively worse if the landfill height is increased as the sound will travel further.

In addition residents of the Parish have been subjected to ever increasing levels of nuisance generated by weekend activities. The users of the site at weekend would have had to make alternative arrangements if the site had closed as planned.

Therefore it is contended that weekend work at the site should cease in December 2005 when the existing planning permission ceases and not renewed or extended under any circumstances.

Visual Assessment

Viewpoint 4 is located 0.4km from the site to the side and rear of the properties of Lena and Elsalene Drive from the public footpath at the edge of Lady Hay Wood.

Viewpoint 5 is taken again from this public footpath 0.1 from the site.

The report states "Nature of view points is sensitive to visual impact as residents experience the impact on a regular and prolonged basis".

In 5.54 the report states these views represent areas not commonly used by the public and which provide less clear views of the proposals.

This is strongly disputed:

- i). local residents, by ramblers/walking clubs, use the public footpath regularly. The County Council who maintain this footpath may well confirm this point
- ii) View point 4 shows the site from ground level but the view from the first floor of houses facing the site the plant traffic can be clearly seen and view will inevitably be affected.
- iii)View point 5 is an eyesore and by no stretch of the imagination is it "sensitive to visual impact".

Resolved that:

1) An objection is sent to Leicestershire County Council Planning Department taking into account the full details discussed at this meeting including points raised in Cou/135/05-06 and views expressed by residents.

2) Cllr Purves and Batty write a response on behalf of the Council for the Acting Clerk Cllr Lock.

Further Applications Considered:

<i>Reference No</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Comments</i>
05/00739/FUL	Druck Ltd 30 Fir Tree Lane	New CO2 Tank and associated Pump House	No Objection Subject to neighbours not being inconvenienced and they're being no other planning applications outstanding.
05/00492 FUL	Martinshaw County Primary School Forest Rise	Erection of Portacabin for use of Changing Facilities	There is concern regarding the increase in traffic flow on a Sunday both am and pm along Forest Rise and parking facilities within the school grounds.
0500744/FUL	19 Laundon Close	Extension and alterations to dwelling	Object on the following grounds 1) There needs to be consistency with the application refused at 26 Castell Drive on the grounds of the number of parking spaces policy RES7. 2) It does not mirror the character of the existing street scene BE1.

05/00716/FUL	33 Farr Wood Close	Extension and alteration to dwelling	Object on the following grounds. 1) This application is inconsistent when taking into account a resent application at 31 Farr Wood Close 2) Garage area enclosed previous applicant required to have a car port 3) Inconsistent regarding rear first floor extension 4) Inconstant regarding front elevation 5) It does not mirror the existing street scene BE1
--------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------	--

Acting Clerk Cllr Lock left the Chamber for the discussion on planning application 05/00716/FUL

Chairman asked for the suspension of standing orders before they discuss planning application 05/00716/FUL.

Resolved that the Acting Clerk Cllr Lock informs Hinckley and Bosworth of the Councils comments on planning applications as set out in the table above.

Resolved that the Council give the Acting Clerk Cllr Lock authority to seek the best way for reducing the incident of punctures.

Resolved that the Council change the decision to suspend the meeting of 25th July and call a new meeting for 8th August the agenda to include the missed items from tonight so to agree along with the remaining item form the 25th July so to conform to standing orders a notice will be issued tomorrow.

Cou/137/05-06 Date of Next Meeting.

Monday 8th August.

Signed.....Date.....
Chairman